

Pinellas County Schools

Osceola Fundamental High School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	7
III. Planning for Improvement	11
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	0
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	0
VI. Title I Requirements	0
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

Osceola Fundamental High

9751 98TH ST, Seminole, FL 33777

<http://www.osceola-hs.pinellas.k12.fl.us/>

SIP Authority

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

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

Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)

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

Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)

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

Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

I. School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

Osceola Fundamental High School's mission is to sustain an environment where staff, students, parents and community work collaboratively to support all students in meeting or exceeding college and career readiness.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Osceola Fundamental High School's vision is to graduate 100% of our students so they are prepared for college and career.

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
Bohnet, Michael	Principal	
Finley, Julie	Assistant Principal	ELA, Science, Application Program
Mucerino, Cynthia	Assistant Principal	Social Studies, Exceptional Student Education, Facilities, Activities
Smith, Eric	Assistant Principal	Math, Career and Technical, Curriculum, Acceleration, Assessment
Montgomery, Christopher	Behavior Specialist	
Stolz, Juliana	Psychologist	
Polizzi, Electra	School Counselor	

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.

Teacher Input through School Based Leadership Team, Surveys of Staff, Student and Parents, Community Groups (ie, Elks, Rotary) Monthly Parent Meetings, Boosters, SAC, PTSA, Academy Advisory Boards.

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))

Observation Process: Walk through data and feed-back, especially in our focus area of differentiation and sound teaching practices.

Consistent Data Review and data chats.

Adjustments will be made based on the data provided by observation and data review results.

Demographic Data

2023-24 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Other School 9-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	26%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	28%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	<i>Data will be uploaded when available</i>
2021-22 ESSA Identification	N/A
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	
School Grades History	2021-22: A 2020-21: A 2019-20: A 2018-19: A 2017-18: A
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

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*	68			71			77		
ELA Learning Gains	54			57			61		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	51			58			58		
Math Achievement*	72			63			80		
Math Learning Gains	63			41			59		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	56			41			57		
Science Achievement*	84			81			88		
Social Studies Achievement*	90			85			90		
Middle School Acceleration									
Graduation Rate	100			99			98		
College and Career Acceleration	75			72			67		
ELP Progress	60			76			71		

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

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

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	70
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	773
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	100

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	63			
ELL	51			
AMI				
ASN	86			
BLK	72			
HSP	66			
MUL	82			
PAC				
WHT	71			
FRL	68			

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	68	54	51	72	63	56	84	90		100	75	60
SWD	49	52	55	65	69	64	38	95		97	43	
ELL	43	41	36	50	60		67					60
AMI												
ASN	90	66		83	92		93			100	77	
BLK	67	61					90	80		91	40	
HSP	58	51	47	60	63	59	73	78		100	65	70
MUL	77	55		75	91			93		100	81	
PAC												
WHT	68	53	51	74	59	53	85	92		100	77	
FRL	61	53	43	62	70	65	74	89		99	66	64

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	71	57	58	63	41	41	81	85		99	72	76
SWD	61	59	56	71	48		86	62		100	43	
ELL	39	44	47	50	47		56					76
AMI												
ASN	85	79		64	58		92	92		100	60	
BLK	80	64		57			100					
HSP	56	51	54	60	44	35	74	87		100	80	77
MUL	76	50		64	54		91	79		100	67	
PAC												
WHT	73	57	58	63	39	46	79	85		99	71	
FRL	64	52	53	55	38	35	77	75		99	66	81

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	77	61	58	80	59	57	88	90		98	67	71
SWD	59	50	43	59	40	17	63	86		94	47	
ELL	40	52	47	78	61		80			91	50	71
AMI												
ASN	87	61	69	74	50		90	92				
BLK	59	48	45	73	38		50	91				
HSP	75	54	43	75	63	65	84	89		96	72	
MUL	85	61		84	64		95	86		100	53	
PAC												
WHT	77	63	61	81	59	55	90	90		98	67	
FRL	70	55	56	76	52	49	89	90		98	52	

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.

Algebra 1 was the lowest performing area. 52% proficient.

