Pinellas County Schools

Paul B. Stephens ESE Center

2022-23 Ungraded Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Paul B. Stephens ESE Center

2935 COUNTY ROAD 193, Clearwater, FL 33759

http://www.stephens.pinellas.k12.fl.us

Demographics

Principal: Katie Csaszar

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2020

2021-22 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Function (per accountability file)	ESE
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School PK-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Special Education
2021-22 Title I School	No
2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	*[Data Not Available]*
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Economically Disadvantaged Students Hispanic Students Students With Disabilities White Students
School Improvement Rating History	2021-22: Maintaining 2020-21: No Rating 2018-19: Maintaining 2017-18: Unsatisfactory 2016-17: No Rating
DJJ Accountability Rating	2022-23: No Rating

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Pinellas County School Board.

SIP Authority

A Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) is a requirement for Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI) ungraded schools pursuant to 1001.42 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) and for DJJ schools receiving a rating of Unsatisfactory pursuant to Sections 1003.51 and 1003.52, F.S. and Rule 6A-1.099813, F.A.C.

CSI schools can be designated as such in 2 ways:

1. Have a graduation of 67% or lower; or
2. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

DJJ Unsatisfactory Ratings are based on percentages by program type:

- Prevention and Intervention: 0%-50%
- Nonsecure Programs: 0%-59%
- Secure Programs: 0%-53%

SIP Plans for Ungraded CSI schools and DJJ schools receiving an Unsatisfactory rating must be approved by the district and reviewed by the state.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The School Improvement Plan (SIP) provides schools and Local Educational Agencies (LEAs) the opportunity to identify the academic and priority goals along with strategies for each school. School leadership teams may refine their SIP annually to define their school's academic and priority goals to increase student achievement.

Schools and LEAs are strongly encouraged to collaborate in the development and implementation of this plan.

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

Prepare each student for a life of purpose and independence.

Provide the school's vision statement.

100% Student Success

Briefly discuss the population unique to your school and the specific supports provided to meet the mission and vision.

Students at Paul B Stephens ESE Center require support in order to access communication, receive instruction on state standards, and engage in the learning process. IEP teams have determined that the general education setting for our students does not provide the necessary supports and the least restrictive environment is an ESE Center.

School Leadership Team

Membership
Identify the name, email address, 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	
Csaszar, Katherine	Principal		Administrative and supervisory work in the area of instruction, personnel, curriculum, safety, budget, purchasing, public relations, plant operations, food service, and transportation
Godek, Lori	Assistant Principal		Transportation, Testing, Extended Transition
Clawson, Nancy	Behavior Specialist		Behavior support and coaching
Levy, Mandy	Staffing Specialist		Compliance monitoring teacher support
Rawl, Janet	Administrative Support		Secretary/Bookkeeper
Liss, Ileana	Other	PT	
Poteet, Melissa	Teacher, ESE		Elementary Team Leader
Parks, Gail	Instructional Media		
Sullivan, Victoria	Teacher, ESE		Extended Transition Team Leader

Is education provided through contract for educational services?

No

If yes, name of the contracted education provider.

.

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Wednesday 7/1/2020, Katie Csaszar

Total number of students enrolled at the school.
229

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school.
48

Number of teachers with professional teaching certificates?
52

Number of teachers with temporary teaching certificates?
1

Number of teachers with ESE certification?
46

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2021-22 school year.
5

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2022-23 school year.
5

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

2022-23

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

Indicator	Grade Level												Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level												Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level												Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 7/13/2022

2021-22 - Updated

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

Indicator	Grade Level												Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	4	4	6	5	4	14	10	15	11	8	20	13	110	224
Attendance below 90 percent	2	1	2	0	3	8	1	5	4	5	10	6	9	56
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level												Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level												Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data Review
Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school, or combination schools).

