

Pinellas County Schools

Dropout Prevention School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	10
III. Planning for Improvement	15
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	22
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	22
VI. Title I Requirements	25
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

Dropout Prevention School

301 4TH ST SW, Largo, FL 33770

<http://it.pinellas.k12.fl.us/schools/dropout-prevent/>

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.

Educational Alternative Services, through unified community efforts, provides quality educational opportunities and services for students and their families by educating and preparing each student for college, career and life.

Educational Alternative Services has schools serving students throughout the county.

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
TOPPING, MICHELLE	Director, Educational Alternative Services	The Director, Educational Alternative Services is responsible for providing leadership and support for the district's in-school and out-of-school educational alternative programs. The Director is responsible for the implementation and coordination of these programs and the articulation of such among regular schools and outside agencies.
McManus, Eric	Administrator, DJJ/ Educational Alternative Services	The Administrator is an instructional and operational leader within the school community and is critical to improving student outcomes through staff development and effectiveness. In collaboration with and aligned to the direction of the Director, the Administrator supports the creation of the culture of rigorous learning, belonging and engagement for staff, students and families throughout the school community. In alignment with the Florida Assistant Principal Standards, the Administrator supports and leads assigned school teams to increase school and student outcomes through ongoing training, coaching, feedback and support by prioritizing instruction while effectively balancing operational, safety and policy responsibilities, as assigned.
Saunders, Chawnda	Administrator, DJJ/ Educational Alternative Services	The Administrator is an instructional and operational leader within the school community and is critical to improving student outcomes through staff development and effectiveness. In collaboration with and aligned to the direction of the Director, the Administrator supports the creation of the culture of rigorous learning, belonging and engagement for staff, students and families throughout the school community. In alignment with the Florida Assistant Principal Standards, the Administrator supports and leads assigned school teams to increase school and student outcomes through ongoing training, coaching, feedback and support by prioritizing instruction while effectively balancing operational, safety and policy responsibilities, as assigned.

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.

Annually Pinellas County Schools and the Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) surveys students, parents, and staff. The District and School maintain a website. Three times a year Educational Alternative Services meet with community partners to address needs and discuss progress.

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 goals (areas of focus) will be reviewed and monitored monthly and at mid-year. Data will be collected through walkthroughs to monitor new systems for blended learning, progress monitoring assessments and attendance. Goals will be revised (adjusted) to address any needed action steps revealed during monthly review and the mid-year summary.

Demographic Data

2023-24 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School PK-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Alternative Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	57%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	58%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	Yes
2021-22 ESSA Identification	CSI
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)* Black/African American Students (BLK)* Hispanic Students (HSP)* White Students (WHT)* Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)*
School Grades History	
School Improvement Rating History	2021-22: COMMENDABLE 2020-21: MAINTAINING 2018-19: MAINTAINING 2017-18: MAINTAINING 2016-17: MAINTAINING
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	12	0	0	0	4	16	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	14	0	0	0	4	18	
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		

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	
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	11	0	0	4	4	44	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	7	0	0	4	5	30	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	29	0	0	4	5	58

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	29	0	0	2	6	54
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	11	0	0	4	4	19	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	7	0	0	4	5	16	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	29	0	0	4	5	38

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	29	0	0	2	6	37
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*	8	63	57	0	70	61
ELA Learning Gains	9	56	55	6	63	59
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile		42	46		56	54
Math Achievement*	0	65	55	0	72	62
Math Learning Gains	11	60	60	3	63	59
Math Lowest 25th Percentile		51	56		54	52
Science Achievement*	0	58	51	2	64	56
Social Studies Achievement*		82	72	0	81	78
Middle School Acceleration						
Graduation Rate	4			1		
College and Career Acceleration						
ELP Progress	20					

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

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

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	CSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	7
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	Yes
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	6
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	52
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	80

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index

Graduation Rate

4

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	3	Yes	3	3
ELL	20	Yes	1	1
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	3	Yes	3	3
HSP	13	Yes	3	3
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	17	Yes	3	3
FRL	3	Yes	3	3

Accountability Components by Subgroup

Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school. (pre-populated)

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS

Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21	ELP Progress
All Students	8	9		0	11		0			4		20
SWD	0	8								0		
ELL												20
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	0	5		0	15		0			0		
HSP										13		
MUL												
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	30									3		
FRL	0	9		0						3		

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	0	27		3	12		4			2		
SWD										0		
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	0			0			0			4		
HSP										0		
MUL												
PAC												
WHT										2		
FRL										3		