Students who enter with high school without having met mastery of Algebraic Concepts tend to have deficits in basic math skills and number sense.

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

ELA 2 was the largest decline with a 9% drop from 68% proficient to 59% proficient.

New standards and assessments may be a contributing factor. The adjustment factor for both teachers and students and well as the adaptive test model.

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.

Compared to state averages we are above in all tested areas.

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

Geometry increased by 1% from 75% to 76%.

Geometry increased the achievement in both level 4 and level 5 proficiency. Teacher collaboration and standards-based instruction would be the most notable action to increase the scores.

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

TBD when data is available.

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

1. Increase the performance of the lowest Algebra-I student achievement
2. Increase performance of the lowest English-II student achievement
3. Increase the performance of the lowest achievement for Students With Disabilities.
4. Increase the performance on Advanced level scores to meet or exceed state and national averages.
5. Decrease the number of students receiving Ds and Fs in required content courses.

Area of Focus

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

:

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

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

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

Area of Focus: For Algebra, our overall scale scores from the 2023 Alg EOC were at a mean of 493, which were the highest in district. Most proficient students were at a Level 3 (88% of proficient students) and 0% reaching Level 5. This data lead to a focus toward the ends of the distribution of scores, specifically Level 1 and 2 (a combined 48% of Alg students) and 0% Level 5. The rationale for this focus lies within the distribution of scores skewed left and no students scoring at Level 5. There is critical need to differentiate instruction to support the lower proficient students (Level 1 and 2) and challenge the upper Level 4 students.

For Geometry, our overall scales score was at a 503 with 21% reaching Level 5 which was the highest in the district. While scores were evenly distributed, Level 1 & 2 combined reach 24%. Additionally, the majority of proficient students was in Level 3. There is a critical need to address the overall bottom quartile not reaching proficiency and increasing the Level 4 and 5 total percentages.

Measurable Outcome:

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

For Algebra, the lower quartile of non-proficient students will move to proficiency, which will reflect a 12% reduction of non-proficient students (as measured by the Alg EOC). Additionally, the higher quartile of Level 4 students will move to Level 5, which will reflect an increase of 3% for Level 5 (Alg EOC).

For Geometry, the bottom quartile of all students will be reduced to 20% at Level 1 & 2 combined and the upper quartile of Level 3 progressing to Level for 4 or 5 at an 8.5% increase (as measured by the Geo EOC).

Monitoring:

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

These goals will be monitored throughout the school year through via the following methods: monitoring district cycle assessment summative scores, item analysis in PLCs following cycle assessments, district and teacher created common formative assessments analyzed through Performance Matters platform, attending district quarterly PLCs and semester trainings, targeted feedback through the observation process to include walk-through data and formative evaluation of instructional practice, differentiated pedagogy designed within bimonthly PLCs.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Eric Smith (smithericc@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.)

- Content focused PLCs – assessment breakdown to include item analysis, unit planning and alignment with district pacing guide, individual lesson planning (i.e. objective creation, embedding formative assessments), student work analysis.
- Pedagogy focused PLCs – instructional practice enhancement as defined by teacher DPP, development of differentiated instruction based on current trends in assessment data.
- District quarterly PLCs and semester trainings – district highlighted trends in data across schools to target specific sub-groups in need of remediation, collaboration and sharing of best practices throughout the district.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

A strategic and consistent focus on content mastery and delivery of instructional practice to develop differentiation within the teaching and learning processes, will meet student needs across levels of proficiency. Through purposeful professional development with teacher planning, enhanced pedagogical practices will be implemented and improved levels of differentiated instruction will occur. This will positively impact the distribution of scale scores to reduce non-proficiency and increase proficiency in the higher levels as outlined in the measurable outcome.

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.

Pre-determined scheduled for PLCs that is aligned with district and state assessment calendars.

Person Responsible: Eric Smith (smithericc@pcsb.org)

Assessment analysis and/or student work analysis focus at all Content PLCs.

Person Responsible: Eric Smith (smithericc@pcsb.org)

Alignment between teacher DPP and which area of practice is called for improvement in all Pedagogy PLCs. Pedagogy PLC participants will engage in professional development related to their individual focus area to improve instructional practice.

