

Pinellas County Schools

Lealman Innovation Academy 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	13
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	38
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	0
VI. Title I Requirements	0
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	38

Lealman Innovation Academy

4900 28TH ST N, St Petersburg, FL 33714

<http://www.lealman-ms.pinellas.k12.fl.us>

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes (F.S.), requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a new, amended, or continuation SIP for each school in the district which has a school grade of D or F; has a significant gap in achievement on statewide, standardized assessments administered pursuant to s. 1008.22 by one or more student subgroups, as defined in the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), 20 U.S.C. s. 6311(b)(2)(C)(v)(II); has not significantly increased the percentage of students passing statewide, standardized assessments; has not significantly increased the percentage of students demonstrating Learning Gains, as defined in s. 1008.34, and as calculated under s. 1008.34(3)(b), who passed statewide, standardized assessments; has been identified as requiring instructional supports under the Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE) program established in s. 1008.365; or has significantly lower graduation rates for a subgroup when compared to the state's graduation rate. Rule 6A-1.098813, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.), requires district school boards to approve a SIP for each Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) school in the district rated as Unsatisfactory.

Below are the criteria for identification of traditional public and public charter schools pursuant to the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) State plan:

Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)

A school not identified for CSI or TSI, but has one or more subgroups with a Federal Index below 41%.

Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)

A school not identified as CSI that has at least one consistently underperforming subgroup with a Federal Index below 32% for three consecutive years.

Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)

A school can be identified as CSI in any of the following four ways:

1. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%;
2. Have a graduation rate at or below 67%;
3. Have a school grade of D or F; or
4. Have a Federal Index below 41% in the same subgroup(s) for 6 consecutive years.

ESEA sections 1111(d) requires that each school identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI develop a support and improvement plan created in partnership with stakeholders (including principals and other school leaders, teachers and parent), is informed by all indicators in the State's accountability system, includes evidence-based interventions, is based on a school-level needs assessment, and identifies resource inequities to be addressed through implementation of the plan. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as TSI, ATSI and non-Title I CSI must be approved and monitored by the school district. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as Title I, CSI must be approved by the school district and

Department. The Department must monitor and periodically review implementation of each CSI plan after approval.

The Department's SIP template in the Florida Continuous Improvement Management System (CIMS), <https://www.floridacims.org>, meets all state and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all ESSA components for a support and improvement plan required for traditional public and public charter schools identified as CSI, TSI and ATSI, and eligible schools applying for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) funds.

Districts may allow schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions to develop a SIP using the template in CIMS.

The responses to the corresponding sections in the Department's SIP template may address the requirements for: 1) Title I schools operating a schoolwide program (SWD), pursuant to ESSA, as amended, Section 1114(b); and 2) charter schools that receive a school grade of D or F or three consecutive grades below C, pursuant to Rule 6A-1.099827, F.A.C. The chart below lists the applicable requirements.

SIP Sections	Title I Schoolwide Program	Charter Schools
I-A: School Mission/Vision		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(1)
I-B-C: School Leadership, Stakeholder Involvement & SIP Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(2-3)	
I-E: Early Warning System	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-A-C: Data Review		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-F: Progress Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(3)	
III-A: Data Analysis/Reflection	ESSA 1114(b)(6)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(4)
III-B: Area(s) of Focus	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(i-iii)	
III-C: Other SI Priorities		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(5-9)
VI: Title I Requirements	ESSA 1114(b)(2, 4-5), (7)(A)(iii)(I-V)-(B) ESSA 1116(b-g)	

Note: Charter schools that are also Title I must comply with the requirements in both columns.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Department encourages schools to use the SIP as a “living document” by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

I. School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

R.O.A.R.- Recovery, Onus, Acceleration and Redefinition

Lealman Innovation Academy serves drop-out prevention scholars who require additional supports and interventions to meet academic achievement goals. Our school specializes in remediation, individualized interventions, and flexible scheduling to ensure our shared mission and vision meets the needs of all scholars served.

Provide the school's vision statement.

100% Scholar Success through equitable practices.

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
Fields, Christina	Principal	Principal
Kretz, Darrell	Assistant Principal	APC
Evans, Kristy	Other	MTSS Staff Developer ES/MS/HS
Dyett, Brooke	Assistant Principal	Assistant Principal
Sanferraro, Erika	School Counselor	High School Counselor
Gregg, Shandy	Behavior Specialist	Support students and staff with Restorative Practices and PBIS.
Belk, Debbie	Attendance/Social Work	Social Worker
Daniels, Brittney	Other	MTSS Staff Developer ES/ MS/ HS
Benovic, Elizabeth	Attendance/Social Work	Social Worker
Compas-Orange, Lyndy	School Counselor	School Counselor Middle School

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.

The school leadership team engaged in a data review activity to collaboratively develop school improvement goals during preschool in August 2023. SIP goals will be shared with EAS SAC Team at the first meeting to review school goals and solicit input on the School Improvement Plan.

SIP Monitoring

Describe how the SIP will be regularly monitored for effective implementation and impact on increasing the achievement of students in meeting the State's academic standards, particularly for those students with the greatest achievement gap. Describe how the school will revise the plan, as necessary, to ensure continuous improvement. (ESSA 1114(b)(3))

Instructional Leadership –MTSS Staff Developers, Admin to review data (common assessment data, walkthrough data). The AP's/Academic coaches will facilitate subject-area planning with all Math teachers focusing on improving target/ task alignment. During classroom walkthroughs, the AP will measure target/task alignment using a research-based classroom walkthrough tool.

