

Hillsborough County Public Schools

Pepin Academies



2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	23
Positive Culture & Environment	25
Budget to Support Goals	26

Pepin Academies

3916 E HILLSBOROUGH AVE, Tampa, FL 33610

<http://pepinacademies.com/>

Demographics

Principal: Jennifer Messerschmi

Start Date for this Principal: 9/17/2021

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School 03-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Special Education
2020-21 Title I School	No
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	18%
2020-21 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students* Multiracial Students* White Students* Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2020-21: No Grade 2018-19: No Grade 2017-18: No Grade 2016-17: 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	

* 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 Hillsborough 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	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	23
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	26

Pepin Academies

3916 E HILLSBOROUGH AVE, Tampa, FL 33610

<http://pepinacademies.com/>

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2020-21 Title I School	2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Combination School 03-12	No	%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
Special Education	Yes	%

School Grades History

Year	2012-13	2011-12
Grade		

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Hillsborough 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.

Empowering students with learning disabilities to maximize their potential in a positive therapeutic educational environment.

Provide the school's vision statement.

To prepare students to meet the academic, social, and emotional challenges encountered in everyday life and prepare them for a successful transition to middle and high school and post-secondary.

School Leadership Team

Membership

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

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Messerschmitt, Jennifer	Principal	
Henry, Geri	Principal	

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Friday 9/17/2021, Jennifer Messerschmitt

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.*

3

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.*

12

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

82

Total number of students enrolled at the school

818

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2020-21 school year.

37

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

22

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

2021-22

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	27	44	51	75	101	94	95	97	79	155	818	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	8	8	16	24	27	29	29	37	26	64	268	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	4	0	4	1	5	2	5	5	4	2	32	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	2	0	5	8	5	0	25	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	2	0	17	13	8	0	50	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	53	55	51	53	50	42	33	4	0	0	341	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	61	53	56	53	56	37	0	0	0	0	316	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	24	28	41	60	82	73	76	77	57	48	566	

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	24	28	41	60	82	73	76	77	1	0	462	

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	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	1	12
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	2	1	7

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 9/27/2021

2020-21 - As Reported

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

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Number of students enrolled		
Attendance below 90 percent		
One or more suspensions		
Course failure in ELA		
Course failure in Math		
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment		
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment		

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

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Students with two or more indicators		

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Retained Students: Current Year		
Students retained two or more times		

2020-21 - 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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level														Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12		
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	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 Review

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

School Grade Component	2021			2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement					57%	61%		59%	60%
ELA Learning Gains					56%	59%		56%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile					52%	54%		49%	52%
Math Achievement					55%	62%		57%	61%
Math Learning Gains					57%	59%		53%	58%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile					49%	52%		47%	52%
Science Achievement					50%	56%		51%	57%
Social Studies Achievement					77%	78%		79%	77%

Grade Level Data Review - State Assessments

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

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	6%	52%	-46%	58%	-52%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	3%	55%	-52%	58%	-55%
Cohort Comparison		-6%				
05	2021					
	2019	9%	54%	-45%	56%	-47%
Cohort Comparison		-3%				
06	2021					
	2019	8%	53%	-45%	54%	-46%
Cohort Comparison		-9%				
07	2021					
	2019	10%	54%	-44%	52%	-42%
Cohort Comparison		-8%				
08	2021					
	2019	17%	53%	-36%	56%	-39%
Cohort Comparison		-10%				
09	2021					
	2019	17%	55%	-38%	55%	-38%
Cohort Comparison		-17%				
10	2021					
	2019	15%	53%	-38%	53%	-38%
Cohort Comparison		-17%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	3%	54%	-51%	62%	-59%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	6%	57%	-51%	64%	-58%
Cohort Comparison		-3%				
05	2021					
	2019	7%	54%	-47%	60%	-53%
Cohort Comparison		-6%				
06	2021					
	2019	11%	49%	-38%	55%	-44%
Cohort Comparison		-7%				
07	2021					
	2019	8%	62%	-54%	54%	-46%
Cohort Comparison		-11%				
08	2021					
	2019	10%	31%	-21%	46%	-36%
Cohort Comparison		-8%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	5%	51%	-46%	53%	-48%
Cohort Comparison						
08	2021					
	2019	14%	47%	-33%	48%	-34%
Cohort Comparison		-5%				

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	34%	66%	-32%	67%	-33%
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	22%	67%	-45%	71%	-49%

HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	43%	73%	-30%	70%	-27%
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	22%	63%	-41%	61%	-39%
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	11%	57%	-46%	57%	-46%

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

Provide the progress monitoring tool(s) by grade level used to compile the below data.

All grade levels use iReady as a progress monitoring tool for Reading/ELA and math.