School Grade Component	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement								70%	61%
ELA Learning Gains								63%	59%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile								56%	54%
Math Achievement								72%	62%
Math Learning Gains								63%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile								54%	52%
Science Achievement								64%	56%
Social Studies Achievement								81%	78%

Grade Level Data Review - State Assessments
NOTE: This data is raw data and includes ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					

ELA						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
05	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
06	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
07	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				

MATH						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
05	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
06	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
07	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
05	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
06	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
07	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	**School**	**District**	**School Minus District**	**State**	**School Minus State**
2022					
2019					

CIVICS EOC					
Year	**School**	**District**	**School Minus District**	**State**	**School Minus State**
2022					
2019					

HISTORY EOC					
Year	**School**	**District**	**School Minus District**	**State**	**School Minus State**
2022					
2019					

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	**School**	**District**	**School Minus District**	**State**	**School Minus State**
2022					
2019					

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	**School**	**District**	**School Minus District**	**State**	**School Minus State**
2022					
2019					

Subgroup Data Review

2022 SCHOOL GRADE 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
SWD	7	30		11	26		24	12		100	
WHT		20		10	25		24	7			
FRL	8	30		13				20			

2021 SCHOOL GRADE 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
SWD	6	18		6	23					95	
WHT	6	23		9	21					94	
FRL	8	17		13	20					92	

2019 SCHOOL GRADE 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

ESSA Data Review

This data has been updated for the 2018-19 school year as of 7/16/2019.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	CS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	26
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	YES
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	207
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	91%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	26
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	3
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0

Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	14
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	3

Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	18
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	3

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis
Answer the following analysis questions using the progress monitoring data and state assessment data, if applicable.

Reflect on the Areas of Focus from the previous school year. What progress monitoring was in place related to the Areas of Focus?

This past year we used a data spreadsheet to monitor student progress for communication and level of response. We are using this as a baseline for improvement of student communication and level of response for the upcoming school year.

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

Weekly Progress Monitoring Tasks Aligned to Access Points
Instructional staff progress monitored students weekly with grade band progress monitoring assessments aligned to learning targets. A rubric utilizing levels of prompting and 3-2-1 choice support provided consistent monitoring of achievement.
Results:
ELA 931 opportunities (Correct Response) 416 (1) 45% 334 (2) 36% 181 (3) 19%
Math 938 opportunities (Correct Response) 449 (1) 48% 343 (2) 37% 146 (3) 15%
The above numbers show that students were able to make a correct choice with a selection of 2 or more answers 52% of the time. This shows that the need for an errorless choice is becoming less prominent. Our students are moving in the direction of communicating what they know within the choice options provided as part of access point instruction. This method is directly connected to the FSAA and data-folio assessments.

What area is in the greatest need of improvement? What specific component of this area is most problematic? What is your basis (data, progress monitoring) for this conclusion?

While ELA scores are rising our students are still in need of a reliable mode of communicating what they know and understand. The majority of our students remain a level one across academic areas. School wide focus on core vocabulary and communication modes integrated into all academic areas.

What trends emerge across grade levels, subgroups and core content areas?

The above numbers show that students were able to make a correct choice with a selection of 2 or more answers 52% of the time. This shows that the need for an errorless choice is becoming less prominent.
A consistent focus on core vocabulary and the use of core boards integrated into English language arts learning targets contributed to this growth. Planning for real world connections aligned to instructional targets helped students participate in meaningful functional activities.

What strategies need to be implemented in order to accelerate learning?

Identifying the most reliable method of FSAA assessment; Data-Folio or Performance tasks is critical to assessing the academic success of our students. In addition using grading rubrics identifying the levels of prompting and number of choices necessary for a correct response is key to progress monitoring for academic improvements. Provide more opportunities for students to make academic answer choices using the identified mode of communication.

Based on the contributing factors and strategies identified to accelerate learning, describe the professional development opportunities that will be provided to support teachers and leaders.

All staff will participate in Project Core Modules to assist classroom staff in integrating core vocabulary and modes of communication into all academic activities.
Technology specialist will provide professional development in online learning resources to engage our unique population.
Professional Learning Communities will focus on researching and planning for real world academic connections to engage learners in the areas of math and ELA.
Ongoing training will be provided on choosing the most reliable mode of assessment through the IEP team and using the communication matrix to guide goal setting.

