

Pinellas County Schools

Oak Grove Middle School



2022-23 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 | 14 |
| Positive Culture & Environment | 0 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 0 |

Oak Grove Middle School

1370 S BELCHER RD, Clearwater, FL 33764

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

Demographics

Principal: Kristy Therrien

Start Date for this Principal: 6/9/2020

| | |
|--|--|
| 2019-20 Status (per MSID File) | Active |
| School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File) | Middle School 6-8 |
| Primary Service Type (per MSID File) | K-12 General Education |
| 2021-22 Title I School | Yes |
| 2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3) | 100% |
| 2021-22 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* Asian Students Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students* Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students |
| School Grades History | 2021-22: C (41%) 2018-19: C (46%) 2017-18: C (47%) |
| 2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information* | |
| SI Region | Central |
| Regional Executive Director | Lucinda Thompson |
| Turnaround Option/Cycle | N/A |
| Year | |
| Support Tier | |
| ESSA Status | TSI |
| * 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 | 14 |
| Title I Requirements | 0 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 0 |

Oak Grove Middle School

1370 S BELCHER RD, Clearwater, FL 33764

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

School Demographics

| School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File) | 2021-22 Title I School | 2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3) |
|--|------------------------|--|
| Middle School 6-8 | Yes | 100% |
| Primary Service Type (per MSID File) | Charter School | 2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2) |
| K-12 General Education | No | 65% |

School Grades History

| Year | 2021-22 | 2020-21 | 2019-20 | 2018-19 |
|-------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| Grade | C | | C | C |

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.

To provide an equitable learning experience for all students and prepare all students for high school, college, career, and life.

Provide the school's vision statement.

100% Student Success

School Leadership Team

Membership

For each member of the school leadership team, select the employee name and email address from the dropdown. Identify the position title and job duties/responsibilities.:

| Name | Position Title | Job Duties and Responsibilities |
|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------------------|
| Therrien, Kristy | Principal | |
| Mallory, Karen | Assistant Principal | |
| Oleksy, Mariah | Assistant Principal | |
| Alford, Christopher | Assistant Principal | |

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Tuesday 6/9/2020, Kristy Therrien

Number of teachers with a 2022 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 2022 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.*

21

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

44

Total number of students enrolled at the school

877

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

21

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2022-23 school year.

21

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

Using prior year's data, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|--|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|-----|-----|-----|---|----|----|----|-----|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | | |
| Number of students enrolled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 283 | 303 | 291 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 877 | |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 84 | 68 | 61 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 213 | |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 8 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 21 | |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | |
| Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 103 | 129 | 130 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 362 | |
| Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 118 | 125 | 93 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 336 | |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 103 | 129 | 130 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 362 | |

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level who have 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 | |

Using current year data, complete the table below with the number of students identified as being "retained.":

| 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 | 3 | 7 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 | |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | |

Date this data was collected or last updated

Sunday 7/31/2022

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 | 293 | 317 | 355 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 965 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 3 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 8 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 21 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 52 | 63 | 79 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 194 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 45 | 66 | 68 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 179 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 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 | 26 | 61 | 50 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 137 |

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 | 7 | 12 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 32 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |

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 | 293 | 317 | 355 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 965 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 3 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 8 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 21 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 52 | 63 | 79 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 194 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 45 | 66 | 68 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 179 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 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 | 26 | 61 | 50 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 137 |

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 | 7 | 12 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 32 |
| Students retained two or more times | 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 | 2022 | | | 2021 | | | 2019 | | |
|-----------------------------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|
| | School | District | State | School | District | State | School | District | State |
| ELA Achievement | 34% | 46% | 50% | | | | 38% | 52% | 54% |
| ELA Learning Gains | 36% | | | | | | 47% | 55% | 54% |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | 30% | | | | | | 42% | 47% | 47% |
| Math Achievement | 37% | 30% | 36% | | | | 43% | 55% | 58% |
| Math Learning Gains | 39% | | | | | | 47% | 52% | 57% |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 39% | | | | | | 40% | 46% | 51% |
| Science Achievement | 33% | 52% | 53% | | | | 43% | 51% | 51% |
| Social Studies Achievement | 56% | 52% | 58% | | | | 60% | 68% | 72% |