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	0	6		0	3		2	0		1		
SWD	0	10		0	0		0			0		
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	0	0		0	0		0			0		
HSP										0		
MUL												
PAC												
WHT				0						2		
FRL	0	3		0	3		3			0		

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	*	48%	*	50%	*
05	2023 - Spring	4%	57%	-53%	54%	-50%
07	2023 - Spring	*	48%	*	47%	*
08	2023 - Spring	*	47%	*	47%	*
09	2023 - Spring	*	46%	*	48%	*

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	*	61%	*	55%	*
05	2023 - Spring	0%	61%	-61%	55%	-55%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	*	47%	*	44%	*
05	2023 - Spring	0%	60%	-60%	51%	-51%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	14%	53%	-39%	50%	-36%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	8%	46%	-38%	48%	-40%

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

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

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.

Math showed the lowest performance overall in achievement levels and dropped in learning gains. After reviewing student data for the 2018-19, 2020-21, and the 2021-22 school years, EAS programs made learning gains in ELA and Math in all three years. ELA gains showed the most significant fluctuations while math remained more stable. Achievement levels in ELA and Math showed the least improvements. However, after 2 years at zero percent, in 2021-22, 8% of the student's showed proficiency in ELA. Overall, in the past 3 years our black students and students with disabilities had no students reach achievement levels. Contributing factors for our EAS sites could be poor student attendance and engagement.

Data collection for Educational Alternative Services (EAS (Dropout Prevention)) programs vary greatly and do not allow for easy monitoring and evaluation as we have an inconsistent population. From year-to-year students served in our programs vary in age, grade level, and length of enrollment. Grade levels range from 4th to 12th grade; and length of enrollments can vary from a few weeks to the entire year. All students are administered the state assessments. In many of our programs there are not enough students to populate a data component.

Our staff receive district VAM scores as part of their evaluation. For the purposes of our analysis, and as we serve the entire district with our programs, we will use the district scores compared to the state for the required assessments for graduation, Algebra (Pinellas 28, State 32) and FAST ELA (Pinellas 48, State 50).

The majority of our programs rely on a blended learning model of instruction; and a single classroom will serve multiple grade levels and courses. As we continue to develop our system to evaluate the blended learning classroom, we will use classroom walkthrough "Look-Fors" to collect data to ensure standards-based instruction and academic acceleration are in place to support our students.

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

Math showed a decline from prior years, dropping from 3% attaining achievement levels to no students. District achievement was also below the state average. Factors related to our EAS students could include poor student attendance, lack of student engagement, and students' deficiencies in the skills needed to be successful in a blended learning environment.

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.

Math scores showed the greatest gap with the district scoring 4 percentage points below the state average. Factors related to our EAS students could include poor student attendance, lack of student engagement, and students' deficiencies in the skills needed to be successful in a blended learning environment.

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

District scores in ELA remained constant, however, EAS improved from zero to 8% of our student's achieving proficiency. We employed instructional practices that resulted in students doing the work of the lessons.

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

EAS programs serve students across the district, those students meet the multiple criteria elements defining Dropout Prevention programs. Our typical students struggle with attendance, academic achievement and lack engagement. We have not met the minimum required 41% in the six (6) federal indicators: White (WHT), Black (BLK), Hispanic (HSP), English Learners (EL), Students with Disabilities (SWD), and Free and Reduced Lunch (FRL). Areas of concern based on EAS population trends would be our two largest categories: black students and students with disabilities.

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

Standards-Based instruction (with academic acceleration), positive school climate (attendance and engagement), and staff support (Professional Learning, and Professional Learning Communities (PLC's)).

Area of Focus

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

#1. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Early Warning System**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.

EAS students struggle with school attendance and engagement. We will focus on further development of PBIS activities to build a positive school culture in order to improve student attendance and engagement.

Measurable Outcome:

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

During the 2023-2024 school year, EAS programs will develop our PBIS systems within our various programs to improve attendance and student engagement. Attendance will improve to 90% ADA and student engagement will increase as measured by attendance records, child study teams minutes, satisfaction surveys, and improved academic performance as measured by course completions and academic assessments.

Monitoring:

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

Monthly attendance reports will be monitored by administrative team and will guide Child Study Team meetings. Satisfaction Surveys will be completed annually by students, staff and families via email questionnaires. Student course completions and academic assessments will be reviewed after each semester of the school year by the Administrative and School Based Leadership Team.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

MICHELLE TOPPING (toppingl@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.)