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.	Our current level of performance shows we had a learning gain of 29% during the 2021-2022 school year of our ESE students who took the FSAA performance task. There are no scores available for the 2020-2021 school year as testing was not provided due to the COVID-19 pandemic. The majority of our Level 1 students do not have a reliable mode of communicating what they know and understand, which impacts their ability to make any gains. An increase in real world connections and more culturally relevant instruction through the use of a consistent mode of communication, core vocabulary and accurate form of assessment will lead to more students making learning gains.
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	The percent of ESE students who make learning gains in ELA FSAA will increase from 29% to at least 34%.
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	Instructional staff will progress monitor students weekly with grade band progress monitoring assessments aligned to learning targets. A rubric utilizing levels of prompting and 3-2-1 choice support will provide consistent monitoring of achievement. Grade band teams review weekly progress monitoring data and make adjustments to instruction based on student need. Team leaders share progress during bi-weekly school based leadership team meeting.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Katherine Csaszar (csaszark@pcsb.org)
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.	Project Core is a classroom-based intervention for students with significant cognitive disabilities who do not use speech, sign language or symbols to meet a broad range of communication needs. The Tier I, universal intervention in Project Core calls for modeling the use of symbols combined with explicit teaching of the meaning and use of the Universal Core vocabulary. Modeling and teaching are integrated into daily activities (arrival, mealtime, personal care) instructional routines (shared reading, predictable chart writing, alphabet knowledge/phonological awareness activities). Communication core boards will be used as a mode of modeling communication during instruction. As the first tier of a multi-tiered System for Augmenting Language (mSAL), the intervention is a classroom-based communication intervention for all students with targeted communication needs. Instructional routines(e.g., shared reading, predictable chart writing, alphabet/phonological awareness) are grounded in evidence-based practices and provide examples of the use of the Universal Core vocabulary throughout the academic blocks of instruction.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.	The multi-tiered System for Augmenting Language (mSAL) is a three-tiered system for providing communication intervention that offers support to a large number of students with significant cognitive disabilities who do not currently use speech, signs, and/ or symbols to communicate. The first Tier of mSAL is focused on the classroom and the classroom teacher using Aided Language Stimulation in a systematic instructional routine. This will help build consistent and reliable modes of communication so we can accurately assess student progress.

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.

During Individual Education Plan meetings teams will determine the appropriate form of the FSAA that accurately measures individual student learning gains. (Performance task or Data-folio) and identify communication skill goals to address based on the students' individual needs.

Person Responsible Mandy Levy (levym@pcsb.org)

Instructional staff will progress monitor students weekly with grade band progress monitoring assessments aligned to learning targets. A rubric utilizing levels of prompting and 3-2-1 choice support will provide consistent monitoring of achievement.

Person Responsible Katherine Csaszar (csaszark@pcsb.org)

During pre-school and ongoing monthly sessions instructional and support staff will participate in Project Core training modules to learn instructional practices to integrate core communication/ vocabulary into daily learning targets.

Person Responsible Katherine Csaszar (csaszark@pcsb.org)

Instructional staff will plan and implement real world culturally relevant lessons connected to identified learning targets.

Person Responsible Lori Godek (godekl@pcsb.org)

During preschool and ongoing monthly sessions ALL staff will become fluent in modeling the use of communication core boards across all areas of the school. (front office, clinic, classroom, cafeteria, behavior suite) Ongoing professional development sessions will provide classroom staff with engagement strategies to support learner success. (Shared Reading, Partner Assisted Scanning, Behavior De-escalation/Redirection, Levels of Prompting)

Person Responsible Katherine Csaszar (csaszark@pcsb.org)

Speech therapists will provide weekly modeling in the use of a variety of communication modes that meet the needs of individual students and collaborate with classroom teachers to integrate a variety off communication modes to engage all students during academic activities. Speech therapists will develop and share a Core words focus of the week and activities for teacher intentional planning.

Person Responsible Mary Katherine Jones (jonesmaryk@pcsb.org)

Administrators and district staff developers will plan monthly support meetings to problem solve and focus our improvement efforts based on classroom walk-through and teacher input. (Communication Team)

Person Responsible	Katherine Csaszar (csaszark@pcsb.org)
Ongoing professional development will occur during monthly PLC's on various online platforms as identified by each team to ensure staff can plan and develop interactive lessons to support students use of a variety of learning platforms via their I-Pads	
Person Responsible	Gail Parks (parksg@pcsb.org)
Monitoring ESSA Impact: If this Area of Focus is not related to one or more ESSA subgroups, please describe the process for progress monitoring the impact of the Area of Focus as it relates to all ESSA subgroups not meeting the 41% threshold according to the Federal Index.	Instructional staff will progress monitor students weekly with grade band progress monitoring assessments aligned to learning targets. A rubric utilizing levels of prompting and 3-2-1 choice support will provide consistent monitoring of achievement. Grade band teams review weekly progress monitoring data and make adjustments to instruction based on student need. Team leaders share progress during bi-weekly school based leadership team meeting.

