

Pinellas County Schools

# Lealman Innovation Academy



## 2019-20 School Improvement Plan

---

## **Table of Contents**

---

<b>School Demographics</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>Title I Requirements</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>30</b>

# Lealman Innovation Academy

4900 28TH ST N, St Petersburg, FL 33714

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

## Demographics

**Principal: Connisheia Mathews**

Start Date for this Principal: 6/25/2014

<b>2019-20 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	High School 5-12
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	Alternative Education
<b>2018-19 Title I School</b>	Yes
<b>2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	<i>[Data Not Available]</i>
<b>2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups in orange are below the federal threshold)	Black/African American Students Economically Disadvantaged Students English Language Learners Hispanic Students Multiracial Students Students With Disabilities White Students
<b>School Grade</b>	2018-19:
<b>School Grades History</b>	2017-18:
	2016-17:
	2015-16:
	2014-15:
	2013-14:
<b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>	
<b>SI Region</b>	Southwest
<b>Regional Executive Director</b>	<a href="#">Tracy Webley</a>
<b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>	
<b>Year</b>	
<b>Support Tier</b>	NOT IN DA

ESSA Status	CS&I
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, <a href="#">click here</a> .	

## School Board Approval

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

## SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F. This plan is also a requirement for Targeted Support and Improvement (TS&I) and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CS&I) schools pursuant to 1008.33 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

To be designated as TS&I, a school must have one or more ESSA subgroup(s) with a Federal Index below 41%. This plan shall be approved by the district. There are three ways a school can be designated as CS&I:

1. have a school grade of D or F
2. have a graduation rate of 67% or lower
3. have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

For these schools, the SIP shall be approved by the district as well as the Bureau of School Improvement.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F, or a graduation rate 67% or less. Districts may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing for schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at [www.floridacims.org](http://www.floridacims.org).

## 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 Florida Department of Education 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.

## Part I: School Information

### School Mission and Vision

#### Provide the school's mission statement

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

#### Provide the school's vision statement

100% Scholar Success through equitable practices.

### School Leadership Team

#### Membership

Identify the name, email address and position title for each member of the school leadership team:

Name	Title
Dyett, Brooke	Other
Other	
DuGranrut, Michelle	Assistant Principal
Assistant Principal	
Gore, Valencia	Assistant Principal
Assistant Principal	
McCree, Konrad	Assistant Principal
Assistant Principal	
Harris, Nicole	Instructional Coach
Instructional Coach	
Sanferraro, Erika	Guidance Counselor
Guidance Counselor	
Vann, Monica	Guidance Counselor
Guidance Counselor	
McElveen, Jocelyn	Teacher, ESE
Teacher, ESE	
Mathews, Connisheia	Principal
Principal	
Moon, Jonathan	Other
Other	
Belk, Debbie	Attendance/Social Work
Attendance/Social Work	
Kropp, Tracy	Instructional Coach
Instructional Coach	

### Early Warning Systems

**Current Year**

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	16	102	68	91	102	92	52	28	551
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	8	33	31	32	46	41	28	17	236
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	36	27	25	18	22	10	2	140
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	5	9	37	12	6	75
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	10	78	59	78	90	81	35	11	442

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	6	50	41	35	48	48	27	12	267

**The number of students identified as retainees:**

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

**FTE units allocated to school (total number of teacher units)**

43

**Date this data was collected or last updated**

Tuesday 6/25/2019

**Prior Year - As Reported**

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

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Attendance below 90 percent		
One or more suspensions		
Course failure in ELA or Math		
Level 1 on statewide assessment		

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

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Students with two or more indicators		

**Prior Year - Updated**

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

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

**Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis**

**School Data**

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

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	0%	56%	56%	0%	56%	56%
ELA Learning Gains	0%	51%	51%	0%	53%	53%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	0%	43%	42%	0%	44%	44%
Math Achievement	0%	45%	51%	0%	46%	51%
Math Learning Gains	0%	44%	48%	0%	48%	48%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	0%	41%	45%	0%	42%	45%
Science Achievement	0%	64%	68%	0%	66%	67%
Social Studies Achievement	0%	71%	73%	0%	72%	71%

<b>EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey</b>									
Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)								Total
	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	16 (0)	102 (0)	68 (0)	91 (0)	102 (0)	92 (0)	52 (0)	28 (0)	551 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	8 ( )	33 ( )	31 ( )	32 ( )	46 ( )	41 ( )	28 ( )	17 ( )	236 (0)
One or more suspensions	0 (0)	36 (0)	27 (0)	25 (0)	18 (0)	22 (0)	10 (0)	2 (0)	140 (0)
Course failure in ELA or Math	0 (0)	2 (0)	4 (0)	5 (0)	9 (0)	37 (0)	12 (0)	6 (0)	75 (0)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	10 (0)	78 (0)	59 (0)	78 (0)	90 (0)	81 (0)	35 (0)	11 (0)	442 (0)

**Grade Level Data**

NOTE: This data is raw data and includes ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.

NOTE: 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.

