

Pinellas County Schools

Athenian Academy



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 | 21 |
| Positive Culture & Environment | 23 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 24 |

Athenian Academy

2289 N. HERCULES AVE, Clearwater, FL 33763

<http://www.athenianacademy.org/>

Demographics

Principal: June Roper

Start Date for this Principal: 7/30/2018

| | |
|--|--|
| 2019-20 Status (per MSID File) | Active |
| School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File) | Combination School KG-8 |
| Primary Service Type (per MSID File) | K-12 General Education |
| 2020-21 Title I School | No |
| 2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3) | 59% |
| 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 | 2018-19: C (52%) 2017-18: B (55%) 2016-17: C (53%) |
| 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 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 | 7 |
| Needs Assessment | 10 |
| Planning for Improvement | 21 |
| Title I Requirements | 0 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 24 |

Athenian Academy

2289 N. HERCULES AVE, Clearwater, FL 33763

<http://www.athenianacademy.org/>

School Demographics

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| <p>School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)</p> <p>Combination School KG-8</p> | <p>2020-21 Title I School</p> <p>No</p> | <p>2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p>43%</p> |
| <p>Primary Service Type (per MSID File)</p> <p>K-12 General Education</p> | <p>Charter School</p> <p>Yes</p> | <p>2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p>46%</p> |

School Grades History

| Year | 2020-21 | 2019-20 | 2018-19 | 2017-18 |
|-------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| Grade | | C | C | B |

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.

Our mission is to change lives and challenge minds by creating global citizens through unique world language instructions.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The school's vision is to fulfill the mission through the educational development of global minded, multilingual citizens using world language instruction as a vehicle toward academic achievement and excellence in all curriculum areas.

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 |
|-------------|---------------------|---|
| Roper, June | Principal | Develops, implement, and evaluates school philosophy, goals and objectives reflecting district and state goals Develops, implements and evaluates School Improvement Plan (SIP) and School-wide Discipline Plan Develops and maintains a positive school/community climate and a safe, secure, and healthy environment Plans, implements, and evaluates the school instructional program based on student needs and within state guidelines Determines staffing needs including selection, supervision, staff development and evaluation of all school personnel Actively monitors and implements best practices and professional development for improved Student Achievement Oversees the school daily operations Facilitates PD Oversees MTSS, ESE,PTA and Family engagement, Teacher evaluations and walk throughs, Facilitates the School Leadership Team and the Instructional leadership team |
| | Assistant Principal | |

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 7/30/2018, June Roper

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.*

0

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.*

0

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

27

Total number of students enrolled at the school

484

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

5

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

7

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 | 53 | 53 | 62 | 59 | 58 | 66 | 45 | 48 | 40 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 484 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 8 | 10 | 7 | 6 | 22 | 7 | 7 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 73 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 10 | 14 | 5 | 6 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 48 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 4 | 5 | 4 | 17 | 12 | 1 | 11 | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 69 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 5 | 11 | 15 | 6 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 50 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 15 | 12 | 16 | 4 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 72 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 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 | 5 | 6 | 10 | 9 | 26 | 31 | 24 | 26 | 25 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 162 |

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 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 |
| 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

Friday 10/7/2022

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 FSA ELA assessment | | |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA 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 | 48 | 57 | 57 | 62 | 59 | 43 | 52 | 36 | 33 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 447 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 8 | 10 | 7 | 6 | 22 | 7 | 7 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 73 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 6 | 4 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 20 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 4 | 3 | 5 | 10 | 6 | 9 | 8 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 55 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 4 | 2 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 19 | 14 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 78 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 8 | 15 | 8 | 5 | 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 56 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 12 | 14 | 3 | 5 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 49 |

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 | 22 | 15 | 17 | 26 | 33 | 32 | 30 | 22 | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 215 |

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 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 |
| 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 | | | | 49% | 70% | 61% | 53% | 65% | 60% |
| ELA Learning Gains | | | | 49% | 63% | 59% | 50% | 59% | 57% |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | 48% | 56% | 54% | 49% | 55% | 52% |
| Math Achievement | | | | 49% | 72% | 62% | 64% | 69% | 61% |
| Math Learning Gains | | | | 52% | 63% | 59% | 68% | 64% | 58% |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | 42% | 54% | 52% | 55% | 59% | 52% |
| Science Achievement | | | | 48% | 64% | 56% | 56% | 62% | 57% |
| Social Studies Achievement | | | | 65% | 81% | 78% | 61% | 82% | 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 | 57% | 56% | 1% | 58% | -1% |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 04 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 45% | 56% | -11% | 58% | -13% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -57% | | | | |
| 05 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 38% | 54% | -16% | 56% | -18% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -45% | | | | |
| 06 | 2021 | | | | | |