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.	Our current level of performance shows we had a learning gain of 28% during the 2021-2022 school year of our ESE students who took the FSAA performance task. There are no scores available for the 2020-2021 school year as testing was not provided due to the COVID-19 pandemic. The majority of our students do not have a reliable mode of communicating what they know and understand, which impacts their ability to make any gains. An increase in real world connections and more culturally relevant instruction through the use of a consistent mode of communication, core vocabulary and accurate form of assessment will lead to more students making learning gains.
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	The percent of ESE students who make learning gains in Math FSAA will increase from 28% to at least 33%.
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	Instructional staff will progress monitor students weekly with grade band progress monitoring assessments aligned to learning targets. A rubric utilizing levels of prompting and 3-2-1 choice support will provide consistent monitoring of achievement. Grade band teams review weekly progress monitoring data and make adjustments to instruction based on student need. Team leaders share progress during bi-weekly school based leadership team meeting.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Katherine Csaszar (csaszark@pcsb.org)
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.	Project Core is a classroom-based intervention for students with significant cognitive disabilities who do not use speech, sign language or symbols to meet their communication needs. The Tier I, universal intervention in Project Core calls for modeling the use of symbols combined with explicit teaching of the meaning and use of the Universal Core vocabulary. Modeling and teaching are integrated into daily activities (arrival, mealtime, personal care) instructional routines (shared reading, predictable chart writing, alphabet knowledge/phonological awareness activities).Communication core boards will be used as a mode of modeling communication during instruction. As the first tier of a multi-tiered System for Augmenting Language (mSAL), the intervention is a classroom-based communication intervention for all students with targeted communication needs. Instructional routines(e.g., shared reading, predictable chart writing, alphabet/phonological awareness) are grounded in evidence-based practices and provide examples of the use of the Universal Core vocabulary throughout the academic blocks of instruction.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for	The multi-tiered System for Augmenting Language (mSAL) is a three-tiered system for providing communication intervention that offers support to a large number of students with significant cognitive disabilities who do not currently use speech, signs, and/ or symbols to communicate. The first Tier of mSAL is focused on the

selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.	classroom and the classroom teacher using Aided Language Stimulation in a systematic instructional routine. This will help build consistent and reliable modes of communication so we can accurately assess student progress.

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.

During Individual Education Plan meetings teams will determine the appropriate form of the FSAA that accurately measures individual student learning gains. (Performance task or Data-folio) and identify communication skill goals to address based on the students' individual needs.

Person Responsible Mandy Levy (levym@pcsb.org)

Instructional staff will progress monitor students weekly with grade band progress monitoring assessments aligned to learning targets. A rubric utilizing levels of prompting and 3-2-1 choice support will provide consistent monitoring of achievement.

Person Responsible Katherine Csaszar (csaszark@pcsb.org)

During pre-school and ongoing monthly sessions instructional and support staff will participate in newly developed Project Core training modules to learn instructional practices to integrate core communication/ vocabulary into daily learning targets.

Person Responsible Katherine Csaszar (csaszark@pcsb.org)

Instructional staff will plan and implement real world culturally relevant lessons connected to identified learning targets.

Person Responsible Lori Godek (godekl@pcsb.org)

During preschool and ongoing monthly sessions ALL staff will become fluent in modeling the use of communication core boards across all areas of the school. (front office, clinic, classroom, cafeteria, behavior suite) Ongoing professional development sessions will provide classroom staff with engagement strategies to support learner success. (Shared Reading, Partner Assisted Scanning, Behavior De-escalation/Redirection, Levels of Prompting)

Person Responsible Katherine Csaszar (csaszark@pcsb.org)

Speech therapists will provide weekly modeling in the use of a variety of communication modes that meet the needs of individual students and collaborate with classroom teachers to integrate a variety off communication modes to engage all students during academic activities. Speech therapists will develop and share a Core words focus of the week and activities for teacher intentional planning.