Person Responsible: Eric Smith (smithericc@pcsb.org)

Recorded summary of PLCs and evidence of work produced submitted to administration following all PLCs.

Person Responsible: Eric Smith (smithericc@pcsb.org)

Teachers will track rigor through a cognitive ladder (i.e. Bloom's Taxonomy) in planning and practice.

Person Responsible: Eric Smith (smithericc@pcsb.org)

Instructional leadership will provide specifically targeted feedback through observation walk-throughs aligned with differentiated instruction, purposeful and standards-based lesson planning, and pedagogy covering a range of learning modalities.

Person Responsible: Eric Smith (smithericc@pcsb.org)

#2. 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 a pass rate of 57% for our accelerated courses that are meeting or exceeding the national and/or state average as evidence by the Advanced Placement (AP) data. The area of focus is on the additional 43% of courses that fall below the national and/or state average. There is a critical need to improve our standing among the state and national pass averages for all AP courses.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Average pass rate per accelerated course compared to the national and/or state average will increase by half, at 21.5%, as evidenced by AP exam scores.

Monitoring:

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

This goal will be monitored throughout the school year through via the following methods: monitoring practice exam data and item analysis through AP focused PLCs following delivery of assessments such as DBQ, teacher created common formative assessments, targeted feedback through the observation process to include walk-through data and formative evaluation of instructional practice, differentiated pedagogy designed within bimonthly PLCs, attending district professional development and AP Summer Institute trainings.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Eric Smith (smithericc@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.)

- AP focused PLCs – assessment breakdown to include practice exam data and item analysis, unit planning and alignment with AP course requirements/pacing guides, individual lesson planning (i.e. objective creation, embedding formative assessments), student work analysis.
- Pedagogy focused PLCs – instructional practice enhancement as defined by teacher DPP, development of differentiated instruction based on current trends in assessment data.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

A strategic and consistent focus on content mastery and delivery of instructional practice to develop differentiation within the teaching and learning processes, will meet student needs across levels of proficiency. Through purposeful professional development with teacher planning, enhanced pedagogical practices will be implemented and improved levels of differentiated instruction will occur. This will positively impact the varied learning styles to reduce non-proficiency and increase proficiency in the higher levels as outlined in the measurable outcome.

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.

Pre-determined scheduled for PLCs that is aligned with district and state assessment calendars.

Person Responsible: Eric Smith (smithericc@pcsb.org)

Assessment analysis and/or student work analysis focus at all Content PLCs.

Person Responsible: Eric Smith (smithericc@pcsb.org)

Alignment between teacher DPP and which area of practice is called for improvement in all Pedagogy PLCs. Pedagogy PLC participants will engage in professional development related to their individual focus area to improve instructional practice.

Person Responsible: Eric Smith (smithericc@pcsb.org)

Recorded summary of PLCs and evidence of work produced submitted to administration following all PLCs.

Person Responsible: Eric Smith (smithericc@pcsb.org)

Teachers will track rigor through a cognitive ladder (i.e. Bloom's Taxonomy) in planning and practice.

Person Responsible: Eric Smith (smithericc@pcsb.org)

Instructional leadership will provide specifically targeted feedback through observation walk-throughs aligned with differentiated instruction, purposeful and standards-based lesson planning, and pedagogy covering a range of learning modalities.

Person Responsible: Eric Smith (smithericc@pcsb.org)

Create a lead accelerated teacher position (encompassing all accelerated areas: AP, AICE, certifications) to drive instructional practice in PLC, organize small learning groups for targeted professional development, develop systems for recruitment, and assist with organization and cross-curricular activities.

Person Responsible: [no one identified]

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

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

Our current level of performance shows that 59% of students are proficient, as measured by the 2023 PM Cycle 3 ELA FAST Assessment, this ranked as one of the highest performances in the district. Students showing below proficient is at 41%. Focusing on intentional planning, differentiation, and strong instructional practices, we will work to reduce the number of students below proficiency by 7% therefore increasing students proficient and above to 66%.

Measurable Outcome:

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

The percent of all students achieving ELA BEST proficiency will increase from 59% to 66%, as measured by the PM Cycle 3 ELA FAST Assessment.