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 |
| 06 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 36% | 51% | -15% | 54% | -18% |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 07 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 41% | 51% | -10% | 52% | -11% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -36% | | | | |
| 08 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 37% | 55% | -18% | 56% | -19% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -41% | | | | |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 06 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 33% | 44% | -11% | 55% | -22% |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 07 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 51% | 60% | -9% | 54% | -3% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -33% | | | | |
| 08 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 30% | 31% | -1% | 46% | -16% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -51% | | | | |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 06 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 07 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 0% | | | | |
| 08 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 42% | 51% | -9% | 48% | -6% |
| Cohort Comparison | | 0% | | | | |

| BIOLOGY EOC | | | | | |
|-------------|--------|----------|-----------------------|-------|--------------------|
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2022 | | | | | |
| 2019 | | | | | |
| CIVICS EOC | | | | | |
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2022 | | | | | |
| 2019 | 61% | 68% | -7% | 71% | -10% |
| HISTORY EOC | | | | | |
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2022 | | | | | |
| 2019 | | | | | |

| ALGEBRA EOC | | | | | |
|--------------|--------|----------|-----------------------|-------|--------------------|
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2022 | | | | | |
| 2019 | 70% | 55% | 15% | 61% | 9% |
| GEOMETRY EOC | | | | | |
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2022 | | | | | |
| 2019 | 0% | 56% | -56% | 57% | -57% |

Subgroup Data Review

| 2022 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 2020-21 | C & C Accel 2020-21 |
| SWD | 7 | 24 | 26 | 10 | 26 | 28 | 12 | 36 | | | |
| ELL | 20 | 27 | 23 | 28 | 31 | 32 | 14 | 45 | 58 | | |
| ASN | 63 | 60 | | 72 | 59 | | | | | | |
| BLK | 19 | 33 | 27 | 19 | 35 | 35 | 13 | 44 | 33 | | |
| HSP | 29 | 32 | 26 | 34 | 34 | 35 | 28 | 49 | 58 | | |
| MUL | 34 | 30 | | 32 | 38 | | 30 | | 70 | | |
| WHT | 44 | 40 | 37 | 48 | 45 | 47 | 45 | 66 | 70 | | |
| FRL | 29 | 32 | 29 | 34 | 38 | 38 | 28 | 51 | 58 | | |
| 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 | 8 | 22 | 22 | 11 | 30 | 31 | 14 | 32 | | | |
| ELL | 22 | 36 | 38 | 30 | 36 | 42 | 21 | 42 | 50 | | |
| ASN | 61 | 61 | | 83 | 72 | | | | | | |
| BLK | 24 | 31 | 18 | 26 | 37 | 34 | 23 | 54 | 69 | | |
| HSP | 29 | 39 | 39 | 36 | 38 | 37 | 36 | 49 | 65 | | |
| MUL | 52 | 56 | | 44 | 38 | | 53 | 69 | 64 | | |
| WHT | 47 | 46 | 44 | 49 | 45 | 38 | 59 | 60 | 76 | | |
| FRL | 32 | 38 | 34 | 37 | 39 | 34 | 37 | 50 | 66 | | |
| 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 | 13 | 36 | 32 | 16 | 33 | 31 | 28 | 20 | 36 | | |
| ELL | 18 | 39 | 40 | 29 | 36 | 32 | 19 | 37 | 35 | | |
| ASN | 71 | 50 | | 79 | 62 | | | | | | |
| BLK | 29 | 44 | 48 | 26 | 40 | 46 | 34 | 42 | 53 | | |
| HSP | 30 | 44 | 40 | 37 | 42 | 35 | 35 | 49 | 54 | | |
| MUL | 46 | 50 | | 53 | 54 | | 80 | 54 | 64 | | |
| WHT | 47 | 49 | 45 | 52 | 53 | 44 | 48 | 76 | 56 | | |
| FRL | 32 | 44 | 41 | 38 | 42 | 34 | 38 | 50 | 50 | | |