Tichnor-Wagner, A., & Allen, D. (2016). Accountable for Care: Cultivating Caring School Communities in Urban High Schools. Leadership and Policy in Schools, 1-42

This study examined the caring practices in two higher performing and two lower performing urban high schools. It was found that "higher performing schools demonstrated caring communities, where interpersonal relationships and high academic expectations were prevalent throughout the school" (pg. 406).

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Our EAS programs have a smaller TPR and focus on the unique needs of our learners. Some common complaints from our students in regard to traditional schools, include: the sense of not belonging, academic struggles, lack of assistance, issues with peers, and family struggles.

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 2 - Moderate 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.

Each EAS program will develop their own PBIS guidelines for success and incentives.

Person Responsible: Chawnda Saunders (saundersch@pcsb.org)

By When: Guidelines for success and PBIS activities will be in place before the end of the 1st quarter of the 2023-2024 SY.

Monthly ADA (Average Daily Attendance) reports and CST (Child Study Team) meetings will be conducted and reviewed by Administrative and SBLT (School Based Leadership Team).

Person Responsible: Michelle Pool (poolm@pcsb.org)

By When: Monthly throughout the 2023-2024 SY. ADA reports will be reviewed, and CST meetings held to address attendance concerns.

Surveys will be completed annually for all stakeholders. Surveys will gather information based on student experiences and engagement, family satisfaction with our programs, and staff/partnering agency perceptions of our programs and student engagement. Specific surveys addressing new processes will be conducted as needed throughout the year.

Person Responsible: Eric McManus (mcmanuse@pcsb.org)

By When: At a minimum an annual survey will be conducted for all stakeholders in late April/May from the district and EAS administration.

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Benchmark-aligned Instruction**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

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

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

EAS sites have multi-grade, multi-course classrooms. Benchmark aligned instruction is difficult to monitor and evaluate. Students' basic skills need to be accelerated in order for them to reach the standards of the courses in which they are enrolled. Staff need further training and supports to help them accelerate and keep students progressing through courses. Students need the skills to work more independently through notetaking and collaboration.

Measurable Outcome:

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

During the 2023-2024 SY, EAS programs will see an increase in learning gains in both ELA and Math as measured by state and district cycle assessments with 80% of our students making a learning gain.

Monitoring:

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

Classroom walkthroughs will occur monthly by the administrative team to assess benchmark aligned instruction and student acceleration. Progress monitoring Assessments will be reviewed, along with student progress in academic software.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Eric McManus (mcmanuse@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.)

Ysseldyke, J., Spicuzza, R., Kosciulek, S., Teelucksingh, E., Boys, C., & Lemkuil, A. (2003). Using a curriculum-based instructional management system to enhance math achievement in urban schools. *Journal of Education for Students Placed at Risk*, 8(2), 247-265.

The authors reflect that in order to improve teaching and learning, systematic, usable information regarding individual student performance and progress at the classroom level must be available (pg. 247). The system allowed teachers to differentiate instruction based on data. Results reflect a positive effect with students in classrooms implementing the system demonstrating more growth than students in classrooms that did not implement the system (pg. 259)

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

As teachers become more skilled, student acceleration and course completions will improve in both the timely completion of the course as well as the depth of knowledge, with students passing cycle assessments and/or curriculum (Edmentum) assessments on the first attempt.

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 2 - Moderate 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.

EAS staff will be provided training, guidance and feedback to ensure benchmark aligned instruction and academic acceleration for students are in place utilizing a newly developed walkthrough tool with classroom "Look-Fors".

Person Responsible: Eric McManus (mcmanuse@pcsb.org)

By When: Monthly faculty and PLC meetings will address teacher training, support and collaboration in order to address student learning and acceleration.

Teachers will provide an interactive introduction to lessons and utilize collaborative study groups in all applicable EAS programs.

Person Responsible: Chawnda Saunders (saundersch@pcsb.org)

By When: Ongoing throughout the 2023-2024 SY.

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Professional Learning Communities**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

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

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

EAS sites have multi-grade, multi-course classrooms. Our programs tend to be isolated, with only one or a couple of teachers on site teaching multiple subjects using a blended learning model. PLC's lack focus on the benchmark standards and focus on school needs. Staff need to be able to collaborate with staff members instructing in similar content areas, sharing best practices and concerns related to content area. Staff need further training and supports to help them accelerate and keep students progressing through courses.