| ELA | | | | | | |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| | 2019 | 30% | 51% | -21% | 54% | -24% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -38% | | | | |
| 07 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 56% | 51% | 5% | 52% | 4% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -30% | | | | |
| 08 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 56% | 55% | 1% | 56% | 0% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -56% | | | | |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 03 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 32% | 62% | -30% | 62% | -30% |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 04 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 46% | 64% | -18% | 64% | -18% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -32% | | | | |
| 05 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 40% | 60% | -20% | 60% | -20% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -46% | | | | |
| 06 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 43% | 44% | -1% | 55% | -12% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -40% | | | | |
| 07 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 76% | 60% | 16% | 54% | 22% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -43% | | | | |
| 08 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 60% | 31% | 29% | 46% | 14% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -76% | | | | |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 05 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 34% | 54% | -20% | 53% | -19% |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 08 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 59% | 51% | 8% | 48% | 11% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -34% | | | | |

| BIOLOGY EOC | | | | | |
|---------------------|---------------|-----------------|------------------------------|--------------|---------------------------|
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2021 | | | | | |
| 2019 | | | | | |
| CIVICS EOC | | | | | |
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2021 | | | | | |
| 2019 | 67% | 68% | -1% | 71% | -4% |
| HISTORY EOC | | | | | |
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2021 | | | | | |
| 2019 | | | | | |
| ALGEBRA EOC | | | | | |
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2021 | | | | | |
| 2019 | 74% | 55% | 19% | 61% | 13% |
| GEOMETRY EOC | | | | | |
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2021 | | | | | |
| 2019 | | | | | |

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 (K-8) used Measures of Academic Progress to progress monitor.

| Grade 1 | | | | |
|-----------------------|----------------------------|------|--------|--------|
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| English Language Arts | All Students | 73 | 71 | 73 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 49 | 49 | 49 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 14 | 14 | 14 |
| | English Language Learners | 1.75 | 1.75 | 1.75 |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Mathematics | All Students | 80 | 78 | 64 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 49 | 49 | 49 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 14 | 14 | 14 |
| | English Language Learners | 1.75 | 1.75 | 1.75 |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Grade 2 | | | | |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| English Language Arts | All Students | 68 | 61 | 58 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 47 | 47 | 47 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 7 | 7 | 7 |
| | English Language Learners | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Mathematics | All Students | 60 | 38 | 53 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 47 | 47 | 47 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 7 | 7 | 7 |
| | English Language Learners | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |

| Grade 3 | | | | |
|-----------------------|----------------------------|------|--------|--------|
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| English Language Arts | All Students | 74 | 76 | |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 39 | 39 | 39 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 7 | 7 | 7 |
| | English Language Learners | 10 | 10 | 10 |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Mathematics | All Students | 60 | 50 | 55 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 39 | 39 | 39 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 7 | 7 | 7 |
| | English Language Learners | 10 | 10 | 10 |
| | Grade 4 | | | |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| English Language Arts | All Students | 64 | 66 | 61 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 47 | 47 | 47 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 7 | 7 | 7 |
| | English Language Learners | 7 | 7 | 7 |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Mathematics | All Students | 53 | 49 | 52 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 47 | 47 | 47 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 7 | 7 | 7 |
| | English Language Learners | 7 | 7 | 7 |

| Grade 5 | | | | |
|-----------------------|----------------------------|------|--------|--------|
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| English Language Arts | All Students | 40 | 40 | 35 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 52 | 52 | 52 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 15 | 15 | 15 |
| | English Language Learners | 7 | 7 | 7 |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Mathematics | All Students | 40 | 40 | 35 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 52 | 52 | 52 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 15 | 15 | 15 |
| | English Language Learners | 7 | 7 | 7 |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Science | All Students | | | |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | | | |
| | Students With Disabilities | | | |
| | English Language Learners | | | |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |

| Grade 6 | | | | |
|-----------------------|----------------------------|------|--------|--------|
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| English Language Arts | All Students | 57 | 46 | |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 46 | 46 | 46 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 16 | 16 | 16 |
| | English Language Learners | 8 | 8 | 8 |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Mathematics | All Students | 51 | 50 | 35 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 46 | 46 | 46 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 16 | 16 | 16 |
| | English Language Learners | 8 | 8 | 8 |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |

| Grade 7 | | | | |
|-----------------------|----------------------------|------|--------|--------|
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| English Language Arts | All Students | 57 | 59 | |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 52 | 52 | 52 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 8 | 8 | 8 |
| | English Language Learners | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Mathematics | All Students | 68 | 53 | 55 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 52 | 52 | 52 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 8 | 8 | 8 |
| | English Language Learners | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Civics | All Students | | | |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | | | |
| | Students With Disabilities | | | |
| | English Language Learners | | | |
| | | | | |