Teachers meet in a Professional Learning Community (PLC) at least once per month to review student work in order to determine to what degree students are making progress with benchmarks because of the use of complex tasks. Additionally, teachers will plan remediation by evaluating student data from various subject area programs and classroom assessment to determine student individual needs to improve learning gains. Administrator will monitor PLC's to ensure student data is driving instructional practices in all subject areas.

Demographic Data

2023-24 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Other School 5-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Alternative Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	Yes
2022-23 Minority Rate	76%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	100%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	Yes
2021-22 ESSA Identification	CSI
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	Yes
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	
School Grades History	
School Improvement Rating History	2021-22: MAINTAINING 2020-21: MAINTAINING

	2018-19: MAINTAINING 2017-18: MAINTAINING 2016-17: UNSATISFACTORY
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

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

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

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	8	39	58	76	390	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	28	28	121	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	8	12	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	1	6	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	4	13	37	41	167

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	1	4	1	14
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4	12

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	8	39	58	76	181	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	28	28	62	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	8	12	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	1	6	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	4	13	37	41	95

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	1	4	1	6
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4	12

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.

District and State data will be uploaded when available.

Accountability Component	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	7			7			10		
ELA Learning Gains	25			28			36		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	32			42			40		
Math Achievement*	4			4			9		
Math Learning Gains	38			21			36		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	59			34			51		
Science Achievement*	7			7			14		
Social Studies Achievement*	10			8			16		
Middle School Acceleration							61		
Graduation Rate	90			82			50		
College and Career Acceleration	8			22					
ELP Progress	23			38			14		

* 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

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	28
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	Yes
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	6
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	303
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	88
Graduation Rate	90

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	26	Yes	3	3
ELL	26	Yes	3	3
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	26	Yes	3	3
HSP	15	Yes	3	3
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	33	Yes	1	
FRL	29	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	7	25	32	4	38	59	7	10		90	8	23
SWD	1	18	24	2	40	63	2	7		94	6	

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
ELL	7	38		13	54			20				23
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	4	25	37	3	35	56	3	5		92	3	
HSP	4	27		4	37		0	8				27
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	13	22	7	8	48	73	25	27		87	23	
FRL	8	25	34	5	38	62	6	11		91	8	27

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	7	28	42	4	21	34	7	8		82	22	38
SWD	3	25	38	2	20	34	7	7				
ELL	13	20		6	35							38
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	5	28	44	2	18	29	3	2		80	8	
HSP	4	18		6	25	55	10	13				33
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	18	32	50	10	27	36	20	29				
FRL	8	29	38	5	21	36	6	5		82	17	40

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	10	36	40	9	36	51	14	16	61	50		14
SWD	2	31	30	4	35	56	9	4				
ELL	0	29		9	27		0					14
AMI												
ASN												

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
BLK	3	30	39	2	32	47	1	7				
HSP	18	51		20	39	42	11	19				
MUL	8	18		10								
PAC												
WHT	27	48	36	26	49		45	38	62			
FRL	8	33	40	8	37	55	10	15	70			

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.

School, District and State data will be uploaded when available.

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.

Based on Progress Monitoring Three (PM3) data reading, 13% of the students were proficient in ELA/ Reading, and 15% of the student were proficient in math. Contributing factors for last year's low performance are a lack of rigorous instruction, a lack of differentiated support consistently, and a lack of student-centered learning with defined purpose and relevance.

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

Based on Progress Monitoring Three (PM3) data reading, 13% of the students were proficient in ELA/ Reading, and 15% of the student were proficient in math. Contributing factors for last year's low performance are a lack of rigorous instruction, a lack of differentiated support consistently, and a lack of student-centered learning with defined purpose and relevance.

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.

Data components that have the greatest gap when compared to the state are reading and math proficiency. Contributing factors that contribute to the gaps are lack of rigorous instruction, a lack of differentiated support consistently, and a lack of student-centered learning with defined purpose and relevance.

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

The data component that showed the most improvement graduation rate 81% and promotion rate 98%. School actions that the school take in these areas review student schedule to ensure students are placed in proper classes to improve graduation efforts, ensure student are receiving instruction in areas that require remediation to increase student academic learning gains in the areas of ELA/ Reading and Math.

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

Based on the EWS data two potential areas of concern are students absent 10% or more days and number of students who are a Level One on state assessments in reading and math.

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

- 1, Professional Learning Communities focused on data driven planning and instruction.
2. Positive learning community for students and staff members with emphasis on Restorative Practices.
3. Student Centered tasks and instruction.
4. Cognitively complex tasks to increase student engagement and rigor.

Area of Focus

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

:

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

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

Standards-based data (FAST, common assessments, walk-through data, etc.) collected from the 2022-2023 school year indicated that scholars are performing below grade level in ELA/ Reading with lack of consistency in tasks aligned to grade appropriate standards and data-driven lesson planning. FAST PM 3 data indicates scholars are performing below grade level of the students tested only 10% of the scholars scored in the proficient range. Only 28% of the scholars made learning gains as evidenced by the 2022 FSA data.

Measurable Outcome:

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

The percentage of all scholars achieving learning gains in ELA/ Reading will increase from 28% to 51% and the number of scholars who are proficient in ELA/ Reading will increase from 10% to 25% as evidenced by FAST data.