Grade 3				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	12%	15%	21%
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	100%	100%	100%
	English Language Learners			
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	3%	6%	8%
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	100%	100%	100%
	English Language Learners			

Grade 4				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	5%	2%	9%
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	100%	100%	100%
	English Language Learners			
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	0%	0%	6%
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	100%	100%	100%
	English Language Learners			
Grade 5				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	7%	11%	9%
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	0%	9%	8%
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	100%	100%	100%
	English Language Learners			
Science	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			

Grade 6				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	8%	6%	13%
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	100%	100%	100%
	English Language Learners			
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	3%	4%	8%
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	100%	100%	100%
	English Language Learners			
Grade 7				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	8%	11%	14%
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	100%	100%	100%
	English Language Learners			
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	5%	9%	9%
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	100%	100%	100%
	English Language Learners			
Civics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			

Grade 8				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	9%	14%	17%
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	100%	100%	100%
	English Language Learners			
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	6%	7%	13%
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	100%	100%	100%
	English Language Learners			
Science	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			

Grade 9				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	3%	10%	12%
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	100%	100%	100%
	English Language Learners			
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	2%	10%	13%
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	100%	100%	100%
	English Language Learners			
Biology	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
US History	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			

Grade 10				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	4%	4%	12%
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	100%	100%	100%
	English Language Learners			
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	6%	6%	7%
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	100%	100%	100%
	English Language Learners			
Biology	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
US History	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			

Grade 11				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	4%	7%	5%
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	100%	100%	100%
	English Language Learners			
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	1%	1%	1%
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	100%	100%	100%
	English Language Learners			
Biology	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
US History	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			

Grade 12				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	3%	7%	5%
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	100%	100%	100%
	English Language Learners			
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	0%	0%	0%
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	100%	100%	100%
	English Language Learners			
Biology	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
US History	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			

Subgroup Data Review

2021 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
SWD	24	42	55	24	41	47	31	53		94	
ELL	12	50	53	7	33	42	14	28			
BLK	27	35	39	27	37	53	34	56		88	
HSP	22	45	54	22	41	50	26	43		100	
MUL	35	57		35	54						

2021 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
WHT	22	43	75	23	41	38	37	61		95	
FRL	22	42	49	24	40	45	30	49		80	
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	24	41	41	26	43	44	36	47		87	5
ELL	12	39	30	20	39			30			
BLK	23	38	53	27	42	44	38	54		82	
HSP	23	42	30	23	42	40	36	44			
MUL	22	50		44	38		36				
WHT	25	42	41	27	43	52	34	47		88	9
FRL	22	40	42	24	41	41	34	47		90	
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

ESSA Data Review

This data has been updated for the 2021-22 school year as of 10/19/2021.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	41
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	4
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	411
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	94%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	41
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	30

English Language Learners	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	
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%	
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%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	40
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	40
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	45
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	
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%	
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	44
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	38
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Analysis

Data Analysis

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

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

Students demonstrate growth from fall to spring across all grade levels and content areas on progress monitoring. This is evidenced by an increase in the number of students reaching proficiency from the fall administration to spring administration of iReady.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

A majority of the students demonstrate a need for improvement in both reading and math; however based on data, math is the area of greater need.

What were the contributing factors to this need for improvement? What new actions would need to be taken to address this need for improvement?

As an ESE Center, all students at Pepin Academies are identified as a student with a disability. In reviewing the data, additional intervention and intensive supports can be incorporated into the academic program.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

A majority of the students demonstrate a need for improvement in both reading and math; however based on data, reading is the area of most improvement.

What were the contributing factors to this improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

As an ESE Center, all students at Pepin Academies are identified as a student with a disability. In reviewing the data, additional intervention and intensive supports were incorporated into the academic program.

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

Additional professional development will be offered to staff to incorporate more rigor, differentiation for varying student levels and additional intervention opportunities.

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

Ongoing professional development will be offered to teachers to utilize and incorporate iReady for data driven lesson planning and instruction. Trainings will be offered with an emphasis on instructional tools and strategies as well as differentiation.

Provide a description of the additional services that will be implemented to ensure sustainability of improvement in the next year and beyond.

The leadership team recognizes the importance of improvement and will continue to provide supports to ensure professional development and improvement in the academic program are a focus and made available.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Reading and ELA are identified as an area of critical need because 50% or more students scored below a level 3 on the Spring 2021 FSA ELA. During the 2020-2021 school year, 46% of students in grades 3-12 achieved typical growth as demonstrated on iReady diagnostics taken at the beginning and end of the year. Based on the Fall 2021 iReady Reading Diagnostic assessment, 83% of students in grades 3-12 are identified as at-risk (scoring 2 more levels below grade level).

Measurable Outcome: Based on iReady diagnostic data, 60% of students in grades 3-12 will meet their typical growth goal by Spring 2022.