Person Responsible Mary Katherine Jones (jonesmaryk@pcsb.org)

Administrators and district staff developers will plan monthly support meetings to problem solve and focus our improvement efforts based on classroom walk-through and teacher input. (Communication Team)

Person Responsible	Katherine Csaszar (csaszark@pcsb.org)
Ongoing professional development will occur during monthly PLC's on various online platforms as identified by each team to ensure staff can plan and develop interactive lessons to support students use of a variety of learning platforms via their I-Pads	
Person Responsible	Gail Parks (parksg@pcsb.org)
Monitoring ESSA Impact: If this Area of Focus is not related to one or more ESSA subgroups, please describe the process for progress monitoring the impact of the Area of Focus as it relates to all ESSA subgroups not meeting the 41% threshold according to the Federal Index.	Instructional staff will progress monitor students weekly with grade band progress monitoring assessments aligned to learning targets. A rubric utilizing levels of prompting and 3-2-1 choice support will provide consistent monitoring of achievement. Grade band teams review weekly progress monitoring data and make adjustments to instruction based on student need. Team leaders share progress during bi-weekly school based leadership team meeting.

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.	Increase the percentage of students scoring above a Level 1 by 5% as measured by the 2023 FSAA and EOCs. 28% of students who participated in the 5th or 8th grade Science FSAA or the Biology EOC scored a level 1.
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	The percentage of all students scoring above a Level 1 will increase by 5% in Science and EOCs as measured by the 2022 FSAA (Performance Task or Datafolio) and EOCs.
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	The percentage of all students scoring above a Level 1 will increase by 5% in Science and EOCs as measured by the 2023 FSAA (Performance Task or Datafolio) and EOCs.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	[no one identified]
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.	The evidence-based strategy being implemented in this Science area includes direct instruction using a variety of teaching strategies (such as visual supports, hands-on materials, core vocabulary supports, sensory integrated experiences, whole group/small group/ individualized instruction, repeated instruction). Project Core/ MELD/core vocabulary supports is a classroom-based intervention for students with significant cognitive disabilities who do not use speech, sign language or symbols to meet a broad range of communication needs. The Tier I, universal intervention in Project Core calls for modeling the use of symbols combined with explicit teaching of the meaning and use of the Universal Core vocabulary. Modeling and teaching are integrated into daily

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

activities (arrival, mealtime, personal care) instructional routines (shared reading,
predictable chart writing, alphabet knowledge/phonological awareness activities).
Communication core boards will be used as a mode of modeling communication
during instruction. As the first tier of multi-tiered System for Augmenting Language
the intervention is a classroom-based communication intervention for all students
with targeted communication needs. Instructional routines (e.g., shared reading,
predictable chart writing, alphabet/phonological awareness) are grounded in evidence-based practices and
provide examples of the use of the Universal Core throughout the Science block of
instruction.

Because some of our students have no identified mode of communication compounded by limited intellectual capacity, they require exposure to real world
experiences to help them process and retain information. Based on the 2019
FSAA results, 23% of students in grades 5 and 8 scored a Level 2 or higher and
44% of the students who took Biology EOCs scored a Level 2 or higher. As a
result, we will incorporate the use of culturally relevant science lessons aligned to
the access standards and refine methods of determining students' modes of
communication. Direct instruction using a variety of teaching strategies includes
multiple evidence-based learning strategies to reach the variety of learners with

	significant cognitive disabilities. The multi-tiered System for Augmenting Language (mSAL) is a three-tiered system for providing communication intervention that offers support to a large number of students with significant cognitive disabilities who do not currently use speech, signs, and/or symbols to communicate. The first Tier of mSAL is focused on the classroom and the classroom teacher using Aided Language Stimulation in a systematic routine. This will help build consistent and reliable modes of communication so we can accurately assess student progress and determine the most reliable method of assessment.
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 incorporate real world culturally relevant science lessons, activities, and materials aligned to the access points standards.	
Person Responsible	Katherine Csaszar (csaszark@pcsb.org)
All Instructional Staff will receive Professional Development regarding the use of "Core Boards" (Project Core, MELD training) to build language/communication skills and utilize Communication Boards throughout Science instruction.	
Person Responsible	Katherine Csaszar (csaszark@pcsb.org)
Monitoring ESSA Impact: If this Area of Focus is not related to one or more ESSA subgroups, please describe the process for progress monitoring the impact of the Area of Focus as it relates to all ESSA subgroups not meeting the 41% threshold according to the Federal Index.	Our ESSA underperforming subgroups are Black/African American, White, Students with Disabilities, and Economically Disadvantaged students. All of our Black/African American and White students are included in both the Students with Disabilities and Economically Disadvantaged subgroups. Our school monitors each individual student's progress monitoring data, academic grades, behavioral