Monitoring:

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

Instructional Leadership – MTSS Instructional Staff Developers, Admin will review a triangulation of data using formative, summative and common assessments, data and walkthrough data. The instructional leadership team will facilitate subject-area planning with all ELA/Reading teachers focusing on improving target/task alignment. During classroom walkthroughs, the administrator will measure target/task alignment using a research-based classroom walkthrough tool.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Brooke Dyett (dyettb@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.)

Evidence-based Strategy- Professional Learning Communities (PLC) Professional learning communities will focus on standards-based planning, student work analysis protocol, development of common assessments and analyzing data. The work of the PLC will be centered around the research of Richard DuFour's PLC questions:

1. What is it we want our students to learn?
2. How will we know if each student has learned it?
3. How will we respond when some student do not learn it?
4. How can we extend and enrich the learning for students who have demonstrated proficiency?

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

In order to provide students opportunities to engage in grade appropriate standards-based tasks teachers will be supported through a structure for professional learning communities focused on effective teaching methods for learning and data driven lesson planning.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

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

Teachers meet in a Professional Learning Community (PLC) at least once per month to review student work in order to determine to what degree students are making progress with benchmarks because of the use of complex tasks. Additionally, teachers will plan remediation by evaluating student data from Reading programs and classroom assessment to determine student individual needs to improve learning gains.

Person Responsible: Brooke Dyett (dyettb@pcsb.org)

Professional Development and supports for implementing standards-based instruction with fidelity.

Person Responsible: Brooke Dyett (dyettb@pcsb.org)

Administrators will monitor Lexia, Applerouth, iReady and other district approved reading program data in ELA and Reading and provide feedback to support teacher growth.

Person Responsible: Brooke Dyett (dyettb@pcsb.org)

Administrators will monitor and support the use of grade level task and text alignment and provide feedback to support teacher growth. Protocol will include DuFour's PLC Framework and how teachers will be supported with effective teaching methods for standards-based instruction.

Person Responsible: Brooke Dyett (dyettb@pcsb.org)

Administrators will monitor the consistent use of anchor charts and text marking strategies in all core subject areas to promote the implementation of learning strategies to improve student learning outcomes.

Person Responsible: Brooke Dyett (dyettb@pcsb.org)

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

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

Standards-based data (FSA, common assessments, walkthrough data, etc..) collected from 2021-2022 school year indicated students performing below grade level in Math with a lack of consistency in tasks aligned to grade-appropriate standards and data driven lesson planning. FAST PM 3 data indicates scholars are performing below grade level of the scholars tested only 15% of the scholars scored in the proficient range. Only 42% of the scholars made learning gains as evidenced by the 2022 FSA data.

Measurable Outcome:

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

The percentage of all scholars achieving learning gains in Math will increase from 42% to 51% to and the number of scholars who are proficient in Math will increase from 15% to 25% as evidenced by FAST data.

Monitoring:

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

Instructional Leadership – MTSS Instructional Staff Developers, Admin to review data (common assessment data, walkthrough data). The AP's/Academic coaches will facilitate subject-area planning with all Math teachers focusing on improving target/task alignment. During classroom walkthroughs, the AP will measure target/task alignment using a research-based classroom walkthrough tool.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Darrell Kretz (kretzd@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.)

Evidence-based Strategy- Professional Learning Communities (PLC) Professional learning communities will focus on standards-based planning, student work analysis protocol, development of common assessments, and analyzing data. The work of the PLC will be centered around the research of Richard DuFour's PLC questions:

1. What is it we want our students to learn?
2. How will we know if each student has learned it?
3. How will we respond when some students do not learn it?
4. How can we extend and enrich the learning for students who have demonstrated proficiency?

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

In order to provide students opportunities to engage in grade appropriate standards-based tasks teachers will be supported through a structure for professional learning communities focused on effective teaching methods for learning and data driven lesson planning.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

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

Teachers regularly assess (formally and informally) and utilize data to modify and adjust instruction. Teachers utilize ongoing formative assessments and use the information gained to adjust instruction, enrich and reteach, and provide research-based interventions.

Person Responsible: Darrell Kretz (kretzd@pcsb.org)

Administrator will conduct monthly PLCs with teachers inclusive of 'data chats' to review student responses to tasks and formative assessments and plan for instructional lessons incorporating MAFS and Practice Standards based on classroom and student level data and provide feedback to support instruction.

Person Responsible: Darrell Kretz (kretzd@pcsb.org)

Teachers utilize systemic documents (adopted curriculum, pacing guide, etc.) to effectively plan for mathematics units that incorporate the Standards for Mathematical Practice and rigorous performance tasks aligned to BEST standards.

Person Responsible: Darrell Kretz (kretzd@pcsb.org)

High school teachers will incorporate PSAT/ACT/SAT math practice skills to help prepare students for success on college readiness and state assessments.

Person Responsible: Darrell Kretz (kretzd@pcsb.org)

Administrators monitor and support the use of grade-appropriate, B.E.S.T. standards provide constructive feedback and participate in teacher reflection to increase effective teaching practices.

Person Responsible: Darrell Kretz (kretzd@pcsb.org)

Administrators will monitor the consistent use of anchor charts and text marking in mathematical word problems using CUBES for school wide implementation of learning strategies to improve student learning outcomes.