<b>ELA</b>						
<b>Grade</b>	<b>Year</b>	<b>School</b>	<b>District</b>	<b>School-District Comparison</b>	<b>State</b>	<b>School-State Comparison</b>
05	2019	4%	54%	-50%	56%	-52%
	2018	0%	50%	-50%	55%	-55%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison						
06	2019	4%	51%	-47%	54%	-50%
	2018	23%	49%	-26%	52%	-29%
Same Grade Comparison		-19%				
Cohort Comparison		4%				
07	2019	16%	51%	-35%	52%	-36%
	2018	9%	48%	-39%	51%	-42%
Same Grade Comparison		7%				
Cohort Comparison		-7%				
08	2019	11%	55%	-44%	56%	-45%
	2018	10%	55%	-45%	58%	-48%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison		2%				
09	2019	8%	54%	-46%	55%	-47%
	2018	16%	53%	-37%	53%	-37%
Same Grade Comparison		-8%				
Cohort Comparison		-2%				
10	2019	12%	53%	-41%	53%	-41%
	2018	22%	54%	-32%	53%	-31%
Same Grade Comparison		-10%				
Cohort Comparison		-4%				

<b>MATH</b>						
<b>Grade</b>	<b>Year</b>	<b>School</b>	<b>District</b>	<b>School-District Comparison</b>	<b>State</b>	<b>School-State Comparison</b>
05	2019	4%	60%	-56%	60%	-56%
	2018	0%	61%	-61%	61%	-61%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison						
06	2019	1%	44%	-43%	55%	-54%
	2018	11%	45%	-34%	52%	-41%
Same Grade Comparison		-10%				
Cohort Comparison		1%				
07	2019	13%	60%	-47%	54%	-41%
	2018	13%	59%	-46%	54%	-41%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				



<b>MATH</b>						
<b>Grade</b>	<b>Year</b>	<b>School</b>	<b>District</b>	<b>School-District Comparison</b>	<b>State</b>	<b>School-State Comparison</b>
Cohort Comparison		2%				
08	2019	8%	31%	-23%	46%	-38%
	2018	2%	31%	-29%	45%	-43%
Same Grade Comparison		6%				
Cohort Comparison		-5%				

<b>SCIENCE</b>						
<b>Grade</b>	<b>Year</b>	<b>School</b>	<b>District</b>	<b>School-District Comparison</b>	<b>State</b>	<b>School-State Comparison</b>
05	2019	4%	54%	-50%	53%	-49%
	2018	0%	57%	-57%	55%	-55%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison						
08	2019	8%	51%	-43%	48%	-40%
	2018	10%	53%	-43%	50%	-40%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison		8%				

<b>BIOLOGY EOC</b>					
<b>Year</b>	<b>School</b>	<b>District</b>	<b>School Minus District</b>	<b>State</b>	<b>School Minus State</b>
2019	27%	62%	-35%	67%	-40%
2018	0%	63%	-63%	65%	-65%
Compare		27%			

<b>CIVICS EOC</b>					
<b>Year</b>	<b>School</b>	<b>District</b>	<b>School Minus District</b>	<b>State</b>	<b>School Minus State</b>
2019	12%	68%	-56%	71%	-59%
2018	16%	66%	-50%	71%	-55%
Compare		-4%			

<b>HISTORY EOC</b>					
<b>Year</b>	<b>School</b>	<b>District</b>	<b>School Minus District</b>	<b>State</b>	<b>School Minus State</b>
2019	21%	70%	-49%	70%	-49%
2018	23%	70%	-47%	68%	-45%
Compare		-2%			

<b>ALGEBRA EOC</b>					
<b>Year</b>	<b>School</b>	<b>District</b>	<b>School Minus District</b>	<b>State</b>	<b>School Minus State</b>
2019	15%	55%	-40%	61%	-46%
2018	16%	57%	-41%	62%	-46%

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
Compare		-1%			
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	14%	56%	-42%	57%	-43%
2018	10%	56%	-46%	56%	-46%
Compare		4%			

**Subgroup Data**

2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17

2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2015-16	C & C Accel 2015-16

**ESSA Data**

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

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	CS&I
OVERALL Federal Index - All Students	31
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	YES
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	6
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	14
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	337
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	97%

**Subgroup Data**

Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	21
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	2

<b>English Language Learners</b>	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	13
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	2
<b>Asian Students</b>	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
<b>Black/African American Students</b>	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	20
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	2
<b>Hispanic Students</b>	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	29
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	2
<b>Multiracial Students</b>	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	12
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	2
<b>Native American Students</b>	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
<b>Pacific Islander Students</b>	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
<b>White Students</b>	
Federal Index - White Students	41
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

<b>Economically Disadvantaged Students</b>	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	31
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	2

## **Analysis**

### **Data Reflection**

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources (see guide for examples for relevant data sources).