Monitoring: iReady diagnostic assessment will be utilized mid year to determine progress towards goals. In addition to mid-year progress monitoring, students will utilize the iReady instructional component, which will be monitored by classroom teachers to determine progress towards goal.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Jennifer Messerschmitt (jennifer.messerschmitt@charter.hcps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Students will participate in individual goal setting and tracking of progress weekly utilizing the iReady intervention tool.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: iReady is able to provide students with individualized instruction, immediate feedback, progress monitoring and is data driven.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Professional Development
2. Individual and schoolwide incentive programs developed
3. Administration of diagnostic assessment
4. Review of data to determine trends and future lesson planning
5. Implementation of instructional program is monitored to ensure fidelity
6. Individual and schoolwide incentive program will implemented

Person Responsible Geri Henry (geri.henry@charter.hcps.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Math is identified as an area of critical need because 50% or more students scored below a level 3 on the Spring 2021 FSA Math/EOC. During the 2020-2021 school year, 41% of students in grades 3-12 achieved typical growth as demonstrated on iReady diagnostics taken at the beginning and end of the year. Based on the Fall 2021 iReady Reading Diagnostic assessment, 86% of students in grades 3-12 are identified as at-risk (scoring 2 more levels below grade level).
Measurable Outcome:	Based on iReady diagnostic data, 60% of students in grades 3-12 will meet their typical growth goal by Spring 2022.
Monitoring:	iReady diagnostic assessment will be utilized mid year to determine progress towards goals. In addition to mid-year progress monitoring, students will utilize the iReady instructional component, which will be monitored by classroom teachers to determine progress towards goal.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Jennifer Messerschmitt (jennifer.messerschmitt@charter.hcps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Students will participate in individual goal setting and tracking of progress weekly utilizing the iReady intervention tool.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	iReady is able to provide students with individualized instruction, immediate feedback, progress monitoring and is data driven.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Professional Development
2. Individual and schoolwide incentive programs developed
3. Administration of diagnostic assessment
4. Review of data to determine trends and future lesson planning
5. Implementation of instructional program is monitored to ensure fidelity
6. Individual and schoolwide incentive program will implemented

Person Responsible Geri Henry (geri.henry@charter.hcps.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the [SafeSchoolsforAlex.org](https://www.safeschoolsforalex.org), compare the discipline data of the school to discipline data across the state and provide primary or secondary areas of concern that the school will monitor during the upcoming school year. Include how the school culture and environment will be monitored through the lens of behavior or discipline data.

Pepin Academies discipline data was not listed on the SafeSchoolsforAlex.org website.

Pepin Academies uses the Positive Behavior Support (PBS) Program to promote expected behaviors within the school environment. PBS is used across campus to ensure consistency and a thorough understanding of school-wide expectations. Visuals are also posted across campus. Training is provided to staff throughout the year based on data, teacher input and needs assessment. Students in varying grade levels can earn incentives for demonstrating the three Pillars (Expectations) of Pepin Academies: Respect, Responsibility and Integrity. Students earn Falcon Bucks which they can spend weekly in the school's Falcon Store. These incentives reinforce positive behavior and reduce negative behaviors. Students use their Falcon Bucks to purchase items from the school store. PBS sponsors celebrations/ incentives for all students each semester. In elementary, teachers monitor student behavior daily using a behavior checklist. Across all three schools (elementary, middle, and high school), staff monitor behavior for students within tier 1 through the RtI-B data system. The RtI-B data system is our school-wide behavior tracker for disciplinary incidents. Data collected from RtI-B is used to determine grade level incentives. Students on tier 2 and 3 have individualized behavior plans and incentive programs.

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.

Pepin Academies strives to create a low-threat, therapeutic environment where students feel safe and respected at all times. We are a Gold Model Positive Behavior Support School and set high expectations for all students. We practice positive reinforcement, which enhances student performance across contexts. Our staff utilizes restorative practice strategies to respond appropriately when addressing student behavior and regularly communicates with families to report concerns. Students participate in bullying prevention presentations throughout the school year. Pepin Academies has a zero tolerance for bullying. Students at Pepin are encouraged to advocate for themselves and their peers. All students participate in a Learning Strategies course which incorporates weekly self-advocacy, social-emotional, and self-determination lessons.

Identify the stakeholders and their role in promoting a positive culture and environment at the school.

Principal
 Assistant Principal(s)
 MTSS Chair (Attendance, Curriculum & Learning and Behavior)
 Parents

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA				\$30,000.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2021-22
			6609 - Pepin Academies	Other		\$30,000.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math				\$2,000.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2021-22
			6609 - Pepin Academies	General Fund		\$2,000.00
			<i>Notes: This is the cost to develop and implement an incentive program for reading and math across all grade levels.</i>			
Total:						\$32,000.00