ESSA Data Review

This data has not been updated for the 2022-23 school year.

| ESSA Federal Index | |
|---|-----|
| ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I) | TSI |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students | 41 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students | NO |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 6 |
| Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency | 45 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 412 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 10 |
| Percent Tested | 95% |
| 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% | 3 |
| English Language Learners | |
| Federal Index - English Language Learners | 32 |
| English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | YES |
| 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 | 64 |
| Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| Black/African American Students | |
| Federal Index - Black/African American Students | 29 |
| Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | YES |
| Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32% | 1 |

| Hispanic Students | |
|--|-----|
| Federal Index - Hispanic Students | 37 |
| Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | YES |
| Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| Multiracial Students | |
| Federal Index - Multiracial Students | 39 |
| Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | YES |
| 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 | 48 |
| White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| 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% | 0 |

Part III: Planning for Improvement

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?

Proficiency and learning gains in all content areas has decreased or remained the same with the exception of our math L25 learning, which increased by 2%.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

Our Pre-Algebra and Science scores, based on end of year assessments, need the most improvement.

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

Our 8th grade population struggled to make gains and meet proficiency across all grade levels. This was due to the disruption in their middle school career because of COVID. Our teachers struggled with providing rigorous standards based learning tasks. We lacked bilingual associates and paraprofessionals to support scholars within class. Our ESE teachers were pulled to cover classes due to staff absences for COVID related purposes.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

Our Civics remained the same with 56% proficiency in 2021 and 2022. Our Math L25 learning gains improved.

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

The teachers were experienced, dedicated, and provided daily rigorous standard based instruction with little disruption to the classroom environment.

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

Priority 1-Accelerating Learning through High Achievement: Planning standards-based lessons, aligning resources to BEST standards, and planning to close the achievement GAP of our subgroups.

Priority 2-Accelerating Learning through Student Experiences: Using formative assessments to track student progress and plan differentiated instruction, organize students to interact with content using engaging strategies, and communicating high expectations for each student to close the achievement gap

Priority 3-High Expectations for All: The development of an equitable environment where the academic, social emotional and behavioral needs of every student are known and met.

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.

We will continue to provide professional development in scholar engagement, use of WICOR strategies and academic vocabulary by both teacher and scholar, as well as a focus on acceleration (1. Generate Thinking, Purpose, Relevance, and Curiosity, 2. Clearly Articulate the Learning Goal and Expectations, 3. Scaffold and Practice Essential Prerequisite Skills, 4. Introduce New Vocabulary and Review Prior Vocabulary, 5. Dip into the New Concept, and 6. Conduct Formative Assessment Frequently)

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

Common planning for all content/grade level teams, including the partnership of reading with civics. Presence of instructional coaches and administrators daily for support and corrective feedback.

Areas of Focus

Identify the key Areas of Focus to address your school's highest priorities based on any/all relevant data sources.

:

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

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

Our current level of performance is 35% of our students are proficient on the 2022 FSA ELA. The problem/gap is occurring because students are not being challenged with higher order thinking questions on a routine basis which allows them to actively participate in the learning.

Measurable Outcome:

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

We expect our performance level to increase from 35% to 50% of our students meeting proficiency by Spring 2023 Progress Monitoring assessment F.A.S.T.

Monitoring:

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

Monitoring will occur through daily walkthroughs and analysis of data, both formal and informal.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Karen Mallory (malloryk@pcsb.org)

Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

Enhance staff capacity to identify content from the BEST Benchmarks that will create opportunities for collaboration around higher order thinking questions and allow students to enter a productive struggle.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

If teachers intentionally planned higher order thinking questions and allowed students time to engage in the productive struggle in collaboration with other students, the problem would be reduced by 15%.

Action Steps to Implement

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

Teachers meet in PLCs at least twice per month to share ways they are incorporating HOT Qs and collaboration into their lessons and what effect placing students in the productive struggle is having on student growth. In PLCs teachers also share ways to support students who continue to struggle with engagement in collaboration around complex tasks like HOT Qs.

Person Responsible

Kristy Therrien (therrienk@pcsb.org)

ELA and reading teachers receive professional development around B.E.S.T. Benchmarks, HOT Questions, and collaborative structures.