#### **Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year's low performance and discuss any trends**

6th Grade ELA had the lowest performance/proficiency overall at 4% as measured by the FSA ELA 2019. Contributing factors include by are not limited to a lack of high quality, rigorous instruction, lack of differentiated supports on a consistent basis that are adjusted to meet the needs of all students, teacher-centered learning environment, a lack of systemic equity including an equity approach and belonging centered practices, lack of actionable feedback

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

6th Grade ELA had the greatest decline in overall proficiency dropping 19% from 23% to 4 % proficiency as measured by the FSA ELA 2019. Contributing factors include by are not limited to a lack of high quality, rigorous instruction, lack of differentiated supports on a consistent basis that are adjusted to meet the needs of all students, teacher-centered learning environment, a lack of systemic equity including an equity approach and belonging centered practices, lack of actionable feedback

#### **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**

6th Grade Math (-54%) and 6th grade ELA (-50%) had the greatest gaps compared to the state average. Contributing factors include by are not limited to a lack of high quality, rigorous instruction, lack of differentiated supports on a consistent basis that are adjusted to meet the needs of all students, teacher-centered learning environment, a lack of systemic equity including an equity approach and belonging centered practices, lack of actionable feedback

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

Math - 15% Increase in Learning Gains  
 ELA 5% Increase in learning gains.  
 Biology EOC (+27%)

ELA -

- Overall Increase of ELA Gains from 23% (2017) to 31% (2018) to 36% (2019)!!
- Our Heaviest reporting categories (Craft and Structure and Integration of Knowledge) showed the most growth
- 8th Grade ROCKED these categories with a 10 and 12 point overall gain respectively. This correlates with having the highest gains overall.
- Writing needs the most attention overall. (\*FSA report with the breakdown for writing)
- Our Intervention VISSA was focused on Integration of Knowledge where we saw the most growth overall- 4pts.

ALL -

-Interventions

-Small group

-Individualized coaching

-Tier 2 interventions

-deliberate, intentional, quality testing environment and use of formative assessments to

**Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern? (see Guidance tab for additional information)**

Areas of concern include achievement/learning gains for scholars in ELA and Reading.

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

1. ELA Gains (w/ Heavy writing emphasis)
2. Math Gains
3. Equitable Practices/Systemic Equity
4. Culturally Responsive Instruction
- 5.

## Part III: Planning for Improvement

**Areas of Focus:**

<b>#1</b>	
<b>Title</b>	ELA - Increase student learning gains by 15% from 36% to 51%.
<b>Rationale</b>	<p>Our current level of performance is 36 % of students achieved ELA gains as evidenced in FSA ELA Score Report 2018-19. We expect our performance level to be 51% ELA Gains by June of 2020 which would increase our SIR from "Maintaining" to "Commendable." The problem/gap is occurring because students are not receiving high quality, culturally responsive interventions in literacy and language in needs-identified small groups.</p> <p>If high quality, culturally responsive, needs-based interventions in literacy and language facilitated through small group would occur, the problem would be reduced by being able to observe evidence of increased individual academic performance as related to standards assessed.</p>

<b>State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve</b>	The percent of all students achieving ELA gains will increase will increase from 36%to 51%, as measured by FSA ELA Score Reporting.
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome</b>	Michelle DuGranrut (dugranrutm@pcsb.org)
<b>Evidence-based Strategy</b>	<p>Provide small group instructional intervention to students struggling in areas of literacy and English language development.</p> <p>Some students require instructional support in various aspects of literacy above and beyond what typical classroom instruction provides. Small group instructional intervention is emphasized and evidenced as a strategy which benefits learners if facilitated in alignment with the identified literacy needs of students. The panel that reviewed the six studies that met WWC (What Works Clearinghouse) standards recommends and suggests ways to provide high-quality instructional interventions in literacy and language to students who are struggling in areas such as foundational reading skills, vocabulary acquisition, listening comprehension and reading comprehension. These six studies resulted in impacts across the domains of pre-reading, reading, vocabulary, and English language development. (www.ies.ed.gov)</p>
<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy</b>	

<b>Action Step</b>	
<b>Description</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Use formative assessment information (e.g. iReady, Write Score, Unit Assessments) to identify students who demonstrate persistent struggles with with aspects of language and literacy development.</li> <li>2. Teachers intentionally design lessons on a trajectory of difficulty with multiple checkpoints to find out what students know and then adapt instruction (small group with targeted interventions) to meet students' needs.</li> <li>3. Within small groups teachers will establish norms for collaborative work to ensure a productive role for every learner and to attend to the social-emotional needs of learners.</li> <li>4. Support the implementation of reading programs--including the use of grade-appropriate, culturally relevant complex texts in reading intervention classes, typically during small group instruction.</li> </ol>

**Person Responsible** Michelle DuGranrut (dugranrutm@pcsb.org)

**#2**

**Title** Math - Increase student learning gains by 9% from 42% to 51%.  
**Rationale** Our current level of performance is 42% of students achieved Math gains as evidenced in FSA Math score Report 2018-2019. We expect our performance level to be 51% Math Gains by May 2020 which would increase our SIR from "Maintaining" to "Commendable." The problem/gap is occurring because students are not receiving high quality, culturally responsive interventions in math.

**State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve** The percent of all students achieving Math gains will increase from 42% to 51%, as measures by FSA Math Score Reporting.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome** Valencia Gore (gorev@pcsb.org)

**Evidence-based Strategy** Enhance staff capacity to identify critical content from the Standards in alignment with district resources.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy** To build teacher capacity to deconstruct standards to teach critical content aligned to the level of rigor for the standards.

