

Pinellas County Schools

Paul B. Stephens ESE Center



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	6
Needs Assessment	9
Planning for Improvement	15
Positive Culture & Environment	32
Budget to Support Goals	33

Paul B. Stephens ESE Center

2935 COUNTY ROAD 193, Clearwater, FL 33759

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

Demographics

Principal: Katie Csaszar

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2017

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School PK-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Special Education
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	54%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* Hispanic Students* White Students* Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: No Grade 2017-18: No Grade 2016-17: No Grade 2015-16: No Grade
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	CS&I
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here .	

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.

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.

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	6
Needs Assessment	9
Planning for Improvement	15
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	33

Paul B. Stephens ESE Center

2935 COUNTY ROAD 193, Clearwater, FL 33759

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

School Demographics

<p>School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)</p> <p>Combination School PK-12</p>	<p>2019-20 Title I School</p> <p>No</p>	<p>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p>%</p>
<p>Primary Service Type (per MSID File)</p> <p>Special Education</p>	<p>Charter School</p> <p>No</p>	<p>2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p>%</p>

School Grades History

Year
Grade

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 school improvement plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F.

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 (see page 4). For schools receiving a grade of A, B, or C, the district may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at <https://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.

Prepare each student for a life of purpose and independence.

Provide the school's vision statement.

100% Student Success

School Leadership Team

Membership

Identify the name, email address, position title, and job duties/responsibilities for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Kane, Donna	Teacher, ESE	Classroom Teacher MS Team Leader
Montalbano, Kathleen	Teacher, ESE	
Shields, David	Teacher, ESE	Behavior Specialist
Rawl, Janet	Administrative Support	School secretary/ bookkeeper
Poteet, Melissa	Teacher, ESE	Team Leader Elementary
Parks, Gail	Instructional Technology	Technology/Media Center
Levy, Mandy	Teacher, ESE	VE Specialist
Liss, Ileana	Other	Therapist
Vereb, Stacie		
Godek, Lori	Assistant Principal	
Jones, Mary Katherine	Other	
Thornton, Deborah	Principal	

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Saturday 7/1/2017, Katie Csaszar

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

30

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

30

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School PK-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Special Education
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	54%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* Hispanic Students* White Students* Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: No Grade 2017-18: No Grade 2016-17: No Grade 2015-16: No Grade
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	CS&I
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here .	

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	2	4	6	3	3	13	11	16	9	7	19	10	70	173
Attendance below 90 percent	0	3	5	0	3	9	6	10	6	4	9	8	31	94
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	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	0

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 6/18/2020

Prior Year - As Reported

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

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Number of students enrolled	2	5	3	3	13	8	14	10	7	18	12	10	73	178
Attendance below 90 percent	0	3	1	2	7	4	5	3	2	8	7	6	16	64
One or more suspensions	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	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	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 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	

Retained Students: Current Year 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0

Students retained two or more times 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0

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	

Number of students enrolled 2 5 3 3 13 8 14 10 7 18 12 10 73 178

Attendance below 90 percent 0 3 1 2 7 4 5 3 2 8 7 6 16 64

One or more suspensions 0 3 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 3

Course failure in ELA or Math 0 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 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 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	

Retained Students: Current Year 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0

Students retained two or more times 0 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%	70%	61%	0%	65%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	0%	63%	59%	0%	57%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	0%	56%	54%	0%	52%	51%

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
Math Achievement	0%	72%	62%	0%	64%	58%
Math Learning Gains	0%	63%	59%	0%	56%	56%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	0%	54%	52%	0%	52%	50%
Science Achievement	0%	64%	56%	0%	55%	53%
Social Studies Achievement	0%	81%	78%	0%	81%	75%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey															
Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)													Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12		
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	0 (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.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
05	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
06	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
07	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
09	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
10	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
05	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
06	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
07	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison						
08	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					

CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					

HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					

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 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	6	16	17	2	35		6	5		100	
HSP		30									
WHT	8	13		2	37		4	4		100	
FRL	8	27		2	45		8	7			
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 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
2017 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	21
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	YES
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	4
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	

ESSA Federal Index	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	186
Total Components for the Federal Index	9
Percent Tested	90%
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
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	8
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	2
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	

Multiracial Students	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	21
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	2
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	16
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.