Person Responsible

Karen Mallory (malloryk@pcsb.org)

Administrators monitor and support the implementation of the use of grade-appropriate B.E.S.T. complex texts and connected tasks, like HOT Q's in reading and ELA classrooms through classroom observation.

Person Responsible

Karen Mallory (malloryk@pcsb.org)

Place students in the appropriate level ELA class to ensure they are being challenged with the right amount of rigor, including placing high Level 2 EL scholars in an Intensive Reading class using the Acceleration Framework (1. Generate Thinking, Purpose, Relevance, and Curiosity, 2. Clearly Articulate the Learning Goal and Expectations, 3. Scaffold and Practice Essential Prerequisite Skills, 4. Introduce

New Vocabulary and Review Prior Vocabulary, 5. Dip into the New Concept, and 6. Conduct Formative Assessment Frequently).

Person Responsible

Karen Mallory (malloryk@pcsb.org)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Social Studies

| | |
|---|---|
| Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed. | Our current level of performance is: 56% proficiency, as evidenced in 2021 Spring EOC Civics Assessment. The problem/gap is occurring because classroom practices rarely include student-centered learning environments with rigor. |
| Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome. | The percent of students achieving proficiency on the Civics EOC will increase from 56% to 70%, as measured by the spring administration of the Civics EOC |
| Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome. | Monitoring will take place daily through walkthroughs and data analysis during bimonthly PLCs. |
| Person responsible for monitoring outcome: | Christopher Alford (alfordch@pcsb.org) |
| Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus. | Support staff to utilize data to organize students to interact with content in manners which differentiates/scaffolds instruction to meet the needs of each student. |
| Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy. | If collaborative planning for student-centered, scaffolded exercises that build to HOT opportunities would occur, the problem would be reduced and proficiency would increase by 14%. |
| Action Steps to Implement List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step. | |
| Regularly assess (formally and informally) and utilize data to modify and adjust instruction. Teachers utilize ongoing formative assessment and use the information gained to adjust instruction, enrich and reteach, and provide research-based interventions. | |
| Person Responsible | Christopher Alford (alfordc@pcsb.org) |
| In PLCs teachers collaborate on a common instrument for students track and reflect on their data. The instrument includes space for student reflection and “next steps.” | |
| Person Responsible | Christopher Alford (alfordch@pcsb.org) |
| Use data to plan instruction that ensures differentiation, intervention and enrichment while scaffolding learning to increase student performance. | |
| Person Responsible | Christopher Alford (alfordch@pcsb.org) |
| Provide students with the opportunity to demonstrate higher order thinking strategies and processes. | |
| Person Responsible | Christopher Alford (alfordch@pcsb.org) |
| Schedule our Level 1 ELA 8th grade scholars with an Intensive Reading teacher who is paired with a Civics teacher, which will provide those scholars with the skills necessary to deconstruct the complex Civics texts. | |
| Person Responsible | Karen Mallory (malloryk@pcsb.org) |

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

Our current level of performance is 29% Mathematics Achievement, as evidenced in 2021-2022 School Grade Report. The problem/gap is occurring because learning targets and learning tasks are not differentiated to address student readiness, interest, and learning profile of the students with regards to mathematics.

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

We expect our performance level to increase from 29% to 45% Mathematics Achievement by the 2022-2023 School Grade Report.

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

Monitoring will occur through daily observations with corrective feedback and emphasis on differentiation. Both formal and informal data will be analyzed during Department PLCs and Common planning.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Christopher Alford (alfordc@pcsb.org)

Evidence-based Strategy:
Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

Support staff to utilize data to organize students to interact with content in manner which differentiates/scaffolds instruction to meet the needs of each student.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

If differentiated learning opportunities are implemented as part of student instruction, the problem would be reduced by 20%

Action Steps to Implement

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

Mathematics teachers participate in professional learning opportunities around the B.E.S.T. Standards, the Mathematical Thinking & Reasoning Standards, and Differentiation in the Math Classroom.