**Action Step**

**Description**

1. Teacher 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 Mathematics Florida Standards.
2. 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.
3. 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 incorporating MAFS and Practice Standards based on classroom and student level data.
4. Administrators and Math Coach monitor teacher practice and provide feedback to support instruction. Administrators regularly observe mathematics lessons and provide feedback.

**Person Responsible** Valencia Gore (gorev@pcsb.org)

**#3**

<b>Title</b>	Social Studies- Increase student learning gains by 5% from 16% to 21% Our current level of performance is 16% of students achieved gains on Civics EOC as evidenced by the 2018-2019 EOC report. We expect our performance level to to be 21% EOC gains, an increase of 5% by June 2020. The problem/gap is occurring due to students not receiving culturally responsive and equitable instruction with fidelity.
<b>Rationale</b>	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.

**State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve** We expect our performance level to increase by a minimum of 5% from 16% to 21% of learners achieving learning gains as measured by the Civics EOC by the end of the 2019-2020 school year.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome**  
Konrad McCree (mccreek@pcsb.org)

**Evidence-based Strategy** Support staff to utilize data to organize students to interact with content in manners which differentiate/scaffolds instruction to meet the needs of each student.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy**

1. Data will be used to drive instruction to indicate which students are not proficient and need support, and which studies need enrichment.
2. Provide instruction that aligns the benchmarks to the EOC.

**Action Step**

**Description**

1. Regularly assess (formally and informally) and utilize data to modify and adjust instruction. Teachers utilize ongoing formative assessment (district developed unit and cycle assessments) and use the information gained to adjust instruction, enrich and reteach, and provide research based interventions.
2. Teachers monitor the extent to which their students demonstrate deeper levels of understanding in rigorous tasks and adjust academic support structures as needed.
3. Teachers will engage in professional development opportunities through the use of Core Connections to increase literacy in the content area.

**Person Responsible** Tracy Kropp (kroppt@pcsb.org)



<b>#4</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Science - Increase student proficiency by a minimum of 5% from 14% to 20%
<b>Rationale</b>	Our current level of performance is 14% of students achieved proficiency as evidenced in the NGSSS Score Report. We expect our performance level to be 19% overall Science proficiency gains by June of 2020. The problem/gap is occurring due to the lack of re-exposure to course content that helps students remember key information longer.
<b>State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve</b>	The percent of students achieving Science proficiency will increase from 7% to 17%, as measured by the NGSSS Score Report.
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome</b>	Valencia Gore (gorev@pcsb.org)
<b>Evidence-based Strategy</b>	For staff to utilize data to organize students to interact with content in manners which differentiates/scaffolds instruction to meet the needs of each student.
<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy</b>	To enhance staff capacity so as to analyze and utilize data to drive instruction. Provide students with more hands on learning opportunities.
<b>Action Step</b>	
<b>Description</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Teachers regularly assess (formally and informally) and utilize data to modify and adjust instruction. Teacher utilize ongoing formative assessment and use the information gained to adjust instruction, enrich and reteach, and provide research based interventions.</li> <li>2. Teachers utilize a variety of modalities when presenting concepts and instruction to meet the needs of each student.</li> <li>3. Teachers monitor and provide feedback to students to support learning.</li> <li>4. 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.</li> </ol>
<b>Person Responsible</b>	Tracy Kropp (kroppt@pcsb.org)

<b>#5</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Bridging the Gap with Equity for All - Black Students
<b>Rationale</b>	Our current level of performance is 30% percent of African-American students achieved learning gains in ELA, and 32% achieved learning gains in Math as evidenced in FSA & Algebra 1 EOC Score Reporting. Current goal: The percent of African-Americans achieving student learning gains will increase by 10% in both ELA and Math as measured by FSA & Algebra EOC Score reporting by May 2020.
<b>State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve</b>	The percent of African-Americans achieving student learning gains will increase by 10% in both ELA and Math as measured by FSA & Algebra EOC Score reporting by May 2020.
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome</b>	Konrad McCree (mccreek@pcsb.org)
<b>Evidence-based Strategy</b>	Implement culturally relevant instructional practices in classrooms such as cooperative and small group settings, music and movement, explicit vocabulary instruction, monitoring with feedback and deliberate use of cultural references in lesson plans.  UDL & CRP and culture/climate frameworks (RP) are designed to mitigate barriers within the class climate, the methods of instruction and assessment instructional materials, and the types of learning tasks to improve social and academic outcomes for all learners. The UDL can be used as a structure for restorative culturally responsive practices. Differentiating the curriculum content, (what learners learn), process (how learners learn the content) and product (how learners demonstrate their learning) based on learners' cultural connection/belonging drives interest, readiness to learn and learning preference. It is crucial that the learning environment is conducive to differentiated instruction. (Tomlinson, 2001).
<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy</b>	
<b>Action Step</b>	
<b>Description</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Establish expectations and procedures to guide collaborative learning that brings diverse learners to engage in inquiry, productive struggle, discourse, and problem-solving.</li> <li>2. Provide learning opportunities for teachers and staff to engage in culturally responsive professional development opportunities to support diverse learners.</li> <li>3. Strengthen current PBIS Reward System to help reduce classroom disruptions so that a greater focus can be on classroom instruction and learning.</li> <li>4. Develop equity-centered PLCs to advance culturally responsive instructional practices with an emphasis in standards-based planning, student work analysis, developing quality formative assessments, and student performance data analysis.</li> <li>5. Create progress monitoring plans (PMPs) to support black learners</li> </ol>
<b>Person Responsible</b>	Konrad McCree (mccreek@pcsb.org)