Our FSAA data show that the majority of our students are at a Level 1. The problem is occurring because the majority of our Level 1 students do not have a reliable mode of communicating what they know and understand. In addition we must accurately measure what they know with the most reliable assessment either performance task or Data-folio.

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

ELA showed the least amount of proficiency.

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.

ELA working on communication

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

Our math scores showed the most increase in proficiency. Provided more real word connections for students to understand the concepts taught. Extended the amount of time on each standard.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern?

Average daily attendance

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

1. Building communication skills.
2. Identifying the most reliable mode of assessment. Data-folio or performance task
3. Streamlined progress monitoring to capture student success.
4. Planning lessons with real world learning connections.
5. Providing instruction during virtual school.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Our current level of performance is 32% of our ESE students are scoring a level 2 or above as evidenced in the results of our current FSAA scores. The problem is occurring because the majority of our Level 1 students do not have a reliable mode of communicating what they know and understand. An increase in real world connections and more culturally relevant instruction through the use of a consistent mode of communication, core vocabulary and accurate form of assessment will lead to more students moving up a level of proficiency

Measurable Outcome:

The percent of ESE students who make learning gains to score at least a level 2 as measured by the ELA FSAA will increase from 32% to at least 52%.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Deborah Thornton (thorntonde@pcsb.org)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Project Core a classroom-based intervention for students with significant cognitive disabilities who do not use speech, sign language or symbols to meet a broad range of communication needs. The Tier I, universal intervention in Project Core calls for modeling the use of symbols combined with explicit teaching of the meaning and use of the Universal Core vocabulary. Modeling and teaching are integrated into daily activities (arrival, mealtime, personal care) instructional routines (shared reading, predictable chart writing, alphabet knowledge/phonological awareness activities). Communication core boards will be used as mode of modeling communication during instruction. As the first tier of multi-tiered System for Augmenting Language the intervention is a classroom-based communication intervention for all students with targeted communication needs. Instructional routines(e.g., shared reading, predictable chart writing, alphabet/phonological awareness) are grounded in evidence-based practices and provide examples of

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

the use of the Universal Core throughout the English Language Arts block of instruction. The multi-tiered System for Augmenting Language (mSAL) is a three-tiered system for providing communication intervention that offers support to a large number of students with significant cognitive disabilities who do not currently use speech, signs, and/ or symbols to communicate. The first Tier of mSAL is focused on the classroom and the classroom teacher using Aided Language Stimulation in a systematic instructional routine. This will help build consistent and reliable modes of communication so we can accurately assess student progress and determine the most reliable method of assessment

Action Steps to Implement

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

Person Responsible Mandy Levy (levym@pcsb.org)

2. Instructional staff will progress monitor students with individualized progress monitoring assessments aligned to learning targets.

Person Responsible Deborah Thornton (thorntonde@pcsb.org)

3. During pre-school instructional staff will participate in MELD (Project Core) training to learn instructional practices to integrate core communication/ vocabulary into daily learning targets.

Person Responsible Brian Singler (singlerb@pcsb.org)

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

Person Responsible Lori Godek (godekl@pcsb.org)

5. During preschool and ongoing monthly sessions ALL support staff will become fluent in the use of communication core boards across all areas of the school. (front office, clinic, classroom, cafeteria, behavior suite)

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

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

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

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

Person Responsible Deborah Thornton (thorntonde@pcsb.org)

8. Ongoing professional development will occur during monthly PLC's on Vizzle, NearPod, Canvas and other online platforms as identified by each team to ensure staff can plan and develop online lessons to support students during virtual instruction.

Person Responsible Gail Parks (parksg@pcsb.org)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Our current level of performance is 32% of our ESE students are scoring a level 2 or above as evidenced in the results of our current FSAA scores. The problem is occurring because the majority of our Level 1 students do not have a reliable mode of communicating what they know and understand. An increase in real world connections and more culturally relevant instruction through the use of a consistent mode of communication, core vocabulary and accurate form of assessment will lead to more students moving up a level of proficiency.