Person Responsible: Darrell Kretz (kretzd@pcsb.org)

#3. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Other**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

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

Consistently implemented school-wide processes help students to understand the importance of positive behavior on learning. All staff members desire to build positive and supportive relationships with scholars' but need opportunities to better understand the impact of scholars' cultural reference on the learning environment. Our current level of performance is an average of 22 behavior calls per day, as evidenced by the classroom behavior call log. The problem is occurring because of an inconsistency in the understanding and application of school-wide behavioral expectations. Expectations need to be reinforced, clearly defined and taught consistently. This would reduce the problem by 50% to no more than 11 calls per day.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Reduce classroom behavior calls to more than 112 calls per day by May 2024.

Monitoring:

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

Child Study Team – Behavior Specialists, Admin to review data (PBIS Rewards, walkthrough data, discipline data).

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Shandy Gregg (greggs@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.)

If we continue to utilize and highlight the importance of PBIS, the problem of engagement and discipline would be reduced by establishing and maintaining positive relationships and high expectations with all students. If positive behavioral expectations for students are clearly defined, communicated, agreed on, implemented by staff, explicitly taught to students, and celebrated when met, the problem would be reduced by students better understanding behavioral expectations.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

By implementing the core components of PBIS & Restorative Practices, using techniques such as circles and community activities, we will build relationships and community, increase students' sense of belonging, fairness, support, and positive interactions with teachers and peers.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

Yes

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.

The PBIS Coordinator will provide training to staff on how to teach expectations for commonly used instructional activities.

Person Responsible: Shandy Gregg (greggs@pcsb.org)

Weekly, teachers will review and re-teach expectations and rules. SBLT will establish plans for expectations to be reviewed weekly. Restorative Practice lesson plans will be conducted daily the first 10 days of school.

Person Responsible: Shandy Gregg (greggs@pcsb.org)

Administrators to monitor and support staff implementation of schoolwide initiatives.

Person Responsible: Shandy Gregg (greggs@pcsb.org)

Administrators to review student data for trends gaps and next steps with stakeholders.

Person Responsible: Shandy Gregg (greggs@pcsb.org)

Create and implement a solid plan to celebrate students and staff in a school-based incentive and celebration program.

Person Responsible: Shandy Gregg (greggs@pcsb.org)

Weekly, teachers will review and re-teach expectations and rules. SBLT will establish plans for expectations to be reviewed weekly. Restorative Practice lesson plans will be conducted daily the first 10 days of school.

Person Responsible: Shandy Gregg (greggs@pcsb.org)

Administrators to monitor and support staff implementation of schoolwide initiatives.

Person Responsible: Shandy Gregg (greggs@pcsb.org)

Administrators to review student data for trends gaps and next steps with stakeholders.

Person Responsible: Shandy Gregg (greggs@pcsb.org)

Create and implement a solid plan to celebrate students and staff in a school-based incentive and celebration program.

Person Responsible: Shandy Gregg (greggs@pcsb.org)

#4. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

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

Standards-based data (FSA, common assessments, walkthrough data, etc..) collected from 2022-2023 school year indicated students performing below grade level in science with lack of consistency in tasks aligned to grade appropriate standards and data-driven lesson planning. FAST data indicates scholars are performing below grade level. Of the students tested only 4% of the scholars scored in the proficient range.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Increase student proficiency in science to 25% proficiency as evidenced by FAST data.

Monitoring:

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

Instructional Leadership – MTSS Staff Developers, Admin to review data (common assessment data, walkthrough data). The AP's/Academic coaches will facilitate subject-area planning with all Science teachers focusing on improving target/task alignment. During classroom walkthroughs, the AP will measure target/task alignment using a research-based classroom walkthrough tool.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Brooke Dyett (dyettb@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.)

Evidence-based Strategy- Professional Learning Communities (PLC) Professional learning communities will focus on standards-based planning, student work analysis protocol, development of common assessments and analyzing data. The work of the PLC will be centered around the research of Richard DuFour's PLC questions:

1. What is it we want our students to learn?
2. How will we know if each student has learned it?
3. How will we respond when some student do not learn it?
4. How can we extend and enrich the learning for students who have demonstrated proficiency?

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

In order to provide students opportunities to engage in grade appropriate standards-based tasks teachers will be supported through a structure for professional learning communities focused on effective teaching methods for learning and data driven lesson planning.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

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

Teachers utilize systemic documents (adopted curriculum, pacing guides, etc.) to effectively plan for units that incorporate rigorous performance tasks aligned to the Standards.

Person Responsible: Brooke Dyett (dyettb@pcsb.org)

Conduct regular, monthly, Professional Learning Communities (PLCs) inclusive of 'data chats' to review student responses to tasks and formative assessments and plan for instructional lessons that include text-dependent

questions, close and critical reading and skill/strategy-based groups to implement during core instruction to support success with complex texts.

Person Responsible: Brooke Dyett (dyettb@pcsb.org)

Use data to plan instruction that ensures differentiation, intervention and enrichment while scaffolding learning to increase student performance.

Person Responsible: Brooke Dyett (dyettb@pcsb.org)

Administrators monitor teacher practice and provide feedback to support teacher growth. Administrators regularly observe science lessons to monitor strategy implementation and provide feedback to teachers, MTSS Staff Developers and science Instructional Staff Developer to support next steps.

Person Responsible: Brooke Dyett (dyettb@pcsb.org)

Administrators will monitor the consistent use of anchor charts and text marking in Science for school wide implementation of learning strategies to improve student learning outcomes.