Monitoring:

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

Progresses will be monitored throughout the school year through regular classroom walkthroughs with actionable feedback provided to instructors. Additionally, regular PLCs will be held that focus on intentional planning and strong instructional practices that are centered around data. Data will be collected regularly through formative and summative assessments, along with district provided assessments. Instructors will use this information to develop ongoing remediation and acceleration for students.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Julie Finley (finleyju@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.)

Staff will strengthen pedagogical (instructional) practices through:

- Intentional planning (grounded in objectives, common assessments, WICOR strategies, evaluation of student work, refining use of non-negotiable resources)
- Strategy walks (demo classrooms, co-teach model lesson, and WICOR walks)
- Using cognitive processes to align learning action to standard and rigor.
- Focus on formative assessment strategies that monitor for student learning and mastery of standards.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The use of these evidence-based interventions will all for teachers to better differentiate for students and refine their instructional practices to ensure students are meeting or exceeding mastery of the standards.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

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

Teachers will engage in district provided professional learning opportunities.

Person Responsible: Julie Finley (finleyju@pcsb.org)

Teachers will participate in bi-monthly PLCs that focus on data analysis and intentional planning as well as pedagogy focused on strategies that develop rigor through WICOR, monitoring for learning, and differentiation.

Person Responsible: Julie Finley (finleyju@pcsb.org)

Teachers will analyze student data to monitor student progress toward mastery and develop intentional remediation plan/lesson.

Person Responsible: Julie Finley (finleyju@pcsb.org)

Administrators will conduct consistent walkthroughs to provide actionable feedback and collaborative debrief to foster a growth mindset and improved pedagogical practices, focused on implementation strategies tied to our school focuses and personal professional growth.

Person Responsible: Julie Finley (finleyju@pcsb.org)

Collaboratively work together to implement strategy walks within and across disciplines.

Person Responsible: Julie Finley (finleyju@pcsb.org)

Creation and use of a benchmark tracking system that will be used with both teachers and students.

Person Responsible: Julie Finley (finleyju@pcsb.org)

Throughout lessons teachers will use BEST text, reading comprehension protocols, and anchor charts to assist students in mastery of standards.

Person Responsible: Julie Finley (finleyju@pcsb.org)

#4. 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.

Data indicates that Students With Disabilities (SWD) have demonstrated that they are lacking the foundational skills to meet proficiency levels on state tested areas of English/Language Arts (ELA) and Algebra-I as measured by the Florida Assessment of Student Thinking. Osceola holds the expectation for Exceptional Student Education (ESE) inclusion instructors to collaborate with General Education subject area instructors through PLC's, to know the content being taught and to know the pacing guide for their subject. This will allow the teachers to scaffold and differentiate supports for students to make individual learning gains in both ELA and Algebra.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Students With Disabilities (SWD) will increase their proficiency in ELA and Algebra.

- ELA proficiency will increase 5% from 45% to 50 %
- Algebra proficiency will increase 5% from 53% to 58%

Monitoring:

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

Progress will be monitored throughout the school year through regular classroom walkthroughs with actionable feedback provided to instructors. Additionally, regular PLCs will be held that focus on intentional planning and strong instructional practices that are centered around data. Data will be collected regularly through formative and summative assessments, along with district provided assessments. Instructors will use this information to make adjustments and provided remediation as needed.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Cynthia Mucerino (mucerinocy@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.)

1. Implement a process for placing students requiring ESE services in master schedules to ensure they have optimal supports.
2. Plan intentionally for specially designed instruction to address IEP goals and grade level standards.
3. Intentional planning (grounded in objectives, common assessments, WICOR strategies, evaluation of student work, refining use of non-negotiable resources)
4. Students will work toward mastery of meaningful IEP goals while learning the foundational skills they need to engage in rigorous, grade level content in the Least Restrictive Environment.
5. Teach students strategies to increase their ability to work independently.
6. Collect data and monitor progress towards IEP goals and objectives on an intentional and regular schedule and make adjustments to accommodations and interventions accordingly.
7. Focus on formative assessment strategies that monitor for student learning and mastery of standards.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Students when offered the support and scaffolding needed to understand the content will be more engaged in their learning and will show more learning gains as they increase their skills. Using PLC data chats we will enable early identification of students in need, and plan for the differentiation and support of those students. We will use regular progress monitoring data to determine ESE students making sufficient gains.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

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

Strategically create a schedule that provides time for collaboration and planning time between ESE and General Education teachers to facilitate integration of specially designed instruction into core content classes, provide opportunities for scaffolding and differentiation, and monitor student progress towards IEP goals and mastery of general education standards.