Measurable Outcome: The percent of ESE students who make learning gains to score at least a level 2 as measured by the Math FSAA will increase from 32% to at least 51%.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Deborah Thornton (thorntonde@pcsb.org)

Evidence-based Strategy: Project Core infused throughout mathematics instruction focused on vocabulary and communication. Master schedule will reflect common planning for Elementary, Middle, High and Extended Transition classes to allow for collaboration in developing culturally relevant real world lessons aligned to math access point learning targets.

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

Action Steps to Implement

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

Person Responsible Lori Godek (godekl@pcsb.org)

2. Instructional staff will progress monitor students with individualized progress monitoring assessments aligned to learning targets.

Person Responsible Deborah Thornton (thorntonde@pcsb.org)

3. During pre-school instructional staff will participate in MELD (Project Core) training to learn instructional practices to integrate core communication/ vocabulary into daily math learning targets

Person Responsible Brian Singler (singlerb@pcsb.org)

4. Instructional staff will plan real world culturally relevant lessons connected to identified Math learning targets.

Person Responsible Deborah Thornton (thorntonde@pcsb.org)

5. During preschool ALL support staff will become fluent in the use of communication core boards across all areas of the school. (front office, clinic, classroom, cafeteria, behavior suite)

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

6. Speech therapists will provide weekly modeling in the use of a variety of communication modes that meet the needs of individual students and collaborate with classroom teachers to integrate a variety off communication modes to engage all students during academic activities.

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

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

Person Responsible Deborah Thornton (thorntonde@pcsb.org)

8. Ongoing professional development will occur during monthly PLC's on Vizzle, NearPod, Canvas and other online platforms as identified by each team to ensure staff can plan and develop online lessons to support students during virtual instruction.

Person Responsible Gail Parks (parksg@pcsb.org)

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

Our current level of performance is 32% of our ESE students are scoring a level 2 or above as evidenced in the results of our current FSAA scores. The problem is occurring because the majority of our Level 1 students do not have a reliable mode of communicating what they know and understand. An increase in real world connections and more culturally relevant instruction through the use of a consistent mode of communication, core vocabulary and accurate form of assessment will lead to more students moving up a level of proficiency.

Measurable Outcome:

The percent of ESE students who make science learning gains to score at least a level 2 as measured by the Florida Standards Alternate Assessment will increase from 35% to at least 55%.

**Person responsible
for monitoring
outcome:**

Deborah Thornton (thorntonde@pcsb.org)

**Evidence-based
Strategy:**

Project Core infused throughout science instruction focused on science vocabulary and communication. Master schedule will reflect common planning for Elementary, Middle, High and Extended Transition classes to allow for collaboration in developing culturally relevant real world lessons aligned to science access point learning targets.

**Rationale for
Evidence-based
Strategy:**

The multi-tiered System for Augmenting Language (mSAL) is a three-tiered system for providing communication intervention that offers support to a large number of students with significant cognitive disabilities who do not currently use speech, signs, and/or symbols to communicate. The first Tier of mSAL is focused on the classroom and the classroom teacher using Aided Language Stimulation in a systematic instructional routine. This will help build consistent and reliable modes of communication so we can accurately assess student progress and determine the most reliable method of assessment.

Action Steps to Implement

1. During Individual Education Plan meetings teams will determine the appropriate form of the FSAA that accurately measures individual student learning gains. AND Identify communication skill goals to address based on the communication matrix.
2. Instructional staff will progress monitor students with individualized progress monitoring assessments.
3. Instructional staff will participate in MELD (Project Core) training to learn instructional practices to integrate core communication/vocabulary into daily learning targets.
4. Instructional staff will plan real world culturally relevant lessons.
5. During preschool ALL support staff will become fluent in the use of communication core boards across all areas of the school.
6. Speech therapists will provide weekly modeling in the use of a variety of communication modes and collaborate with classroom teachers to engage students.
7. Administrators, district staff developers will plan monthly problem solving to focus our improvement efforts.