Person Responsible: Brooke Dyett (dyettb@pcsb.org)

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

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

Instructional Practice specifically relating to standards- aligned instruction will focus on supporting teachers with research-based practices that follow state adopted standards within the specific content area. Standards-based data (FSAT, common assessments, walkthrough data, etc..) from the 2022-2023 indicate that students are performing below grade level expectations in Civics and US History. FAST PM data indicates that students are performing below grade level in Social Studies with only 8% proficiency in Civics and 13% proficiency in US History.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Increase student proficiency in Civics and US History to 25% proficiency as evidenced by FAST data.

Monitoring:

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

Instructional Leadership – MTSS Staff Developers, Admin to review data (common assessment data, walkthrough data). The AP's/Academic coaches will facilitate subject-area planning with all Social Studies teachers focusing on improving target/task alignment. During classroom walkthroughs, the AP will measure target/task alignment using a research-based classroom walkthrough tool.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Darrell Kretz (kretzd@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.)

Instructional Leadership – MTSS Instructional Developers, Admin to review data (common assessment data, walkthrough data). The AP's/Academic coaches will facilitate subject-area planning with all Social Studies teachers focusing on improving target/task alignment. During classroom walkthroughs, the AP will measure target/task alignment using a research-based classroom walkthrough tool.

Evidence-based Strategy- Professional Learning Communities (PLC) Professional learning communities will focus on standards-based planning, student work analysis protocol, development of common assessments, and analyzing data. The work of the PLC will be centered around the research of Richard DuFour's PLC questions:

1. What is it we want our students to learn?
2. How will we know if each student has learned it?
3. How will we respond when some student do not learn it?
4. How can we extend and enrich the learning for students who have demonstrated proficiency?

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

In order to provide students opportunities to engage in grade appropriate standards-based tasks teachers will be supported through a structure for professional learning communities focused on effective teaching methods for learning, data driven lesson planning and target/tasks alignment feedback.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

Yes

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 participate in PLC with colleagues at least once a month to view student data (collected from multiple sources, including common assessment and or quarterly district progress monitoring assessments) and plan action steps related to identifying areas of strength or areas identified as needs improvement or to develop lessons that meet the rigor of course benchmarks.

Person Responsible: Darrell Kretz (kretzd@pcsb.org)

Social studies teachers will continue to integrate literacy standards into the social studies content via Document Based Question (DBQ) Project materials and Stanford History Education Group (SHEG) lessons.

Person Responsible: Darrell Kretz (kretzd@pcsb.org)

Administrators will monitor the implementation of literacy standards and strategies through DBQ project materials and SHEG lessons in social studies.

Person Responsible: Darrell Kretz (kretzd@pcsb.org)

Administrators monitor teacher practice and provide feedback to support teacher growth. Administrators regularly observe social studies lessons to monitor strategy implementation and provide feedback to teachers.

Person Responsible: Darrell Kretz (kretzd@pcsb.org)

Administrators will monitor the consistent use of anchor charts and text marking in Social Studies classes for school wide implementation of learning strategies to improve student learning outcomes.

Person Responsible: Darrell Kretz (kretzd@pcsb.org)

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

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

We expect our performance level to be 94 percent of seniors will graduate on time by May 2024. Our 2023 graduation rate was 81% and we will increase that percentage to 94%. Instructional Practice specifically relating to standards aligned instruction will focus on supporting teachers with research-based practices that follow state adopted standards within the specific content area.

Measurable Outcome:

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

The percent of students who are on track to graduate will increase from 81 percent to 94 percent, as measured by assessment data in alignment with school graduation rate from the graduation cohort report.

Monitoring:

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

Graduation Cohort Report, SAT, ACT, FSA RETAKES, PSAT, Grade Reviews by Quarter will be monitored biweekly during graduation PLC's. In addition, classroom walkthrough data and PLC to ensure standards-based instruction.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Darrell Kretz (kretzd@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.)

Evidence-based Strategy- Professional Learning Communities (PLC) Professional learning communities will

focus on standards-based planning, student work analysis protocol, development of common assessments, and

analyzing data. The work of the PLC will be centered around the research of Richard DuFour's PLC questions:

1. What is it we want our students to learn?
2. How will we know if each student has learned it?
3. How will we respond when some student do not learn it?
4. How can we extend and enrich the learning for students who have demonstrated proficiency?

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

In order to provide students opportunities to engage in grade appropriate standards-based tasks teachers will be supported through a structure for professional learning communities focused on effective teaching methods for learning and data driven lesson planning.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

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

Teachers intentionally plan in Professional Learning Community (PLC) groups for scholars to engage in complex tasks that are aligned to the content standards through grade-level standards and by incorporating research-based learning support strategies.

Person Responsible: Darrell Kretz (kretzd@pcsb.org)

Teachers utilize systemic documents (adopted curriculum, pacing guides, etc.) to effectively plan for units that incorporate rigorous performance tasks aligned to the Standards-Based Instruction.

Person Responsible: Darrell Kretz (kretzd@pcsb.org)

Administrators/Academic coaches monitor teacher practice and provide feedback to support teacher growth. Administrators, Guidance and MTSS Staff Developers regularly observe Graduation Cohort and monitor graduation progression.