Person Responsible:

Person Responsible: Cynthia Mucerino (mucerinocy@pcsb.org)

ESE teachers will work collaboratively with General Education teachers during common planning and twice monthly PLCs to implement evidence-based practices for students with disabilities to teach foundational literacy and math skills as a pathway to grade level work.

Person Responsible: Cynthia Mucerino (mucerinocy@pcsb.org)

Teachers and/or ESE Service Providers will provide differentiated, individual/small group instruction aligned to areas of need identified in each student's IEP to allow them to fully engage with same age peers and make progress towards grade level standards by engaging in professional development that best supports SWD by differentiating rigorous standards-based instruction.

Person Responsible: Cynthia Mucerino (mucerinocy@pcsb.org)

Strengthen student's abilities to work independently by embedding meta-cognitive strategies into content-based (ELA/Math) instruction to teach students critical memory and engagement processes they can use to access, retain, and generalize important content.

Person Responsible: Cynthia Mucerino (mucerinocy@pcsb.org)

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

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

Our current level of performance shows that 83% of students are proficient, as measured by the 2023 Biology EOC, this ranked as one of the highest performances in the district. Students showing below proficient is at 17%. Focusing on intentional planning, differentiation, and strong instructional practices, we will work to reduce the number of students below proficiency by 7% therefore increasing students proficient and above to 90%.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Students performing below proficiency (17%), will be reduced by 7%, therefore increasing student performing at proficient or above to 90%, as measured by the Biology EOC.

Monitoring:

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

Progresses will be monitored throughout the school year through regular classroom walkthroughs with actionable feedback provided to instructors. Additionally, regular PLCs will be held that focus on intentional planning and strong instructional practices that are centered around data. Data will be collected regularly through formative and summative assessments, along with district provided assessments. Instructors will use this information to develop ongoing remediation and acceleration for students.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

[no one identified]

Evidence-based Intervention:

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

Staff will strengthen pedagogical (instructional) practices through:

- Intentional planning (grounded in objectives, common assessments, WICOR strategies)
- Strategy walks (demo classrooms, co-teach model lesson, and WICOR walks)
- Using cognitive processes to align learning action to standard and rigor.
- Focus on formative assessment strategies that monitor for student learning and mastery of standards.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The use of these evidence-based interventions will all for teachers to better differentiate for students and refine their instructional practices to ensure students are meeting or exceeding mastery of the standards.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

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

Teachers will engage in district provided professional learning opportunities.

Person Responsible: Julie Finley (finleyju@pcsb.org)

Teachers will participate in bi-monthly PLCs that focus on data analysis, intentional planning, as well as pedagogy focused on strategies that develop rigor through WICOR, monitoring for learning, and differentiation.

Person Responsible: Julie Finley (finleyju@pcsb.org)

Teachers will analyze student data to monitor student progress toward mastery and develop intentional remediation plans/lessons.

Person Responsible: Julie Finley (finleyju@pcsb.org)

Administrators will conduct consistent walkthroughs to provide actionable feedback and collaborative debrief to foster a growth mindset and improved pedagogical practices, focused on implementation strategies tied to our school initiatives and personal professional growth.

Person Responsible: Julie Finley (finleyju@pcsb.org)

Collaboratively work together to implement strategy walks within and across disciplines.

Person Responsible: Julie Finley (finleyju@pcsb.org)

Creation and use of a benchmark tracking system that will be used with both teachers and students.

Person Responsible: Julie Finley (finleyju@pcsb.org)

Teachers will work collaboratively with cross curricular planning opportunities to increase student exposure to BEST ELA standards.