	performance, and attendance. Each student we serve has an Individualized Education Plan that is reviewed annually. In addition, teachers/case managers monitor student academic and behavioral data when planning, during instruction, and after each assessment cycle. The School Based Leadership Team utilizes a data driven dialog protocol and continuous improvement cycle model to analyze data, identify barriers, and design actionable next steps. The Child Study Team meets twice per month to monitor student attendance. All SIP goals and action steps are reviewed mid-year and adjustments are made based on current data.

#4. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Social Studies	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.	42% of students scored a Level 1 on the Civics and US History EOC. 49% of students taking this EOC scored a Level 2 or higher. Many of our students are performing at Level One as evidenced in the results of our current FSAA scores.
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	Increase the percentage of students scoring above a Level 1 by 5%, from 58% to 63% as measured by the 2023 FSAA and EOCs.
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	Increase the percentage of students scoring above a Level 1 by 10% as measured by the 2023 FSAA and EOCs.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Katherine Csaszar (csaszark@pcsb.org)
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.	The evidence-based strategy being implemented in this Social Studies area includes direct instruction using a variety of teaching strategies (such as visual supports, hands-on materials, core vocabulary supports, sensory integrated experiences, whole group/small group/ individualized instruction, repeated instruction). Project Core/MELD/core vocabulary supports is a classroom-based intervention for students with significant cognitive disabilities who do not use speech, sign language or symbols to meet a broad range of communication needs. The Tier I, universal intervention in Project Core calls for modeling the use of symbols combined with explicit teaching of the meaning and use of the Universal Core vocabulary. Modeling and teaching are integrated into

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

daily
activities (arrival, mealtime, personal care) instructional routines (shared reading, predictable chart writing, alphabet knowledge/ phonological awareness activities).
Communication core boards will be used as a mode of modeling communication during instruction. As the first tier of multi-tiered System for Augmenting Language
the intervention is a classroom-based communication intervention for all students
with targeted communication needs. Instructional routines (e.g., shared reading, predictable chart writing, alphabet/phonological awareness) are grounded in evidence-based practices and provide examples of the use of the Universal Core throughout the Science block of instruction. And cross-curricular resources from Readtopia.

Because some of our students have no identified mode of communication
compounded by limited intellectual capacity, they require exposure to real world experiences to help them process and retain information.
We will incorporate the use of culturally relevant science lessons aligned to
the access standards and refine methods of determining students' modes of communication. Direct instruction using a variety of teaching strategies includes multiple evidence-based learning strategies to reach the variety of learners with

	significant cognitive disabilities. The multi-tiered System for Augmenting Language (mSAL) is a three-tiered system for providing communication intervention that offers support to a large number of students with significant cognitive disabilities who do not currently use speech, signs, and/or symbols to communicate. The first Tier of mSAL is focused on the classroom and the classroom teacher using Aided Language Stimulation in a systematic routine. This will help build consistent and reliable modes of communication so we can accurately assess student progress and determine the most reliable method of assessment.
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 incorporate real world culturally relevant social studies lessons, activities, and materials aligned to the access points standards. All Instructional Staff will utilize and implement techniques and strategies learned during Professional Development trainings in regard to the use of "Core Boards" (Project Core, MELD training), “Comprehensive Literacy for All “(book study) to build language/communication skills and utilize Communication Boards throughout Social Studies instruction.	
Person Responsible	Katherine Csaszar (csaszark@pcsb.org)
All Instructional Staff will utilize and implement techniques and strategies learned during Professional Development trainings in regard to the use of "Core Boards" (Project Core, MELD training), “Comprehensive Literacy for All “(book study) to build language/communication skills and utilize Communication Boards throughout Science instruction.	
Person Responsible	[no one identified]
Monitoring ESSA Impact: If this Area of Focus is not related to one or more ESSA subgroups, please describe the process for progress monitoring the impact of the Area of Focus as it relates to all ESSA subgroups not meeting the 41% threshold according to the Federal Index.	Our ESSA underperforming subgroups are Black/African American, White, Students with Disabilities, and Economically Disadvantaged students. All of our Black/African American and

	White students are included in both the Students with Disabilities and Economically Disadvantaged subgroups. Our school monitors each individual student's progress monitoring data, academic grades, behavioral performance, and attendance. Each student we serve has an Individualized Education Plan that is reviewed annually. In addition, teachers/case managers monitor student academic and behavioral data when planning, during instruction, and after each assessment cycle. The School Based Leadership Team utilizes a data driven dialog protocol and continuous improvement cycle model to analyze data, identify barriers, and design actionable next steps. The Child Study Team meets twice per month to monitor student attendance. All SIP goals and action steps are reviewed mid-year and adjustments are made based on current data.