Person Responsible

Christopher Alford (alfordc@pcsb.org)

Teachers utilize systemic documents (adopted curriculum, pacing guides, etc.) to effectively plan for mathematics units that incorporate the Mathematical Thinking and Reasoning Standards and rigorous performance tasks aligned to the B.E.S.T. Benchmarks for Mathematics. Planning will include horizontal and vertical alignment across benchmarks to help students make connections in their learning.

Person Responsible

Christopher Alford (alfordc@pcsb.org)

Teachers provide students with at least 1 differentiated learning opportunity within each unit of instruction that addresses either 1) the students' mathematical readiness, 2) the students' interests as related to the mathematics they are learning, and/or 3) the students' choice of how to learn the material (learner profile).

Person Responsible

Christopher Alford (alfordc@pcsb.org)

Teachers utilize IXL's Diagnostic Arena to have students address mathematical skills gaps from their individualized Action Plans with an emphasis on utilizing the program outside of the school day to extend learning beyond the classroom.

Person Responsible Christopher Alford (alfordc@pcsb.org)

Administrators and teachers engage in mathematics-focused learning walks/discussions with a focus on target/task alignment, student-centered learning environment and differentiated learning opportunities for students.

Person Responsible Christopher Alford (alfordc@pcsb.org)

Conduct regular, monthly, Professional Learning Communities (PLCs) inclusive of 'data chats' to review student data to identify and plan for differentiation opportunities based on the students' readiness, interest, and/or learning profile. Data can come from the FAST assessments, IXL, Instructional Materials assessments, and/or teacher and district formal and informal assessments.

Person Responsible Christopher Alford (alfordc@pcsb.org)

#4. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

Our current level of performance is 35%, as evidenced in SSA proficiency (level 3 and above). The problem/gap is occurring because data is not being utilized to differentiate and scaffold instruction to increase student performance.

Measurable Outcome:

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

The percent of 8th grade students achieving science proficiency will increase from 35% to 55%, as measured by 8th grade Science State-Wide Science Assessment

Monitoring:

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

Daily walkthroughs with corrective feedback and data analysis at bimonthly PLCs.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Mariah Oleksy (oleksym@pcsb.org)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

Support staff to utilize data to organize students to interact with content in manners which differentiates/scaffolds instruction to meet the needs of each student.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

If effective implementation of differentiation and scaffolding of inquiry-based instruction based on formative data would occur, the problem would be reduced by 20%.

Action Steps to Implement

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

Conduct regular, monthly, Professional Learning Communities (PLCs) inclusive of 'data chats' to review student responses to tasks and formative assessments and plan for instructional lessons that include text-dependent questions, close and critical reading and skill/strategy-based groups to implement during core instruction to support success with complex texts.

Person Responsible

Mariah Oleksy (oleksym@pcsb.org)

Teachers utilize systemic documents (adopted curriculum, pacing guides, etc.) to effectively plan for units that incorporate rigorous performance tasks aligned to the Standards.

Person Responsible

Mariah Oleksy (oleksym@pcsb.org)

Teachers monitor and provide feedback to students to support learning.

Person Responsible

Mariah Oleksy (oleksym@pcsb.org)

Administrators monitor teacher practice and provide feedback to support teacher growth. Administrators regularly observe science lessons to monitor strategy implementation and provide feedback to teachers, literacy coach and science Instructional Staff Developer to support next steps.

Person Responsible

Mariah Oleksy (oleksym@pcsb.org)

Regularly assess (formally and informally) and utilize data to modify and adjust instruction. Teachers utilize ongoing formative assessment and use the information gained to adjust instruction, enrich and reteach, and provide research-based interventions.

Person Responsible Mariah Oleksy (oleksym@pcsb.org)

Use data to plan instruction that ensures differentiation, intervention and enrichment while scaffolding learning to increase student performance.

Person Responsible Mariah Oleksy (oleksym@pcsb.org)

Utilize a variety of modalities when presenting concepts and instruction to meet the needs of each student.

Person Responsible Mariah Oleksy (oleksym@pcsb.org)

#5. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities**Area of Focus****Description and Rationale:**

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

Our current level of performance is 7% of our students are proficient on the 2022 FSA ELA and 10% on the FSA Math. The problem/gap is occurring because students are not being challenged with higher order thinking questions on a routine basis in ELA and challenged with rigorous instruction in math, which allows them to actively participate in the learning.