Person Responsible: Julie Finley (finleyju@pcsb.org)

#6. 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.

Algebra was the lowest proficient content area in this subgroup at 40% compared to the overall average proficient rate of 52% as measured by the Alg EOC. This was the only area in which this subgroup performed lower than the overall average, indicating a critical need to address the gap in learning.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Algebra proficiency for this subgroup will be on par with the overall tested average rate of proficiency within a 3% margin as measured by the Alg EOC.

Monitoring:

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

This goal will be monitored throughout the school year through via the following methods (through the lens of this subgroup): monitoring district cycle assessment summative scores, item analysis in PLCs following cycle assessments, district and teacher created common formative assessments analyzed through Performance Matters platform, targeted feedback through the observation process to include walk-through data and formative evaluation of instructional practice, differentiated pedagogy designed within bimonthly PLCs.

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.)

Content focused PLCs – assessment breakdown to include item analysis, unit planning and alignment with district pacing guide, individual lesson planning (i.e. objective creation, embedding formative assessments), student work analysis.

- Pedagogy focused PLCs – instructional practice enhancement as defined by teacher DPP, development of differentiated instruction based on current trends in assessment data.
- District quarterly PLCs and semester trainings – district highlighted trends in data across schools to target specific sub-groups in need of remediation, collaboration and sharing of best practices throughout the district.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

A strategic and consistent focus on content mastery and delivery of instructional practice to develop differentiation within the teaching and learning processes, will meet student needs across levels of proficiency for this subgroup. Through purposeful professional development with teacher planning, enhanced pedagogical practices will be implemented and improved levels of differentiated instruction will occur. This will positively impact the distribution of scale scores to reduce non-proficiency and increase proficiency in the higher levels as outlined in the measurable outcome.

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.

Pre-determined scheduled for PLCs that is aligned with district and state assessment calendars.

Person Responsible: Julie Finley (finleyju@pcsb.org)

Assessment analysis and/or student work analysis focus at all Content PLCs.

Person Responsible: Julie Finley (finleyju@pcsb.org)

Alignment between teacher DPP and which area of practice is called for improvement in all Pedagogy PLCs. Pedagogy PLC participants will engage in professional development related to their individual focus area to improve instructional practice.

Person Responsible: Julie Finley (finleyju@pcsb.org)

Recorded summary of PLCs and evidence of work produced submitted to administration following all PLCs.

Person Responsible: Julie Finley (finleyju@pcsb.org)

Teachers will track rigor through a cognitive ladder (i.e. Bloom's Taxonomy) in planning and practice.

Person Responsible: Julie Finley (finleyju@pcsb.org)

Instructional leadership will provide specifically targeted feedback through observation walk-throughs aligned with differentiated instruction, purposeful and standards-based lesson planning, and pedagogy covering a range of learning modalities.

Person Responsible: Eric Smith (smithericc@pcsb.org)

#7. 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.

While our current level of proficiency is the second highest in the district and above the state and district average, it is at a 6% decrease from last year with an 84% proficiency rate, as evidenced by the 2023 US History EOC. Understanding the entire district dropped, the reason is not easily determined because this is not a new assessment in content or practice. The gap will be addressed by focusing on Data Driven PLCs, Cognitively Complex Tasks, and Student-Centered Instruction and Engagement in the classroom.

Measurable Outcome:

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

The percent of students demonstrating proficiency on the US History End of Course Exam will increase from 84% to 90%.

Monitoring:

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

Progresses will be monitored throughout the school year by conducting regular classroom walkthroughs with actionable feedback provided to instructors. Additionally, regular PLCs will be held that focus on intentional planning and strong instructional practices that are centered around data. Data will be collected regularly through formative and summative assessments, along with district provided assessments. Instructors will use this information to develop ongoing remediation and acceleration for students.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Cynthia Mucerino (mucerinocy@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.)