#5. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Career & Technical Education	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.	The percent of ESE students promoted on-track with their cohort will be maintained at 100% as measured by May 2022 graduation rate. Students transcripts of course work taken must be accurately tracked to ensure all required courses are taken for graduation. Lack of credits needed for graduation can exist when students transfer in from another district or state. Transcripts need to be requested and evaluated in a timely manner for these students in order to ensure enrollment in any courses that may still be required.
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	The percent of ESE students promoted on-track with their cohort will be maintained at 100% as measured by May 2023 graduation rate.
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	Monitor student progress throughout the year for course completion and attendance.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	[no one identified]
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.	Ensure all students are enrolled in the appropriate access courses for graduation and monitor progress.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.	Ensure all students are enrolled in the appropriate access courses for graduation.

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.

Students' transcripts will be checked by the assistant principal and Data Management Technician to ensure students are on track to earn their high school credits.	
Person Responsible	Lori Godek (godekl@pcsb.org)
The assistant principal working with the VE Specialist, and Data Management Technician will enroll students in required courses.	
Person Responsible	Lori Godek (godekl@pcsb.org)
Graduation requirements will be discussed with parents at IEP meetings, involving students in the process.	
Person Responsible	Lori Godek (godekl@pcsb.org)

Monitoring ESSA Impact: If this Area of Focus is not related to one or more ESSA subgroups, please describe the process for progress monitoring the impact of the Area of Focus as it relates to all ESSA subgroups not meeting the 41% threshold according to the Federal Index.	Our ESSA underperforming subgroups are Black/African American, White, Students with Disabilities, and Economically Disadvantaged students. All of our Black/African American and White students are included in both the Students with Disabilities and Economically Disadvantaged subgroups. Our school monitors each individual student's progress monitoring data, academic grades, behavioral performance, and attendance. Each student we serve has an Individualized Education Plan that is reviewed annually. In addition, teachers/case managers monitor student academic and behavioral data when planning, during instruction, and after each assessment cycle. The School Based Leadership Team utilizes a data driven dialog protocol and continuous improvement cycle model to analyze data, identify barriers, and design actionable next steps. The Child Study Team meets twice per month to monitor student attendance. All SIP goals and action steps are reviewed mid-year and adjustments are made based on current data.

#6. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.	All of our students have significant cognitive disabilities, other developmental disabilities, and the majority of our students have Complex Communication Needs (CCN) which include students with no verbal speech, limited verbal speech, or unintelligible verbal speech. Students with CCN use Augmentative & Alternative Communication (AAC) systems (including core vocabulary) to meet their communication needs with communication partners, a basic human right that improves our students' quality of life. Students' communication mode of response and interaction with their individualized AAC systems can be classified as one of the following qualitative proficiency levels: Emerging – The student is at the beginning of developing a response mode to use (e.g. eye gaze, touch/point, Partner Assisted Scanning) and they are inconsistent/not deliberate in their responding; Consistent – The student has an identified response mode to use (e.g. eye gaze, touch/point, Partner Assisted Scanning) and can respond, however, they do not appear to be making a deliberate choice in their response that aligns with their

	communicative intent; Reliable – The student can scan their options and make a deliberate response that aligns with their communicative intent. In order for students with CCN to improve their communicative behaviors and intent from the previously-mentioned definitions of emerging to consistent to reliable, the evidence-based strategies of individualized access to core vocabulary, a team approach with content area experts, presuming competence of our learners, aided language input (teacher modeling), repeated instruction with variety, explicit (or direct) instruction, and naturalistic instruction (such as within daily activities/ routines) will be used to teach symbolic communication to AAC users.
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	Increase percentage of students in which their communication skills by one proficiency level (emerging, consistent, or reliable) and increase percentage of students who maintain their communication skills at their individualized proficiency level through improved communication instructional opportunities within one academic year to be documented via school-wide database.

Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	The Instructional Teacher Leader will monitor in collaboration with teacher feedback, data chats at PLCs, and monitoring of school-wide database.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	[no one identified]
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.	All students will have individualized access to Augmentative & Alternative Communication (AAC), including core vocabulary. A team approach will be accessed by teachers, SLPs, OTs, other IEP team members.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.	In order for students with CCN to improve their communicative behaviors and intent from the previously-mentioned definitions of emerging to consistent to reliable, the evidencebased strategies of individualized access to core vocabulary, a team approach with content area experts, presuming competence of our learners, aided language input (teacher modeling), repeated instruction with variety, explicit (or direct) instruction, and naturalistic instruction (such as within daily activities/routines) will be used to teach symbolic communication to AAC users.

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 and other instructional staff will take the necessary Professional Development: refresher/initial MELD PD, refresher/initial Communication Matrix PD, completion of the Project Core PD modules. Administration will monitor completion of this PD.

Person Responsible	Katherine Csaszar (csaszark@pcsb.org)

Administration will monitor the use and instruction of core vocabulary in classrooms by walk-though feedback, direct observations, and lesson plans.

Person Responsible	Katherine Csaszar (csaszark@pcsb.org)
Monitoring ESSA Impact: If this Area of Focus is not related to one or more ESSA subgroups, please describe the process for progress monitoring the impact of the Area of Focus as it relates to all ESSA subgroups not meeting the 41% threshold according to the Federal Index.	N/A

RAISE

The RAISE program established criteria for identifying schools for additional support. The criteria for the 2022-23 school year includes schools with students in grades Kindergarten through fifth, where 50 percent or more of its students, for any grade level, score below a level 3 on the most recent statewide English Language Arts (ELA) assessment.

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 relating to Reading/ELA

n/a

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 new 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: Measureable Outcome(s)

n/a

Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

n/a

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 take place with evaluating impact at the end of the year.

n/a

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:
Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Evidence-based Practices/Programs:
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. Â§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?

n/a

Rationale for Evidence-based Practices/Programs:
Explain the rationale for selecting the specific 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 practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

n/a

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
n/a	

Positive Culture & Environment

A positive school culture and environment is critical in supporting sustainable schoolwide improvement initiatives. When schools implement a shared focus on improving school culture and environment, students are more likely to engage academically. A positive school culture and environment can also increase staff satisfaction and retention.

Select a targeted element from the menu to develop a system or process to be implemented for schoolwide improvement related to positive culture and environment.
Parent Engagement

Describe how data will be collected and analyzed to guide decision making related to the selected target.

Parental/familial/guardian participation will be monitored to increase parent/family/guardian participation. Baseline parental/familial/guardian participation with IEP Annual Review meetings will be monitored. Teachers will gather information regarding parents'/guardians' preferred method of contact at the beginning of the 2022-2023 school year in order to
improve communication with parents/families/guardians and, therefore, increase parent/family/guardian participation at school events and IEP Annual Review Meetings.

Describe how the target area, related data and resulting action steps will be communicated to stakeholders.

At the beginning of the 2022-2023 school year, teachers will acquire parents'/guardians' preferred mode of communication (e-mail, phone call, Canvas updates, hard copy papers sent home with student, etc.). The parent-indicated preferred mode of contact will be utilized by teachers for the majority of communications (utilized for student-specific notices such as IEP meetings while the school will continue to post general information on school website, newsletter, etc.). This teacher-gathered information will be utilized by other school staff when announcing school events

Describe how implementation will be progress monitored.

Attendance at school events, IEP meetings, etc. will be monitored by teachers and administration.

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.

Action Step	Person Responsible for Monitoring
All IEP case managers to have parent/family/guardian complete Parent Input Form prior to IEP meetings.	Csaszar, Katherine, csaszark@pcsb.org
All case managers to make contact with students' parents/guardians at beginning of school year to inquire about/record parent/guardian's preferred method of contact/ communication to be used throughout school year.	Csaszar, Katherine, csaszark@pcsb.org
Use the school messenger as a reminder of upcoming events and update the school website with important school information. Continue to update and monitor all other platforms of communication (marque, etc.).	Csaszar, Katherine, csaszark@pcsb.org