Measurable Outcome:

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

We expect our performance level to increase from 7% to 22% of our SWD students meeting proficiency by Spring 2023 Progress Monitoring assessment F.A.S.T. in ELA and from 10% to 25% in Math.

Monitoring:

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

Monitoring will occur through daily walkthroughs, observing both ELA/Math core content teachers and ESE support facilitation teachers, as well as an analysis of data, both formal and informal.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Karen Mallory (malloryk@pcsb.org)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

Implement Specially-Designed Instruction (SDI) with fidelity, which tailors instruction for individual SWD students (addressing their Individualized Education Program (IEP) goals, accounting for their disability, providing modifications or adaptations to content, and encouraging access to the general education curriculum).

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

If teachers effectively implemented SDI (Specially Designed Instruction), the problem would be reduced in ELA and math by 15%.

Action Steps to Implement

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

Teachers meet in PLCs at least twice per month to share ways they are incorporating HOT Qs and collaboration into their lessons and what effect placing students in the productive struggle is having on student growth. In PLCs teachers also share ways to support students who continue to struggle with engagement in collaboration around complex tasks like HOT Qs.

Person Responsible

Kristy Therrien (therrienk@pcsb.org)

ELA and reading teachers receive professional development around B.E.S.T. Benchmarks, HOT Questions, and collaborative structures.

Person Responsible

Karen Mallory (malloryk@pcsb.org)

Administrators monitor and support the implementation of the use of grade-appropriate B.E.S.T. complex texts and connected tasks, like HOT Q's in reading and ELA classrooms through classroom observation.

Person Responsible Karen Mallory (malloryk@pcsb.org)

Place students in the appropriate level ELA class to ensure they are being challenged with the right amount of rigor, including placing high Level 2 EL scholars in an Intensive Reading class using the Acceleration Framework (1. Generate Thinking, Purpose, Relevance, and Curiosity, 2. Clearly Articulate the Learning Goal and Expectations, 3. Scaffold and Practice Essential Prerequisite Skills, 4. Introduce New Vocabulary and Review Prior Vocabulary, 5. Dip into the New Concept, and 6. Conduct Formative Assessment Frequently).

Person Responsible Karen Mallory (malloryk@pcsb.org)

Teachers utilize systemic documents (adopted curriculum, pacing guides, etc.) to effectively plan for mathematics units that incorporate the Mathematical Thinking and Reasoning Standards and rigorous performance tasks aligned to the B.E.S.T. Benchmarks for Mathematics.

Person Responsible Christopher Alford (alfordch@pcsb.org)

Teachers provide students with at least 1 differentiated learning opportunity within each unit of instruction that addresses either 1) the students' mathematical readiness, 2) the students' interests as related to the mathematics they are learning, and/or 3) the students' choice of how to learn the material (learner profile).

Person Responsible Christopher Alford (alfordch@pcsb.org)

Teachers utilize IXL's Diagnostic Arena to have students address mathematical skills gaps from their individualized Action Plans with an emphasis on utilizing the program outside of the school day to extend learning beyond the classroom.

Person Responsible Christopher Alford (alfordch@pcsb.org)

#6. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Black/African-American**Area of Focus****Description and Rationale:**

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

Our current level of performance is 19% of our students are proficient on the 2022 FSA ELA and on the 2022 FSA Math. The problem/gap in ELA is occurring because students are not being challenged with higher order thinking questions on a routine basis which allows them to actively participate in the learning. The problem/gap in Math is occurring because learning targets and learning tasks are not differentiated to address student readiness, interest, and learning profile of the students with regards to mathematics.

Measurable**Outcome:**

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

We expect our performance level to increase from 19% to 34% of our SWD students meeting proficiency by Spring 2023 Progress Monitoring assessment F.A.S.T. in ELA and from 19% to 34% in Math.

Monitoring:

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

Monitoring will occur through daily walkthroughs, as well as an analysis of data, both formal and informal.