<b>#6</b>	
<b>Title</b>	English Language Learners (ELL)
<b>Rationale</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Our current level of performance is 29% percent of ELL students achieved learning gains in ELA, as evidenced in FSA Score Reporting.</li> <li>2. We expect our ELL ELA gains to increase by 10 percent by June of 2020.</li> <li>3. The problem/gap is occurring because individual student interventions are not producing desired outcomes.</li> <li>4. If effective, differentiated interventions/supports would occur, evidence of increased learning gains would manifest.</li> </ol>
<b>State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve</b>	The percentage of ELL students achieving ELA learning gains will increase from 29 percent to 39 percent, as measured by FSA Score Reporting.
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome</b>	Michelle DuGranrut (dugranrutm@pcsb.org)
<b>Evidence-based Strategy</b>	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.
<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy</b>	To enhance staff capacity so as to analyze and utilize data to drive instruction and differentiation through equitable, culturally responsive practices.
<b>Action Step</b>	
<b>Description</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Provide regular opportunities for ESOL and content teachers to collaborate and co-plan to bridge grade-level work and the integration of language development within content specific instruction</li> <li>2. Review school-based data in a disaggregated manner and thoughtfully plan for remediation and enrichment interventions.</li> <li>3. Monitor the lesson planning and classroom implementation of effective lessons that engage ELs in rigorous, standards-based work rich in language development (explicit vocabulary, specific language patters and language form). Provide ongoing feedback to teachers to support the development of their practice in supporting English learners.</li> <li>4. Provide extended learning opportunities to learners (target specific standards as needed)</li> </ol>
<b>Person Responsible</b>	Michelle DuGranrut (dugranrutm@pcsb.org)

<b>#7</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Students with Disabilities
<b>Rationale</b>	Our current level of performance is 31 percent of ESE students achieved ELA learning gains, as evidenced in FSA Score Reporting. We expect our performance level to be 36 percent achieving ELA gains by May of 2020. The problem/gap is occurring because individual student interventions are not producing desired outcomes. If effective, differentiated interventions would occur, an increase in ESE ELA learning gains of a minimum of 5% would result.
<b>State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve</b>	The percent of ESE students achieving ELA gains will increase from 31% to 36%, as measured by FSA ELA Scores.
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome</b>	Konrad McCree (mccreek@pcsb.org)
<b>Evidence-based Strategy</b>	Students requiring ESE services work towards master of meaningful IEP goals while learning the foundational skills they need to engage in rigorous, grade-level content in the LRE.
<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy</b>	To enhance staff capacity so as to analyze and utilize data to drive instruction and differentiation through equitable, culturally responsive practices.
<b>Action Step</b>	
<b>Description</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Implement a process for placing students requiring ESE services in master schedules first to optimize service delivery and focus on a clustering process to meet student needs.</li> <li>2. Use evidence-based practices for students with disabilities to teach foundational literacy (and math) skills as a pathway to grade level work.</li> <li>3. Make rigorous texts, materials, content and activities accessible to students through supplementary aids including annotated texts and assistive technology.</li> <li>4. Provide multiple opportunities for teachers to engage in professional development opportunities as related to increasing pedagogical knowledge and implementation of research-based strategies.</li> <li>5. Provide extended learning opportunities to support learners as needed (focus on targeted standards).</li> </ol>
<b>Person Responsible</b>	Jocelyn McElveen (mcelveenj@pcsb.org)

<b>#8</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Multiracial Students
<b>Rationale</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Our current level of performance is 18% percent of multiracial students achieved learning gains in ELA, as evidenced in FSA Score Reporting.</li> <li>2. We expect our multiracial ELA gains to increase by 10 percent by May of 2020.</li> <li>3. The problem/gap is occurring because individual student interventions are not producing desired outcomes.</li> <li>4. If effective, differentiated interventions/supports would occur, evidence of increased learning gains would manifest.</li> </ol>
<b>State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve</b>	The percentage of multiracial students achieving ELA learning gains will increase from 18 percent to 28 percent, as measured by FSA Score Reporting.
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome</b>	Konrad McCree (mccreek@pcsb.org)
<b>Evidence-based Strategy</b>	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.
<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy</b>	To enhance staff capacity so as to analyze and utilize data to drive instruction and differentiation through equitable, culturally responsive practices.
<b>Action Step</b>	
<b>Description</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. 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</li> <li>2. Review school-based data in a disaggregated manner and thoughtfully plan for remediation and enrichment interventions.</li> <li>3. Monitor the lesson planning and classroom implementation of effective lessons that engage ELs in rigorous, standards-based work rich in language development (explicit vocabulary, specific language patters and language form). Provide ongoing feedback to teachers to support the development of their practice in supporting English learners.</li> <li>4. Provide extended learning opportunities to learners as needed.</li> </ol>
<b>Person Responsible</b>	Konrad McCree (mccreek@pcsb.org)