Person Responsible Deborah Thornton (thorntonde@pcsb.org)

No description entered

Person Responsible [no one identified]

#4. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Social Studies

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Our current level of performance is 32% of our ESE students are scoring a level 2 or above as evidenced in the results of our current FSAA scores. The problem is occurring because the majority of our Level 1 students do not have a reliable mode of communicating what they know and understand. An increase in real world connections and more culturally relevant instruction through the use of a consistent mode of communication, core vocabulary and accurate form of assessment will lead to more students moving up a level of proficiency.

Measurable Outcome:

The percent of ESE students who make learning gains to score at least a level 2 as measured by the Social Studies FSAA, will increase from 24% to at least 44%.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Deborah Thornton (thorntonde@pcsb.org)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Project Core infused throughout social studies instruction focused on vocabulary and communication. Master schedule will reflect common planning for Elementary, Middle, High and Extended Transition classes to allow for collaboration in developing culturally relevant real world lessons aligned to social studies access point learning targets.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

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

reliable
method of assessment.

Action Steps to Implement

1. During Individual Education Plan meetings teams will determine the appropriate form of the FSAA that accurately measures individual student learning gains. AND Identify communication skill goals to address based on the communication matrix.
2. Instructional staff will progress monitor students with individualized progress monitoring assessments.
3. Instructional staff will participate in MELD (Project Core) training to learn instructional practices to integrate core communication/vocabulary into daily learning targets.
4. Instructional staff will plan real world culturally relevant lessons.
5. During preschool ALL support staff will become fluent in the use of communication core boards across all areas of the school.
6. Speech therapists will provide weekly modeling in the use of a variety of communication modes and collaborate with classroom teachers to engage students.
7. Administrators, district staff developers will plan monthly problem solving to focus our academic improvement efforts.

Person Responsible

Deborah Thornton (thorntonde@pcsb.org)

#5. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Paul B. Stephens School is dedicated to providing a safe, secure and healthy environment with supports and interventions that are adapted to the specialized needs of students who have significant cognitive and developmental disabilities. Each classroom team builds strong relationships with each other and the students they serve. Infused throughout our academic access point lessons is a focus on character education and independent functioning skills. We strive to plan real world culturally relevant lessons to meet the needs of our unique population. This connection is critical for our students to be successful. Behavior data is collected and used to make decisions regarding individual students, as well as school wide, behavioral strategies. In collaboration with classroom teachers a team of four behavior specialists creates and updates the FBA PBIPs, and reviews the preventative, intervention and reinforcement strategies with classroom staff and provides additional support through behavioral intervention on an as-needed basis.

Measurable Outcome: The number of behavior support calls for proactive support/ intervention will increase from 1084 to 2084 as measured by school wide behavior support data by May 2022.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: David Shields (shieldsda@pcsb.org)

Evidence-based Strategy: Positive behavior supports, sensory input, character education, restorative practices and social stories will be adapted to meet the needs of our learners and will be systematically implemented across all grade levels. Project core communication strategies will be incorporated into daily culturally relevant activities.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Students with significant cognitive and developmental disabilities benefit from systematic behavioral supports and interventions infused throughout their daily routines.

Action Steps to Implement

1. During annual IEP meetings the team will review Social Emotional and Independent Learning Goals to ensure priority is given to building social interaction skills into daily culturally relevant lessons.
2. Review and adapt school guidelines for success and Tier 1 activities to build self regulation skills.
3. Schedule weekly behavior team meetings to address specific student/ classroom interventions
4. Provide ongoing behavioral coaching to classroom teams to build proactive intervention strategies into daily routines
5. Allocate resources to increase sensory break areas into classrooms
6. Provide TEACCH and CPI, reminders, strategies and professional development on a monthly basis
7. Adjust classroom daily schedules to include restorative circles
8. Plan and implement character education lessons into daily routines, online learning and the morning show.

Person Responsible

David Shields (shieldsda@pcsb.org)

#6. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Student Attendance

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Our current daily attendance rate is 88.63%. We reached our goal of decreasing the percent of students that missed more than 10 percent of school monthly to 36%. We continue to serve students that are medically fragile and require significant medical treatment on a regular basis. Our families do not have available wrap around services or are unable to navigate to the appropriate resources when they are needed.