| Grade 8 | | | | |
|-----------------------|----------------------------|------|--------|--------|
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| English Language Arts | All Students | 42 | 42 | |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 59 | 59 | 59 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 19 | 19 | 19 |
| | English Language Learners | 15 | 15 | 15 |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Mathematics | All Students | 38 | 38 | 34 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 59 | 59 | 59 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 19 | 19 | 19 |
| | English Language Learners | 15 | 15 | 15 |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Science | 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 | 4 | 32 | 36 | 14 | 38 | 45 | 18 | | | | |
| ELL | 26 | 53 | | 33 | 65 | | | | | | |
| BLK | 29 | 26 | | 21 | 47 | 55 | | | | | |
| HSP | 47 | 57 | | 48 | 56 | | 17 | 15 | | | |
| MUL | 54 | | | 43 | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 45 | 50 | 53 | 40 | 57 | 64 | 29 | 44 | | | |
| FRL | 42 | 49 | 40 | 38 | 54 | 50 | 24 | 27 | 64 | | |
| 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 | 15 | 50 | | 15 | 50 | | | | | | |
| ELL | 23 | 54 | | 46 | 62 | | | | | | |
| BLK | 33 | 42 | | 36 | 62 | 50 | 50 | | | | |

| 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 |
| HSP | 44 | 46 | 54 | 46 | 49 | 55 | 22 | | | | |
| MUL | 58 | | | 58 | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 53 | 51 | 48 | 51 | 50 | 30 | 57 | 67 | 82 | | |
| FRL | 44 | 52 | 58 | 43 | 55 | 47 | 44 | 44 | 70 | | |
| 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 |
| SWD | 8 | | | 17 | | | | | | | |
| ELL | 15 | 29 | 20 | 23 | 40 | | | | | | |
| BLK | 44 | 42 | | 44 | 58 | 46 | 45 | | | | |
| HSP | 54 | 54 | 50 | 61 | 62 | 57 | 57 | | | | |
| MUL | 53 | 53 | | 60 | 60 | | | | | | |
| WHT | 56 | 50 | 52 | 70 | 72 | 70 | 61 | 62 | 41 | | |
| FRL | 48 | 44 | 44 | 56 | 61 | 50 | 48 | 62 | 33 | | |

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 | 45 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students | NO |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 3 |
| Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency | 41 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 452 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 10 |
| Percent Tested | 97% |
| Subgroup Data | |
| Students With Disabilities | |
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities | 27 |
| Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | YES |
| Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32% | |
| English Language Learners | |
| Federal Index - English Language Learners | 44 |
| English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |

| English Language Learners | |
|--|-----|
| 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 | 36 |
| 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 | 39 |
| 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 | 49 |
| 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 | 48 |
| 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 | 41 |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| 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?

Trends emerging across grade levels in both English Language Arts and Mathematics shows zero growth or a decline from the baseline data to the end of year results as evidenced from the progress monitoring program Measures of Academic Progress (MAP).

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

Areas with the greatest need for improvement as evidenced through Measures of Academic Progress assessments and 2019 Florida Standards Assessment were in the areas of English Language Arts. Students in grades 4th -7th fell well below the district and state averages on the Florida Standards Assessment, and show a that less than 50% of students in 5th, 6th, and 8th grades did not reach a level of proficiency in English Language Arts on Measures of Academic Progress assessments.

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

The contributing factors to this need for improvement were lack of using data to drive instruction, differentiating learning and/ or scaffolding learning to meet the needs of all learners. Teachers will receive continual professional development and regular walk throughs with targeted, actionable feedback given by administration to ensure that this is being done with fidelity.

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

Data shows that the students in the lowest quartile made gains and showed improvement in the areas of reading and math as evidenced through Measures of Academic Progress assessment data and 2019 state assessments.

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

Athenian Academy has implemented a more structured Multi-Tiered Support Service for Tier 3 students and provided professional developments, targeted PLC's and monthly data chats to ensure students in the lowest 25% are receiving the greatest amount of targeted support. Athenian Academy has added a full-time MTSS staff member to provide those consistent supports to students and staff.

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

Teachers will provide direct instruction that is targeted to the skills that need improvement. Targeted, actionable feedback will be used to offer the additional supports that students need to be successful. Progress monitoring and data driven instruction will support the needs of all learners.

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.

Our teachers will be provided ongoing professional development and support from the MTSS and ESE teams. Personnel from iReady and STEM scopes are scheduled for 2 or more face to face trainings and continual support through online learning is available for all staff members. Athenian Academy staff will be required to attend at minimum 2 additional trainings through Pinellas county schools that help to meet the school goals. These trainings/professional development is for the purpose of supporting continued learning.