<b>#9</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Economically Disadvantaged Students
<b>Rationale</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Our current level of performance is 33% percent of economically disadvantaged students achieved learning gains in ELA, as evidenced in FSA Score Reporting.</li> <li>2. We expect our multiracial ELA gains to increase by 10 percent by May of 2020.</li> <li>3. The problem/gap is occurring because individual student interventions are not producing desired outcomes.</li> <li>4. If effective, differentiated interventions/supports would occur, evidence of increased learning gains would manifest.</li> </ol>
<b>State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve</b>	The percentage of economically disadvantaged students achieving ELA learning gains will increase from 33 percent to 43 percent, as measured by FSA Score Reporting.
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome</b>	Konrad McCree (mccreek@pcsb.org)
<b>Evidence-based Strategy</b>	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.
<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy</b>	To enhance staff capacity so as to analyze and utilize data to drive instruction and differentiation through equitable, culturally responsive practices.
<b>Action Step</b>	
<b>Description</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. 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</li> <li>2. Review school-based data in a disaggregated manner and thoughtfully plan for remediation and enrichment interventions.</li> <li>3. Monitor the lesson planning and classroom implementation of effective lessons that engage ELs in rigorous, standards-based work rich in language development (explicit vocabulary, specific language patters and language form). Provide ongoing feedback to teachers to support the development of their practice in supporting English learners.</li> </ol>
<b>Person Responsible</b>	Konrad McCree (mccreek@pcsb.org)

<b>#10</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Graduation Rate
<b>Rationale</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Our current level of performance is 65% of seniors are on track to graduate, as evidenced in the 2016 Graduation Cohort Report.</li> <li>2. We expect our performance level to be 75% of seniors will graduate on time by May 2020.</li> <li>3. The problem/gap is occurring because some students have not passed required assessments such as FSA (or concordant score opportunities). We also have students that have a GPA lower than 2.0 and/or do not have the required credits for graduation.</li> <li>4. If students pass the FSA, (or concordant score opportunities) and raise their GPA to at least 2.0 and earn the correct credits, graduation rate would increase.</li> </ol>
<b>State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve</b>	The percent of students who are on track to graduate will increase will increase from 65% to 75%, as measured by assessment data in alignment with school graduation rate from the graduation cohort report.
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome</b>	Konrad McCree (mccreek@pcsb.org)
<b>Evidence-based Strategy</b>	Strengthen teacher implementation of rigorous instructional practices.
<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy</b>	To enhance staff capacity so as to analyze and utilize data to drive instruction. Provide students with more tangible learning opportunities to meet graduation requirements.
<b>Action Step</b>	
<b>Description</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Teachers monitor the extent to which their students demonstrate deeper levels of understanding in rigorous tasks and adjust academic support structures as needed.</li> <li>2. Implement a system of grade-level vertical and horizontal articulation that helps ensure students throughout the school are college and career ready.</li> <li>3. Align classroom assessment with high-stakes assessment.</li> <li>4. Paring with mentor or specific interventions for black scholars</li> </ol>
<b>Person Responsible</b>	Wendy Lee (leewe@pcsb.org)

<b>#11</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Career & College Readiness
<b>Rationale</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Our current level of performance is 67%, as evidenced in our school industry certification data.</li> <li>2. We expect our performance level to be at or above 75% passing by May 2019.</li> <li>3. The problem/gap is occurring because multiple industry certification courses are not offered due to low anticipated pass rate, or student schedule conflicts.</li> <li>4. If more extensive support and more frequent assessment would occur, the problem would be reduced by at least 10%.</li> </ol>
<b>State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve</b>	The percent of all students earning credit for acceleration coursework will increase from 77% to 89%, as measured by qualifying scores course credit scores and/or industry certifications earned.
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome</b>	Konrad McCree (mccreek@pcsb.org)
<b>Evidence-based Strategy</b>	Strengthen teacher implementation of rigorous instructional practices.
<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy</b>	To enhance staff capacity so as to analyze and utilize data to drive instruction, problem-solve, and increase career and college readiness by mitigating barriers to success post secondary opportunities.
<b>Action Step</b>	
<b>Description</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Teachers monitor the extent to which their students demonstrate deeper levels of understanding in rigorous tasks and adjust academic support structures as needed.</li> <li>2. Implement a system of grade-level vertical and horizontal articulation that helps ensure students throughout the school are college and career ready.</li> <li>3. Align classroom assessment with high-stakes assessment.</li> </ol>
<b>Person Responsible</b>	Konrad McCree (mccreek@pcsb.org)