Measurable Outcome:

The percent of ESE students missing more than 10% of school monthly will decrease from 36% to 30% as measured by attendance dashboard data by the end of May 2021

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Lori Godek (godekl@pcsb.org)

Evidence-based Strategy:

We will continue to strengthen the implementation of Tier 3 interventions to address the needs of our students in need of most intensive supports and services.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Intervention for attendance is usually connected to medical needs and individualized by each student case by case.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Review attendance taking process and school-wide strategies for positive attendance with all staff
2. Ensure parents are aware of the importance of getting to school and student success
3. During Child Study review data bi-monthly to review school-wide attendance strategies
4. Implement Tier 3 plans for students specific needs and review effectiveness/ barriers bi-monthly
5. Continue home and office visits to connect families with resources.

Person Responsible

Lori Godek (godekl@pcsb.org)

#7. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to African-American

**Area of Focus
Description and
Rationale:**

Our present level of performance shows an increase in the percentage of black students scoring a level two or above on the ELA FSAA. Scores increased from 25% to 27% of black students scoring a level 2 or higher. Of our 11 black students participating in the FSAA 8 scored at a Level 1 on the FSAA. The problem is occurring because the majority of our Black Level 1 students do not have a reliable mode of communicating what they know and understand. An increase in real world connections and more culturally relevant instruction through the use of consistent mode of communication and core vocabulary will lead to more students moving up a level of proficiency.

Measurable Outcome:

The percent of black students achieving performance level of 2 or above will increase from 27% to 47% as measures by the FSAA (ELA) 2021.

**Person responsible for
monitoring outcome:**

Deborah Thornton (thorntonde@pcsb.org)

**Evidence-based
Strategy:**

Project Core a classroom-based intervention for students with significant cognitive disabilities who do not use speech, sign language or symbols to meet a broad range of communication needs. The Tier I, universal intervention in Project Core calls for modeling the use of symbols combined with explicit teaching of the meaning and use of the Universal Core vocabulary. Modeling and teaching are integrated into daily activities (arrival, mealtime, personalcare) instructional routines (shared reading, predictable chart writing,alphabet knowledge/phonological awareness activities). Communication core boards will be used as mode of modeling communication during instruction. As the first tier of multi-tiered System for Augmenting Language the intervention is a classroom-based communication intervention for all students with targeted communication needs. Instructional routines(e.g., shared reading, predictable chart writing, alphabet/phonological awareness) are grounded in evidence-based practices and provide examples of the use of the Universal Core throughout the English Language Arts block of instruction.

**Rationale for
Evidence-based
Strategy:**

The multi-tiered System for Augmenting Language (mSAL) is a three-tiered system for providing communication intervention that offers support to a large number of students with significant cognitive disabilities who do not currently use speech, signs, and/or symbols to communicate. The first Tier of mSAL is focused on the classroom and the classroom teacher using Aided Language Stimulation in a systematic routine. This will help build consistent and reliable modes of communication so we can accurately assess student progress and determine the most reliable method of assessment.

Action Steps to Implement

1. During Individual Education Plan meetings teams will determine the appropriate form of the FSAA that accurately measures individual student learning gains. AND Identify communication

skill goals to address based on the communication matrix.

2. Instructional staff will progress monitor students with individualized progress monitoring assessments.

3. Instructional staff will participate in MELD (Project Core) training to learn instructional practices to integrate core communication/vocabulary into daily learning targets.

4. Instructional staff will plan real world culturally relevant lessons.

5. During preschool ALL support staff will become fluent in the use of communication core boards across all areas of the school.

6. Speech therapists will provide weekly modeling in the use of a variety of communication modes and collaborate with classroom teachers to engage students.

7. Administrators, district staff developers will plan monthly problem solving to focus our academic improvement efforts.

Person Responsible [no one identified]

#8. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Equity & Diversity

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Measurable Outcome: Address student and family engagement for the adoption of equitable practices (equitable voice)

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: [no one identified]

Evidence-based Strategy:

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Action Steps to Implement

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

#10. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Parent Involvement

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Our parents and community members are highly involved in our school and provide ongoing support for school improvement efforts. 95% of school survey participants agree that our school provides opportunities for stakeholders to be involved in the school. We will continue to build meaningful opportunities for families and community members to be involved with our school improvement efforts.