Person

responsible for monitoring outcome:

Kristy Therrien (therrienk@pcsb.org)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

Enhance staff capacity to identify content from the BEST Benchmarks that will create opportunities for collaboration around higher order thinking questions and allow students to enter a productive struggle and implement Culturally Relevant Teaching with fidelity.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

Implement Culturally Relevant Teaching (CRT) with fidelity, which engages scholars more effectively in the learning process. It is based on the pedagogy in which every scholar brings specific cultural enhancements to the classroom. As teachers incorporate those cultural strengths into their instruction, scholars will more actively engage in this supportive environment and the problem would be reduced by 15%.

Action Steps to Implement

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

Teachers meet in PLCs at least twice per month to share ways they are incorporating HOT Qs and collaboration into their lessons and what effect placing students in the productive struggle is having on student growth. In PLCs teachers also share ways to support students who continue to struggle with engagement in collaboration around complex tasks like HOT Qs.

Person Responsible Kristy Therrien (therrienk@pcsb.org)

Teachers utilize systemic documents (adopted curriculum, pacing guides, etc.) to effectively plan for mathematics units that incorporate the Mathematical Thinking and Reasoning Standards and rigorous performance tasks aligned to the B.E.S.T. Benchmarks for Mathematics.

Person Responsible Christopher Alford (alfordch@pcsb.org)

Teachers provide students with at least 1 differentiated learning opportunity within each unit of instruction that addresses either 1) the students' mathematical readiness, 2) the students' interests as related to the mathematics they are learning, and/or 3) the students' choice of how to learn the material (learner profile).

Person Responsible Christopher Alford (alfordch@pcsb.org)

ELA and reading teachers receive professional development around B.E.S.T. Benchmarks, HOT Questions, and collaborative structures.

Person Responsible Karen Mallory (malloryk@pcsb.org)

Teachers will facilitate a 15-minute SEL (Social-Emotional Learning) block each day, which includes circle discussions and cultural activities centered on social and emotional issues impacting the learning environment.

Person Responsible Karen Mallory (malloryk@pcsb.org)

#7. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to English Language Learners**Area of Focus****Description and Rationale:**

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

Our current level of performance is 20% of our students are proficient on the 2022 FSA ELA and 28% on the FSA Math. The problem/gap is occurring because students are not being challenged with higher order thinking questions on a routine basis in ELA and challenged with rigorous instruction in math, which allows them to actively participate in the learning.

Measurable Outcome:

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

We expect our performance level to increase from 20% to 35% of our ELL students meeting proficiency by Spring 2023 Progress Monitoring assessment F.A.S.T. in ELA and from 28% to 43% in Math.

Monitoring:

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

Monitoring will occur through daily walkthroughs, as well as an analysis of data, both formal and informal.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

[no one identified]

Evidence-based**Strategy:**

Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

Enhance staff capacity to identify content from the BEST Benchmarks that will create opportunities for collaboration around higher order thinking questions and allow students to enter a productive struggle and implement Culturally Relevant Teaching with fidelity.

Rationale for Evidence-based**Strategy:**

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

Implement Culturally Relevant Teaching (CRT) with fidelity, which engages scholars more effectively in the learning process. It is based on the pedagogy in which every scholar brings specific cultural enhancements to the classroom. As teachers incorporate those cultural strengths into their instruction, scholars will more actively engage in this supportive environment and the problem would be reduced by 15%.

Action Steps to Implement

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

Teachers meet in PLCs at least twice per month to share ways they are incorporating HOT Qs and collaboration into their lessons and what effect placing students in the productive struggle is having on student growth. In PLCs teachers also share ways to support students who continue to struggle with engagement in collaboration around complex tasks like HOT Qs.

Person Responsible Kristy Therrien (therrienk@pcsb.org)

Administrators monitor and support the implementation of the use of grade-appropriate B.E.S.T. complex texts and connected tasks, like HOT Q's in reading and ELA classrooms through classroom observation.