<b>#12</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hispanic
<b>Rationale</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Our current level of performance is 51% percent of Hispanic students achieved learning gains in ELA, as evidenced in FSA Score Reporting.</li> <li>2. We expect our multiracial ELA gains to increase by 10 percent by May of 2020.</li> <li>3. The problem/gap is occurring because individual student interventions are not producing desired outcomes.</li> <li>4. If effective, differentiated interventions/supports would occur, evidence of increased learning gains would manifest.</li> </ol>
<b>State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve</b>	The percentage of Hispanic students achieving ELA learning gains will increase from 51 percent to 61 percent, as measured by FSA Score Reporting.
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome</b>	Michelle DuGranrut (dugranrutm@pcsb.org)
<b>Evidence-based Strategy</b>	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.
<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy</b>	To enhance staff capacity so as to analyze and utilize data to drive instruction and differentiation through equitable, culturally responsive practices.
<b>Action Step</b>	
<b>Description</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. 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</li> <li>2. Review school-based data in a disaggregated manner and thoughtfully plan for remediation and enrichment interventions.</li> <li>3. Monitor the lesson planning and classroom implementation of effective lessons that engage ELs in rigorous, standards-based work rich in language development (explicit vocabulary, specific language patters and language form). Provide ongoing feedback to teachers to support the development of their practice in supporting English learners.</li> </ol>
<b>Person Responsible</b>	Michelle DuGranrut (dugranrutm@pcsb.org)

<b>#13</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Attendance
<b>Rationale</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Our current attendance rate is 89.6% with 43% of all students absent 10% or more. We expect our performance level to be at or below 30% of students missing more than 10% of school by May 2020.</li> <li>2. The problem/gap in attendance is occurring because of a lack of effective communication.</li> <li>3. If frequent, documented communication between school and home would occur followed by attendance code amendments (PND), the problem would be reduced due to absence codes being amended correctly as evidenced by a minimum at least a 13 % decrease in students who are absent more than 10%.</li> </ol>
<b>State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve</b>	The percent of all students missing more than 10% of school will decrease from 39% to 30%, as evidenced by 2019-2020 attendance dashboard data.
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome</b>	Debbie Belk (belkd@pcsb.org)
<b>Evidence-based Strategy</b>	Strengthen the attendance problem-solving process to address and support the needs of students across all Tiers on an ongoing basis
<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy</b>	To enhance staff capacity so as to analyze and utilize data to drive instruction, problem-solve, and increase attendance rates by mitigating barriers.
<b>Action Step</b>	
<b>Description</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Review attendance taking process and school-wide strategies for positive attendance with all staff</li> <li>2. Develop and implement attendance incentive programs and competitions</li> <li>3. Engage students and families in attendance related activities to ensure they are knowledgeable of the data and aware of the importance of attendance</li> <li>4. Review data and effectiveness of school-wide attendance strategies on a biweekly basis</li> <li>5. Implement Tier 2 and 3 plans for student specific needs and review barriers and effectiveness on a bi-weekly basis.</li> <li>6. Ensure attendance is accurately taken and recorded on a daily basis and reflects the appropriate entry codes (e.g. Pending entries cleared).</li> </ol>
<b>Person Responsible</b>	Michelle DuGranrut (dugranrutm@pcsb.org)

<b>#14</b>	
<b>Title</b>	School Climate/Conditions for Learning
<b>Rationale</b>	<p>1. Our current level of performance in school-wide behavior is 40.5 percent of students received ODRs during the 2019-20 school year. We expect our percent of students receiving ODR's decrease from 40.5% to 30% by May 2020.</p> <p>2. The problem/gap in behavior performance is occurring because the universal design for learning is not being used as a structure for restorative, culturally responsive practices.</p> <p>3. If the universal learning design is used as a structure for restorative, culturally responsive practices then . barriers within the classroom climate would be mitigated to improve the social and academic outcomes for all learners and would result in a reduction of ODRs by at least 10% as evidenced by the School Profile Dashboard.</p>

<b>State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve</b>	The referral risk (percentage of students receiving ODRs) of all students receiving referrals will decrease from 40.5% to 30%, as measured by the end of the year ODR data from the School Profile Dashboard.
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome</b>	Michelle DuGranrut (dugranrutm@pcsb.org)
<b>Evidence-based Strategy</b>	<p>Incorporate belonging-centered practices to increase learners' opportunities to develop, practice, and apply social and academics skills that draw on and build awareness of self and others.</p> <p>UDL &amp; CRP and culture/climate frameworks (RP) are designed to mitigate barriers within the class climate, the methods of instruction and assessment instructional materials, and the types of learning tasks to improve social and academic outcomes for all learners. The UDL can be used as a structure for restorative culturally responsive practices. Differentiating the curriculum content, (what learners learn), process (how learners learn the content) and product (how learners demonstrate their learning) based on learners' cultural connection/belonging drives interest, readiness to learn and learning preference. It is crucial that the learning environment is conducive to differentiated instruction. (Tomlinson, 2001).</p>
<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy</b>	

**Action Step**

<b>Description</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Establish expectations and procedures to guide collaborative learning that brings diverse learners together to engage in inquiry, productive struggle, discourse, and problem-solving</li> <li>2. Establish norms for collaborative work, to ensure a productive role for every learner, and to attend to the social and emotional needs of learners</li> <li>3. Create/develop conditions for learning that empower learners to plan, monitor, reflect, and think deeper about one's learning: notice learning, have conversations about learning, reflect on learning and make learning an object of learning</li> <li>4. Facilitate regular "check-ins" so that learners can reflect on and self-assess their process, as well as their progress; teachers use data and feedback to support the process of learners' reflections and to improve instruction</li> </ol>
--------------------	---

5. Provide opportunities for perspective-taking which empathy and respect in the group

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

**#15**

**Title** Family and Community Engagement

**Rationale** Currently, parents attending two or more events is less than 30% as measured by parent night/events sign-in sheets.