1. Strengthen staff instructional practice to engage students in complex tasks.
2. Strengthen staff instructional practice to utilize questions to help students elaborate on content.
3. Strengthen staff instructional practice to utilize formative assessment strategies to monitor student progress toward mastery of the standards.
4. Strengthen staff instructional practices to utilize differentiation to effectively support diverse learners in their classes.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

By providing ongoing professional development opportunities to increase instruction practices with a focus on cognitively complex tasks, differentiation, student-centered instruction, and development of higher order thinking questions (i.e. rigor via WICOR strategies), along with actively participating in Data Driven PLCs, teachers will strengthen their pedagogical practices, which will result in ALL students engaging in more rigorous tasks in the classroom at an appropriate cognitive level.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

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

Teachers engage in district led professional learning opportunities and district Social Studies PLC, utilizing the resources provided by district leaders and in the US History pacing guides.

Person Responsible: Cynthia Mucerino (mucerinocy@pcsb.org)

Teachers incorporate daily formative assessments to check for understanding, using that data to gauge student progress toward mastery of the standard, utilizing course specific formative assessment/data resources. Teachers collaborate with students in creating in the moment remediation as to address misconceptions and engage students in the ownership of their own data.

Person Responsible: Cynthia Mucerino (mucerinocy@pcsb.org)

Teachers intentionally plan lessons, supported by district resources when appropriate (i.e. LEVEL UP lessons for different EOC content areas), to engage students in cognitively complex tasks, providing students opportunity to meet and exceed the rigor of the standards in the classroom.

Person Responsible: Cynthia Mucerino (mucerinocy@pcsb.org)

Implement Strategy Walks/Instructional Rounds schedule via Teacher Demonstration Days throughout the school year, with structured debrief sessions, centered around our 2022-23 big rocks. Teachers implement learnings after debriefing sessions with actionable feedback from administrator walkthroughs.

Person Responsible: Cynthia Mucerino (mucerinocy@pcsb.org)

Administrator conduct consistent walkthroughs to provide actionable feedback both via iObservation and in-person collaborative debriefs to embody a growth mindset and constant improvement in instructional practices, centered around implementation of strategies tied to our big rocks and personalized professional development within specific content.

Person Responsible: Cynthia Mucerino (mucerinocy@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.

A small subset (four students) of our overall population of student speakers of other languages, were tested on the FAST ELA Assessment. Of those tested one student showed proficient (25%), one student showed approaching proficient (25%), and two students showed below proficient (50%). Focusing on intentional planning, differentiation, and strong instructional practices, we will work to reduce the number of students performing at approaching or below proficient by 10%.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Students performing below proficiency (50%), will be reduced by 10%, therefore increasing student performing at proficient or above to 60%, as measured by the FAST ELA Assessment.

Monitoring:

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

Progresses will be monitored throughout the school year through regular classroom walkthroughs with actionable feedback provided to instructors. Additionally, regular PLCs will be held that focus on intentional planning and strong instructional practices that are centered around data. Data will be collected regularly through formative and summative assessments, along with district provided assessments. Instructors will use this information to develop ongoing remediation and acceleration for students.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Julie Finley (finleyju@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.)

Staff will strengthen pedagogical (instructional) practices through:

- Intentional planning (grounded in objectives, common assessments, WICOR strategies)
- Strategy walks (demo classrooms, co-teach model lesson, and WICOR walks)
- Using cognitive processes to align learning action to standard and rigor.
- Focus on formative assessment strategies that monitor for student learning and mastery of standards.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The use of these evidence-based interventions will all for teachers to better differentiate for students and refine their instructional practices to ensure students are meeting or exceeding mastery of the standards.

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 engage in district provided professional learning opportunities focused on differentiation for student of other languages.

Person Responsible: Julie Finley (finleyju@pcsb.org)

Teachers will participate in bi-monthly PLCs that focus on data analysis and intentional planning as well as pedagogy focused on strategies that develop rigor through WICOR, monitoring for learning, and differentiation.

Person Responsible: Julie Finley (finleyju@pcsb.org)

Teachers will analyze student data to monitor student progress toward mastery and develop intentional remediation plans/lessons.

Person Responsible: Julie Finley (finleyju@pcsb.org)

Administrators will conduct consistent walkthroughs to provide actionable feedback and collaborative debrief to foster growth mindset and improved pedagogical practices, focused on implementation strategies tied to our big rocks and personal professional growth.