Person Responsible: Darrell Kretz (kretzd@pcsb.org)

#7. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Black/African-American**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

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

Our current level of performance is 25 percent of African-American students achieved learning gains in ELA, as evidenced in FSA Score Reporting. Our current level of performance is 35 percent of African-American

students achieved learning gains in Math, as evidenced in FSA Score Reporting. If high quality, equitable, and culturally responsive instructional strategies are used the problem/gap will be decreased, and students will achieve the desired gains. As teachers employ needs-based interventions and ongoing assessments they will be able to observe evidence of increased individual academic performance as related to standards assessed.

Measurable Outcome:

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

The percent of African-American students achieving student learning gains will increase by 10 percent in ELA

to 35 percent, and Math to 45 percent - as measured by Assessment Score Reporting by May 2024.

Monitoring:

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

Grade Level Data Review, Cycle Student Data Chats, Quarterly Teacher Data Chats, Cycle Assessments, Write Score Assessments

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Brooke Dyett (dyettb@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.)

Support staff to utilize data to organize students to interact with content in manners which differentiates/ scaffolds instruction to meet the needs of each student. Implement research based strategies that promote scholar achievement.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

To enhance staff capacity so as to analyze and utilize data to drive instruction and differentiation through equitable, culturally responsive practices.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

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

Provide regular opportunities for content teachers to collaborate and co-plan to bridge grade-level work and the integration of language development within content specific instruction.

Person Responsible: Brooke Dyett (dyettb@pcsb.org)

Review school-based data in a disaggregated manner and thoughtfully plan for remediation and enrichment interventions.

Person Responsible: Brooke Dyett (dyettb@pcsb.org)

Administrators to Monitor the lesson planning and classroom implementation of effective lessons that provide scholars equitable opportunities to engage students in rigorous, standards-based work rich in language development (explicit vocabulary, specific language patterns and language form). Provide ongoing feedback to teachers to support the development of their practice in supporting learners.

Person Responsible: Brooke Dyett (dyettb@pcsb.org)

Provide extended learning opportunities to learners as needed.

Person Responsible: Brooke Dyett (dyettb@pcsb.org)

#8. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to English Language Learners**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

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

Our current level of performance is 38 percent of ELL students achieved learning gains in ELA, as evidenced in FSA Score Reporting. Our current level of performance is 54 percent of ELL students achieved learning gains in ELA, as evidenced in FSA Score Reporting.

The problem/gap is occurring because individual student interventions are not producing desired outcomes. If effective, differentiated interventions/supports would occur, evidence of increased learning gains would manifest.

Measurable Outcome:

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

The percentage of ELL students achieving ELA learning gains will increase from 38 percent to 48 percent, as measured by Progress Monitoring Assessment/ Score Reporting. The percentage of ELL students achieving Math learning gains will increase from 54 percent to 64 percent, as measured by Progress Monitoring Assessment/Score Reporting.

Monitoring:

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

Grade Level Data Review, Cycle Student Data Chats, Quarterly Teacher Data Chats, Cycle Assessments, Write Score Assessments. Content area teachers will utilize Model Performance Indicators to ensure scholar success.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Brooke Dyett (dyettb@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.)

Support staff to utilize data to organize students to interact with content in manners which differentiates/ scaffolds instruction to meet the needs of each student. Implement research-based strategies that promote scholar achievement.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

To enhance staff capacity so as to analyze and utilize data to drive instruction and differentiation through equitable, culturally responsive practices.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

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

Provide regular opportunities for content teachers to collaborate and co-plan to bridge grade-level work and the integration of language development within content specific instruction.

Person Responsible: Brooke Dyett (dyettb@pcsb.org)

Review school-based data in a disaggregated manner and thoughtfully plan for remediation and enrichment interventions.

Person Responsible: Brooke Dyett (dyettb@pcsb.org)

Administrators monitor the lesson planning and classroom implementation of effective lessons that provide scholars equitable opportunities to engage students in rigorous, standards-based work rich in language development (explicit vocabulary, specific language patterns and language form). Provide ongoing feedback to teachers to support the development of their practice in supporting learners.

Person Responsible: Brooke Dyett (dyettb@pcsb.org)

Provide extended learning opportunities to learners as needed.

Person Responsible: Brooke Dyett (dyettb@pcsb.org)

#9. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

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

Our current level of performance is 18 percent of Students with Disabilities students achieved learning gains in ELA, as evidenced in FSA Score Reporting. Our current level of performance is 40 percent of Students with Disabilities achieved learning gains in Math, as evidenced in FSA Score Reporting. The problem/gap is occurring because individual student interventions are not producing desired outcomes. If effective, differentiated interventions/supports would occur, evidence of increased learning gains would manifest.

Measurable Outcome:

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

The percent of Students with Disabilities achieving learning gains will increase by 10 percent in ELA to 28 percent, and Math to 50 percent - as measured by Assessment Score Reporting by May 2024.

Monitoring:

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

Grade Level Data Review, Cycle Student Data Chats, Quarterly Teacher Data Chats, Cycle Assessments, PSAT/ACT/SAT reviews, Write Score Assessments.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

[no one identified]

Evidence-based Intervention:

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

Support staff to utilize data to organize students to interact with content in manners which differentiates/scaffolds instruction to meet the needs of each student. Implement research-based strategies that promote scholar achievement.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

To enhance staff capacity so as to analyze and utilize data to drive instruction and differentiation through equitable, culturally responsive practices.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

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

Provide regular opportunities for content teachers to collaborate and co plan to bridge grade-level work and the integration of language development within content specific instruction.