Person Responsible Karen Mallory (malloryk@pcsb.org)

Teachers utilize systemic documents (adopted curriculum, pacing guides, etc.) to effectively plan for mathematics units that incorporate the Mathematical Thinking and Reasoning Standards and rigorous performance tasks aligned to the B.E.S.T. Benchmarks for Mathematics.

Person Responsible Christopher Alford (alfordch@pcsb.org)

Teachers provide students with at least 1 differentiated learning opportunity within each unit of instruction that addresses either 1) the students' mathematical readiness, 2) the students' interests as related to the mathematics they are learning, and/or 3) the students' choice of how to learn the material (learner profile).

Person Responsible Christopher Alford (alfordch@pcsb.org)

ELA and reading teachers receive professional development around B.E.S.T. Benchmarks, HOT Questions, and collaborative structures.

Person Responsible Karen Mallory (malloryk@pcsb.org)

Teachers will facilitate a 15-minute SEL (Social-Emotional Learning) block each day, which includes circle discussions and cultural activities centered on social and emotional issues impacting the learning environment.

Person Responsible Karen Mallory (malloryk@pcsb.org)

Place students in the appropriate level ELA class to ensure they are being challenged with the right amount of rigor, including placing high Level 2 EL scholars in an Intensive Reading class using the Acceleration Framework (1. Generate Thinking, Purpose, Relevance, and Curiosity, 2. Clearly Articulate the Learning Goal and Expectations, 3. Scaffold and Practice Essential Prerequisite Skills, 4. Introduce New Vocabulary and Review Prior Vocabulary, 5. Dip into the New Concept, and 6. Conduct Formative Assessment Frequently).

Person Responsible Karen Mallory (malloryk@pcsb.org)

#8. Transformational Leadership specifically relating to Teacher Recruitment and Retention**Area of Focus****Description and Rationale:**

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

According to the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES), 8% of teachers leave the profession yearly and another 8% move to other schools, bringing the total annual turnover rate to 16%. As the 2021-2022 school year ended and the 2022-2023 school year approached, 21 teachers left and 21 new teachers were hired of the 44 allocated, which placed our turnover rate at 48%.

Measurable Outcome:

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

We expect our recruitment and retention rate to decrease from 48% to 16%.

Monitoring:

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

This will be monitored through Core Value Recognition: Children, Families, & Community; Respectful & Caring Relationships; Cultural Competence; Integrity; Responsibility; and Connectedness.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Kristy Therrien (therrienk@pcsb.org)

Evidence-based**Strategy:**

Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

The PCS Praise Program will be utilized, as well as school-based employee recognition programs, teacher focus groups which meet with the principal, and an employee support system.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Explain the rationale

for selecting this specific strategy.

Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

If we focus on Core Values Recognition, listening to our teachers, and supporting them, the recruitment and retention rate problem would be alleviated by 35%.

Action Steps to Implement

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

Implement the PCS Praise program.

Person Responsible Kristy Therrien (therrienk@pcsb.org)

Meet bi-weekly with teachers on the Principal Focus Group.

Person Responsible Kristy Therrien (therrienk@pcsb.org)

Meet frequently with teachers to understand their concerns and offer support as needed.

Person Responsible Kristy Therrien (therrienk@pcsb.org)

Implement a tired teacher mentor program, which pairs new teachers with buddy teachers.

Person Responsible Christopher Alford (alfordch@pcsb.org)

Conduct periodic social gatherings for teachers.

Person Responsible Kristy Therrien (therrienk@pcsb.org)

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 is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies that impact the school culture and environment. 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.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment.

The school will ensure consistent classroom and school wide policies and follow through. . We will implement our PBIS program and increase both staff and scholar celebrations on a routine basis. We will continue to support one another and work collaboratively to grow ourselves and our scholars. We will assume positive intent and create an empowered mindset.

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

All Staff will work together to keep the school focused and positive.

Administration will support all staff members while building relationships.

All teachers will build relationships with their scholars while providing meaningful, rigorous, standard based instruction that meets the needs of the scholars.

All staff will focus on supporting the scholars and other staff members while speaking positively and uplifting the staff and scholars.

All staff will align their way of work to the district's six core values: cultural competence; integrity; responsibility; connectedness; and commitment to children, families and community.