Person Responsible: Julie Finley (finleyju@pcsb.org)

Collaboratively work together to implement strategy walks within and across disciplines.

Person Responsible: Julie Finley (finleyju@pcsb.org)

Creation and use of a benchmark tracking system that will be used with both teachers and students.

Person Responsible: Julie Finley (finleyju@pcsb.org)

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

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

Our current graduation rate is at 100%, as evidenced in the school's 2022-2023 graduation data. Current performance will be maintained by implementing targeted areas for school improvement with fidelity.

Measurable Outcome:

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

The percentage of students' graduating on time will maintain at 100%.

Monitoring:

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

This goal will be monitored throughout the school year through via the following methods: monitoring district cycle assessment summative scores for at-risk seniors, intervention placement within scheduling for at-risk seniors, district graduation cohort report data analysis, individual at risk senior report monitored through Child Study Team (CST)

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Eric Smith (smithericc@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.)

CST - weekly meetings held with MTSS support staff to analyze individual student situation
Targeted scheduling - student placement in intervention classes (math and ELA) for students that have not yet recorded passing state scores

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Data analysis for individual students on a weekly basis is how we are able to monitor senior progress immediately and efficiently. Continued implementation of this practice will assist in reaching our repeated goal of 100% graduation.

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.

CST weekly meeting to discuss at risk seniors.

Person Responsible: Julie Finley (finleyju@pcsb.org)

District graduation cohort report analysis

Person Responsible: Eric Smith (smithericc@pcsb.org)

Placement of intervention courses

Person Responsible: Eric Smith (smithericc@pcsb.org)

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

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

Culture & Environment specifically relating to School Climate/Conditions for Learning:

The discipline data at Osceola Fundamental High school indicated 230 discipline referrals were issued in the 2022-23 school year. Student skipping was the most prevalent, with 45 referrals (20%). By building student relationships, keeping students engaged in the classroom and monitoring our halls and campus, and encouraging our students to go to class, we can reduce the number of skipping referrals by 10%. Teachers will be encouraged to use Positive Behavior incentives and restorative practices to foster a positive classroom environment.

Measurable Outcome:

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

The percent of student referrals for skipping will be reduced from 20% of total referrals to 10% of total referrals.

Monitoring:

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

This will be monitored through the CST and MTSS teams, and weekly attendance reports.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Christopher Montgomery (montgomerych@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.)

- Rigorous, engaging instruction
- Restorative Practices (Classroom Climate and Grading)
- PBIS incentives
- Run Focus Attendance reports
- Child Study Team

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Focus discipline and attendance data will be used to determine which students are skipping classes and for what reasons if any. Establishing cooperative learning structures to promote student engagement and positive relationships (utilizing PBIS and Restorative Practices as needed). Students with repeated skipping patterns will be referred to the Child study team for planning and implementation of interventions to improve behavior. Restorative practices must be present to ensure the student feels welcome back into the classroom. With the development of deeper meaningful relationships, engaging content and the active monitoring of campus, students should have a stronger desire to stay in class.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

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

Teachers will engage in pre-school and ongoing professional development in and implement strategies surrounding cognitively complex tasks, student-centered instruction and engagement, and monitoring for learning/development of higher order thinking questions (i.e. rigor via WICOR strategies, like Focused Notetaking) to support learning for ALL students equitably.

Person Responsible: Julie Finley (finleyju@pcsb.org)

Teachers will greet students daily at their doors and monitor their surroundings during transition time, while administration and other support staff actively monitor campus ensuring that students check-in to their class rooms.

Person Responsible: Cynthia Mucerino (mucerinocy@pcsb.org)

A system of recognition will be established to provide rewards to students for demonstration of positive and appropriate behaviors that are identified in the schoolwide expectations. Reward distribution will be monitored through PBIS team

Person Responsible: Julie Finley (finleyju@pcsb.org)

Administration will complete classroom walk-throughs to ensure highly engaging lessons are occurring as well as to promote presence on campus

Person Responsible: Cynthia Mucerino (mucerinocy@pcsb.org)