Person Responsible: Brooke Dyett (dyettb@pcsb.org)

Review school-based data in a disaggregated manner and thoughtfully plan for remediation and enrichment interventions.

Person Responsible: Brooke Dyett (dyettb@pcsb.org)

Administrators to monitor the lesson planning and classroom implementation of effective lessons that provide scholars equitable opportunities to engage students in rigorous, standards-based work rich in language development (explicit vocabulary, specific language patterns and language form). Provide ongoing feedback to teachers to support the development of their practice in supporting learners.

Person Responsible: Brooke Dyett (dyettb@pcsb.org)

Provide extended learning opportunities to learners as needed.

Person Responsible: Brooke Dyett (dyettb@pcsb.org)

#10. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Hispanic**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

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

Our current level of performance is 27 percent of Hispanic students achieved learning gains in ELA, as evidenced in FSA Score Reporting. Our current level of performance is 37 percent of Hispanic students achieved learning gains in Math, as evidenced in FSA Score Reporting.

The problem/gap is occurring because individual student interventions are not producing desired outcomes.

If effective, differentiated interventions/supports would occur, evidence of increased learning gains would manifest.

Measurable Outcome:

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

The percent of Hispanic students achieving student learning gains will increase by 10 percent in ELA to 37 percent, and Math to 47 percent - as measured by Assessment Score Reporting by May 2024.

Monitoring:

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

Grade Level Data Review, Cycle Student Data Chats, Quarterly Teacher Data Chats, Cycle Assessments, PSAT/ACT/SAT reviews, Write Score Assessments.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Brooke Dyett (dyettb@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.)

Support staff to utilize data to organize students to interact with content in manners which differentiates/scaffolds instruction to meet the needs of each student. Implement research-based strategies that promote scholar achievement.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

To enhance staff capacity so as to analyze and utilize data to drive instruction and differentiation through equitable, culturally responsive practices.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

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

Provide regular opportunities for content teachers to collaborate and co-plan to bridge grade-level work and the integration of language development within content specific instruction.

Person Responsible: Brooke Dyett (dyettb@pcsb.org)

Review school-based data in a disaggregated manner and thoughtfully plan for remediation and enrichment interventions.

Person Responsible: Brooke Dyett (dyettb@pcsb.org)

Administrators to monitor the lesson planning and classroom implementation of effective lessons that provide scholars equitable opportunities to engage students in rigorous, standards-based work rich in language.

development (explicit vocabulary, specific language patterns and language form). Provide ongoing feedback to teachers to support the development of their practice in supporting learners.

Person Responsible: Brooke Dyett (dyettb@pcsb.org)

Provide extended learning opportunities to learners as needed.

Person Responsible: Brooke Dyett (dyettb@pcsb.org)

#11. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Career & Technical Education**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

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

Our current level of performance is 87 CTAE Industry Certifications, as evidenced in our school industry certification data.

Instructional Practice specifically relating to standards- aligned instruction and CTAE frameworks will focus on supporting teachers with research-based practices that follow state adopted standards within the specific content area.

Measurable Outcome:

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

We expect our performance level to be at or above 100 Industry Certifications passing by May 2024.

Monitoring:

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

CTAE Walkthroughs, Industry Certifications, and Quarterly data will be reviewed by the SBLT team to monitor positive trend data.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Darrell Kretz (kretzd@pcsb.org)

Evidence-based Intervention:

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

Strengthen teacher implementation of rigorous instructional practices in relation to Industry Certifications

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Incorporate effective PLC's to analyze and utilize data to drive instruction, problem-solve, and increase career and college readiness by mitigating barriers to success post-secondary opportunities.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

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

Teachers monitor the extent to which their students demonstrate deeper levels of understanding in rigorous tasks and adjust academic support structures as needed.

Person Responsible: Darrell Kretz (kretzd@pcsb.org)

Implement a system of grade-level vertical and horizontal articulation that helps ensure students throughout the school are college and career ready.

Person Responsible: Darrell Kretz (kretzd@pcsb.org)

Teachers meet in a Professional Learning Community (PLC) at least once per month to review student work in order to determine to what degree students are making progress with benchmarks that align with CTAE Industry Certification. Additionally, teachers will plan remediation by evaluating student data to determine student individual needs to improve learning gains.

Person Responsible: Darrell Kretz (kretzd@pcsb.org)

Administrators will monitor and support the use of grade level task and text alignment and provide feedback to support teacher growth.

Person Responsible: Darrell Kretz (kretzd@pcsb.org)

#12. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Economically Disadvantaged**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

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

Our current level of performance is 25 percent of Economically Disadvantaged students achieved learning gains in ELA, as evidenced in FSA Score Reporting. Our current level of performance is 38 percent of Economic Disadvantaged students achieved learning gains in Math, as evidenced in FSA Score Reporting.

Measurable Outcome:

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

The percent of Economically Disadvantaged students achieving student learning gains will increase by 10 percent in ELA to 35 percent, and Math to 48 percent - as measured by Assessment Score Reporting by May 2024.

Monitoring:

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

Grade Level Data Review, Cycle Student Data Chats, Quarterly Teacher Data Chats, Cycle Assessments, PSAT/ACT/SAT reviews, Write Score Assessments.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Darrell Kretz (kretzd@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.)