**State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve** By May 2020, 30% of our parent population will have participated in two or more school events.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome** Valencia Gore (gorev@pcsb.org)

**Evidence-based Strategy** Intentionally build positive relationships with families and community partners.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy** Research shows that effective family engagement is critical to student achievement. Family Engagement is a lever to move student achievement levels and support school improvement. When done well, Family Engagement is centered on connecting families to student learning by sharing data, providing strategies to support learning at home, and providing opportunities for two-way communication which helps students earn higher grades, be promoted, improve behavior and social skills, and attend school regularly.

**Action Step**

**Description**

1. Develop and implement activities to build respect and trust between home and school.
2. Conduct home visit to increase relationships between teacher and family/parent.
3. Increase positive interaction with parents/families on a regular basis.
4. Utilize focus groups to gather parents and family input for development of school improvement.

**Person Responsible** Eula Goolsby (goolsbye@pcsb.org)

<b>#16</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Healthy Schools
<b>Rationale</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Our current level of performance is 4 out of 4 modules with action plans, as evidenced in Alliance for a Healthier Generation, Healthy Schools Program Framework.</li> <li>2. We expect our performance level to be 4 out of 6 modules eligible for bronze, silver &amp; gold by May 2020.</li> <li>3. The problem/gap is occurring because of the ease of availability of unhealthy snacks for purchase during lunches.</li> <li>4. If providing limited and healthier snack options would occur, the problem would be reduced by a projected 30% decrease of unhealthy snacks purchased.</li> </ol>
<b>State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve</b>	Our school will be eligible in 4 out of 6 modules for bronze recognition by May 2020 as evidenced by the Alliance for a Healthier Generation, Healthy Schools Program Framework. The percent of all students who purchase and consume unhealthy snacks will decrease from 60% to 30%, as measured by school-based data café report.
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome</b>	Michelle DuGranrut (dugranrutm@pcsb.org)
<b>Evidence-based Strategy</b>	To enhance staff capacity so as to analyze and utilize data to drive instruction and differentiation through equitable, culturally responsive practices.
<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy</b>	To provide students with tangible learning opportunities and more health awareness knowledge regarding healthy snack options.
<b>Action Step</b>	
<b>Description</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Become familiar with smart snacks standards and nutritional composition.</li> <li>2. Complete an inventory of foods and beverages sold on campus and during fundraisers.</li> <li>3. Eliminate foods and beverages that do not meet healthy snack standards.</li> <li>4. Survey teachers and students to learn about the kinds of healthy snacks they would like to see sold at school.</li> <li>5. Negotiate with fundraising, snack and vending companies to increase the number and variety of food and beverage choices available that meet smart snack standards.</li> <li>6. Educate school staff and students about healthy choices through posters, school news articles and the school announcements.</li> </ol>
<b>Person Responsible</b>	Michelle DuGranrut (dugranrutm@pcsb.org)

**Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities (optional)**

**After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities (see the Guidance tab for more information)**

Examples: school safety, external stakeholder relationships, teacher recruitment and development, or other schoolwide initiatives

### Part V: Budget

1	III.A	Areas of Focus: ELA - Increase student learning gains by 15% from 36% to 51%.	\$0.00
2	III.A	Areas of Focus: Math - Increase student learning gains by 9% from 42% to 51%.	\$0.00
3	III.A	Areas of Focus: Social Studies- Increase student learning gains by 5% from 16% to 21%	\$0.00
4	III.A	Areas of Focus: Science - Increase student proficiency by a minimum of 5% from 14% to 20%	\$0.00
5	III.A	Areas of Focus: Bridging the Gap with Equity for All - Black Students	\$0.00
6	III.A	Areas of Focus: English Language Learners (ELL)	\$0.00
7	III.A	Areas of Focus: Students with Disabilities	\$0.00
8	III.A	Areas of Focus: Multiracial Students	\$0.00
9	III.A	Areas of Focus: Economically Disadvantaged Students	\$0.00
10	III.A	Areas of Focus: Graduation Rate	\$0.00
11	III.A	Areas of Focus: Career & College Readiness	\$0.00
12	III.A	Areas of Focus: Hispanic	\$0.00
13	III.A	Areas of Focus: Attendance	\$0.00
14	III.A	Areas of Focus: School Climate/Conditions for Learning	\$0.00
15	III.A	Areas of Focus: Family and Community Engagement	\$0.00
16	III.A	Areas of Focus: Healthy Schools	\$0.00
<b>Total:</b>			<b>\$0.00</b>