Measurable Outcome:

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

During the 2023-2024 school year, EAS staff will participate in monthly virtual Professional Learning Communities by content area via a Teams platform. Satisfaction surveys will assess staff views of this process twice annually, at the end of each semester.

Monitoring:

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

Progress will be monitored by Administrators and school-based team leaders assigned to the content area monthly. Attendance, discussions and data shared in teams will also be reviewed monthly at these meetings.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Eric McManus (mcmanuse@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.)

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

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

consensus that permeates the staff, ensuring that the maximum amount of classroom time is focused on instruction and establishing a cohesive culture (pg. 10-11). The current principal may be able to signal change; however, there may need to be a change in leadership to communicate the need for a dramatic change in the school (pg. 11).

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

It is important for staff to be able to collaborate in content specific fields in their professional learning communities with the support of administration to have clear communication, have high expectations, make changes/adaptations, maximize instruction and establish a cohesive culture.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

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

Tier 3 - Promising 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.

Create a Teams channel for content specific instructors.

Person Responsible: Eric McManus (mcmanuse@pcsb.org)

By When: By September 2023, the TEAM channels will be active for the first PLC meetings of the month.

Assign content specific team leaders, to manage content specific channels and to serve on the School Based Leadership Team.

Person Responsible: MICHELLE TOPPING (toppingl@pcsb.org)

By When: By the September 2023, the team will be established.

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 funds are reviewed and approved between EAS School Based Leadership Team and School Advisory Council, to ensure expenditures are aligned to school improvement initiatives.

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

N/A

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

100% of the students were below Level 3 on the 2022 statewide Fall MAP, 2023 Winter MAP, and 2023 Spring FAST assessments.

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

N/A

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

75% of all 5th grade students will achieve proficiency, as measured by the 2024 FAST 5th grade assessment .

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.

The administrative team will monitor data through the use of all district assessments, formative, and summative assessments. We will also monitor that interventions for all Tier 2 and Tier 3 students are done with fidelity. The administrative will provide support and feedback focused on explicit, systematic and sequential approaches for all instructional content areas.

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Saunders, Chawnda , saundersch@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?

Strategically focus on instruction by ensuring equitable use of resources including instructional supports, school-based professional development, cycles of coaching, feedback, etc. Ensuring the teachers have a clear understanding of the science of reading, we will use a diagnostic on each student to determine what gaps need to be filled. Students will receive interventions to fill these gaps and will be progress monitored on the gaps monthly. Fluid groups will be used so students can be moved into groups that support their need as they master the levels of reading acquisition. The Flamingo Literacy and Accelerated Learning Plan will be the way of delivering many of our small groups, with an emphasis on phonics/phonemic awareness together and a transfer to real text and writing.

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?

The practices described above have a proven track record when the adults using it are monitored for fidelity and coached as needed.

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
Ensure teachers have a clear understanding of the 5th grade B.E.S.T. ELA Standards	Saunders, Chawnda , saundersch@pcsb.org
Increase teacher knowledge of the science of reading and evidence-based practices through Professional Learning Communities	Saunders, Chawnda , saundersch@pcsb.org
Implement targeted instruction and frequent progress monitoring to ameliorate gaps early for students identified as not meeting benchmarks.	Saunders, Chawnda , saundersch@pcsb.org

Title I Requirements

Schoolwide Program Plan (SWP) Requirements

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

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

The SIP will be reviewed with partnering agencies, and school-based leadership team during the 1st quarter. Progress will be shared after monitoring assessments and quarterly with all stakeholders.

Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission, support the needs of students and keep parents informed of their child's progress.

List the school's webpage* where the school's Family Engagement Plan is made publicly available. (ESSA 1116(b-g))

It is the mission of EAS to build positive relationships with all stakeholders and to further develop connections between school and families. PBIS will help us to build a positive school culture and will seek stakeholder input throughout the year.

Describe how the school plans to strengthen the academic program in the school, increase the amount and quality of learning time and help provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum. Include the Area of Focus if addressed in Part III of the SIP. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)ii)

Identified in Area of Focus.

If appropriate and applicable, describe how this plan is developed in coordination and integration with other Federal, State, and local services, resources and programs, such as programs supported under ESSA, violence prevention programs, nutrition programs, housing programs, Head Start programs, adult education programs, career and technical education programs, and schools implementing CSI or TSI activities under section 1111(d). (ESSA 1114(b)(5))

EAS partners with community partners to ensure wrap around services are provided to students and their families. Students have individual progress monitoring plans to address their needs and goals. Students are assessed at appropriate levels for college, career and life planning.