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

Athenian Academy is committed to the academic success of all learners. The school will implement iReady for both reading and math to progress monitor and drive instruction. This year we have hired one full-time MTSS and one part-time MTSS personnel to provide Tier 3 instruction to students and ongoing professional development for staff to ensure that interventions are being done with fidelity. Literacy Footprints and Newsela are two programs the school will purchase to support the Tier 2 intervention process.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Our 2021 level of performance in 3rd grade was 57% proficient, in 4th grade it was 48% proficient, and 5th-8th grades was 37% as evidenced in the 2021 Florida State Assessment of English Language Arts. We expect our proficiency level to be 65% in 3rd grade, 55% in 4th grade, and 45% in 5th - 8th grades, our learning gains level to be 55%% and the learning gains of our lowest 25% of students to be 58% by May of 2022.

Measurable Outcome: The percentage of students in 3rd grade achieving English Language Arts proficiency will increase from 57% to 65%, in 4th grade from 48% to 55% and 5th-8th grades to increase from 37% to 45% as measured by the Florida Standards Assessment. The percentage of students making learning gains in English Language Arts will increase from 49% to 57% as measured by the Florida Standards Assessment. The students in the lowest 25% making learning gains in English Language Arts will increase from 50% to 58% as measured by the Florida Standards Assessment.

Monitoring: Monitoring will be down through data mining of iReady diagnostics and district-wide assessments, and by the administration doing continued walk throughs to monitor that standards based teaching is being completed with fidelity and rigor.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: June Roper (c.roperj@pcsb.org)

Evidence-based Strategy: Athenian Academy teachers will use data from iReady and district-wide assessments to drive instruction, differentiate and scaffold teaching. Continued professional learning will ensure that teachers are engaging students in rigorous and complex reading and writing tasks. Teachers will use strategies, such as gradual release model using the B.E.S.T standards, updated modules, and Study Sync for middle school.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: The problem or gap is occurring because of the need for increased focus on rigor and the lack of use of data to drive instruction. If standard based planning and data mining to drive instruction occur, student proficiency will increase by at least 8% that will be monitored through regular walkthroughs.

Action Steps to Implement

Facilitate English Language Arts focused, continual and consistent professional learning with a focus on using data to drive instruction, focus on standards based instruction, regular practice with complex texts and academic language including reading and writing tasks.

Person Responsible June Roper (c.roperj@pcsb.org)

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.

An area of concern for Athenian Academy in the area of discipline. For every 100 students 1.21 of them received referrals for threatening behavior. This puts Athenian Academy's rank for these incidents at 222/313 for combination schools. We will participate in positive behavior interventions using S.O.A.R to engage students in positive behaviors and reward positive outcomes. The school will also provide character education, and Positive Office Awards to promote a more optimistic climate and culture amongst students. Guidance counselor teaches SEL lessons to rotating classrooms. These lessons include conflict resolution, emotional awareness, and self-regulation. We have implemented an age-appropriate rewards system for middle school. Short term rewards include positive referrals and long-term rewards include field trips and events.

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.

Athenian Academy believes that a partnership with parents/ caregivers is crucial to the success of our students. The school will host two separate open houses for families the week school begins welcome families back to school and create a positive relationship and open up lines of communication between school and home. Curriculum night will be held in September for all grade levels at varying times to support social distancing. Once a semester, schoolwide conferences will be set up by teachers to discuss student progress. This will be offered both face to face or virtually.

The schools Facebook, the school website and marquee are updated regularly to provide families with up-to-date information concerning school events. A School Messenger message will be sent home at minimum once a month with important updates/information and school events. The continued involvement of our parents/guardians is a vital part of ensure we maintain a positive relationship with all stakeholders. Athenian Academy will continue to sustain a positive culture and environment in creative ways through this pandemic.

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

Athenian Academy's administration team, school counselor, and grade level team leads will have the responsibility in developing, implementing and evaluating any parent involvement plans for the 2021-2022

school year. The Athenian Academy PTSA has implemented several parent/guardian involvement events. These include Muffins with Moms held four times per year, and All Pro Dads held twice a year. These events allow parents the opportunity for informational sessions by community professionals, trainings and school activity involvement (building a Buddy Bench, school clean up, organizing classrooms, etc.). Additionally, Athenian Academy surveys families to better support their needs and allow their voices to be heard.

Part V: Budget

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

| 1 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA | | | | \$750.00 |
|---------------|--------|--|-------------------------|--------------------------|---------|-----------------|
| Function | Object | Budget Focus | Funding Source | FTE | 2021-22 | |
| | | | 7151 - Athenian Academy | School Improvement Funds | 750.0 | \$750.00 |
| | | <i>Notes: Purchase iReady materials for teachers to use with students in the lowest 25%.</i> | | | | |
| Total: | | | | | | \$750.00 |