Support staff to utilize data to organize students to interact with content in manners which differentiates/ scaffolds instruction to meet the needs of each student. Implement research-based strategies that promote scholar achievement.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

To enhance staff capacity so as to analyze and utilize data to drive instruction and differentiation through equitable, culturally responsive practices.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

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

Provide regular opportunities for content teachers to collaborate and co-plan to bridge grade-level work and the integration of language development within content specific instruction.

Person Responsible: Darrell Kretz (kretzd@pcsb.org)

Review school-based data in a disaggregated manner and thoughtfully plan for remediation and enrichment interventions.

Person Responsible: Darrell Kretz (kretzd@pcsb.org)

Administrators to monitor the lesson planning and classroom implementation of effective lessons that provide scholars equitable opportunities to engage students in rigorous, standards-based work rich in language development (explicit vocabulary, specific language patterns and language form). Provide ongoing feedback to teachers to support the development of their practice in supporting learners.

Person Responsible: Brooke Dyett (dyettb@pcsb.org)

Provide extended learning opportunities to learners as needed.

Person Responsible: Darrell Kretz (kretzd@pcsb.org)

CSI, TSI and ATSI Resource Review

Describe the process to review school improvement funding allocations and ensure resources are allocated based on needs. This section must be completed if the school is identified as ATSI, TSI or CSI in addition to completing an Area(s) of Focus identifying interventions and activities within the SIP (ESSA 1111(d)(1)(B)(4) and (d)(2)(C).

The School Improvement funding allocation process will be evaluated in school meetings monthly, school messenger calls to communicate with parents, Title One Meetings, updates and input request on school websites and SAC Meetings.

Budget to Support Areas of Focus

Part VII: Budget to Support Areas of Focus

The approved budget does not reflect any amendments submitted for this project.

1	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA				\$8,400.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2023-24
			2151 - Lealman Innovation Academy	UniSIG		\$8,400.00
			<i>Notes: Instruction, basic/furniture fixtures and equipment: Poster Maker and Laminating Machine - Reinforce key learning concepts with poster size learning strategies and reminders. Create a print rich environment to incorporate literacy strategies in all core subject areas to improve student learning gains.</i>			
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math				\$3,409.31
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2023-24
			2151 - Lealman Innovation Academy	UniSIG		\$3,409.31
			<i>Notes: Instruction, basic/supplies: Classroom supplies such as: paper, pencils, pens, highlighters, sheet protectors, copies for marking the text and annotating, composition books for journaling, 3 ring binders, note cards, dry erase makers, student response dry erase boards, colored paper, etc.</i>			
3	III.B.	Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Other				\$4,082.31
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2023-24
			2151 - Lealman Innovation Academy	UniSIG		\$4,082.31

			Notes: Instruction, basic/supplies: Team building equipment and supplies will be utilized to help students understand the importance of working together as a team. This includes but is not limited to a variety of balls, cones, hula hoops, etc. Kinesthetic learners process information best when they are physically engaged during the learning process; they often prefer a learning through doing approach. Additional PBIS activities will include semester incentives such as participation in field day event. This activity includes purchasing the equipment and supplies needed to host the field day events.			
4	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Science				\$0.00
5	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Social Studies				\$6,818.63
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2023-24
			2151 - Lealman Innovation Academy	UniSIG		\$6,818.63
			Notes: Instruction, basic/furniture, fixtures and equipment: Technology to build a classroom computer lab for two Civics classrooms. This will allow students access during civics periods to help improve student learning seamlessly.			
6	III.B.	Area of Focus: Graduation: Graduation				\$31,476.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2023-24
			2151 - Lealman Innovation Academy	UniSIG		\$31,476.00
			Notes: Instructional staff training services/travel: The school would like to send two administrators and two instructional leaders to the Harvard School Turnaround Leaders Conference. This conference is normally held in June in Cambridge, MA. The two staff members attending are considered leaders at the school and this program will provide the tools needed to bring about rapid and sustained change at Lealman Innovation Academy. The school's objectives are to: gain the skills to develop rapid, well thought out improvement action plans, to understand how data-driven decisions can be used to set strategy and assess progress, to learn how transforming school culture fosters high-quality education and to acquire strategies to communicate the school's vision to stakeholders. These objectives match the focus of the conference. Total travel costs (for this five-day program for four staff are \$15,738 and include registration \$7,990 (\$3,995 x2), lodging \$4,584 (6 nights for 2 rooms x 382), airfare \$1,746 (\$873 x 2), meals \$768 (\$64/day x 6 days x 2), and ground transportation/parking \$650.			
7	III.B.	Area of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Black/African-American				\$14,000.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2023-24
			2151 - Lealman Innovation Academy	UniSIG		\$14,000.00
			Notes: Instructional staff training services/travel: Innovative Schools Summit (PBIS, Discipline, Trauma impacted students) in Nashville, TN (6/19-23/24). Estimated costs for each attendee: Registration \$545, airfare \$500, lodging \$1,375 (\$275/night x 5 nights), meals \$320 (\$64/day x 5 days), mileage/parking \$325 = \$3,500 per attendee.			
8	III.B.	Area of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: English Language Learners				\$0.00
9	III.B.	Area of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities				\$0.00
10	III.B.	Area of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Hispanic				\$0.00
11	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Career & Technical Education				\$0.00
12	III.B.	Area of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Economically Disadvantaged				\$0.00
Total:						\$71,250.00

Budget Approval

Check if this school is eligible and opting out of UniSIG funds for the 2023-24 school year.

No