Measurable Outcome:

The number of stakeholders responding to AdvancED surveys will increase from 40 to 57 participants as measured by 2021 survey results.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Deborah Thornton (thorntonde@pcsb.org)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Increasing the number of effective partnerships is a school priority. Epstein's framework of six types of involvement will be used as the basis of developing an increased number of meaningfully engaged families and community stakeholders.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Programs that engage families and community members have activities that support the following types of involvement, parenting, communicating, volunteering, learning at home, decision making and collaborating with the community.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Social worker will continue to connect families with community resources for wrap around services
2. Newly developed daily note home to provide specific progress info to families and two way communication
3. Quarterly family events will be added to school calendar focused on building relationships between stakeholders.
4. Therapists will provide take home bags to engage families in project core and learning at home..
5. Expand the number of families involved in SAC and PTA decision making groups.
5. Develop committees to support and plan school wide engagement activities.

Person Responsible

Deborah Thornton (thorntonde@pcsb.org)

#11. Other specifically relating to Health and Wellnes

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Staff and students must maintain a healthy way of life to engage in work and school activities.
Measurable Outcome:	The number of healthier schools action plan items will increase from 4 to 6 by May of 2022.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	[no one identified]
Evidence-based Strategy:	Focus items will be chosen from the Alliance for a Healthier Generation action plan.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	District uses this assessment to prioritize school improvement efforts.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Promote the use of walking paths inside and outside of school and create monthly challenges
2. Share and promote health eating and living tips for students,staff and families in bi-monthly newsletter
3. Purchase and implement school wide healthy vending machine access manned by students
4. Promote the use of school fitness room.
5. Create and initiate healthy living challenges for students and staff.

Person Responsible Stacie Vereb (vereb@pcsb.org)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities.

N/A

Part IV: Positive Culture & Environment

A positive school culture and environment reflects: a supportive and fulfilling environment, learning conditions that meet the needs of all students, people who are sure of their roles and relationships in student learning, and a culture that values trust, respect and high expectations. Consulting with various stakeholder groups to employ school improvement strategies that impact the positive school culture and environment are critical. Stakeholder groups more proximal to the school include teachers, students, and families of students, volunteers, and school board members. Broad stakeholder groups include early childhood providers, community colleges and universities, social services, and business partners.

Stakeholders play a key role in school performance and addressing equity. Consulting various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment ensuring all stakeholders are involved.

The staff at Paul B. strives to actively engage all stakeholders in our school environment. According to our school survey, 95% of the participants agree that our school provides opportunities for stakeholders to be involved in the school. We are continually building meaningful opportunities for families and community

members to be involved with our school improvement efforts. We will use Epstein's framework of six types of involvement as the basis for continuing to build stakeholder relationships. Some of the notable areas/activities that engage the stakeholders include parenting, communicating, volunteering, learning at home, decision making and collaborating with the community.

The classroom team builds strong relationships with each other and the students as well as the families and community partners that support our students. Character education and independent functioning skills are key facets that are infused throughout our day and incorporate input and resources from parents and community partners. We strive to plan real world culturally relevant lessons to meet the unique needs of our students creating the connection they need to be successful at home and within the community.

Community partnerships are important to building resources and opportunities for our students. Many of our staff and students go out into the community to practice real world skills that will increase the independence and social emotional growth. There are several opportunities that students and parents select based on the needs of the students. It is through open communication and collaboration between all involved that successful partnerships continue.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA				\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math				\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Science				\$0.00
4	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Social Studies				\$0.00
5	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports				\$1,200.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
		510-Supplies	0681 - Paul B. Stephens ESE Center	School Improvement Funds		\$1,200.00
<i>Notes: Provide sensory support for students</i>						
6	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Student Attendance				\$0.00
7	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: African-American				\$0.00
8	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Equity & Diversity				\$0.00
9	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Graduation				\$0.00
10	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Parent Involvement				\$0.00
11	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Other: Health and Wellnes				\$0.00

	Total: \$1,200.00
--	---------------------------------