

Pinellas County Schools

# Pinellas Park High School



## 2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

---

## Table of Contents

---

|                                           |           |
|-------------------------------------------|-----------|
| <b>School Demographics</b>                | <b>3</b>  |
| <b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>     | <b>4</b>  |
| <b>School Information</b>                 | <b>7</b>  |
| <b>Needs Assessment</b>                   | <b>10</b> |
| <b>Planning for Improvement</b>           | <b>14</b> |
| <b>Positive Culture &amp; Environment</b> | <b>0</b>  |
| <b>Budget to Support Goals</b>            | <b>0</b>  |

# Pinellas Park High School

6305 118TH AVE, Largo, FL 33773

<http://www.pp-hs.pinellas.k12.fl.us>

## Demographics

**Principal: Brett Patterson**

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2015

|                                                                                                                                                              |                                                                                                                                                                                                                      |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <b>2019-20 Status</b><br>(per MSID File)                                                                                                                     | Active                                                                                                                                                                                                               |
| <b>School Type and Grades Served</b><br>(per MSID File)                                                                                                      | High School<br>9-12                                                                                                                                                                                                  |
| <b>Primary Service Type</b><br>(per MSID File)                                                                                                               | K-12 General Education                                                                                                                                                                                               |
| <b>2021-22 Title I School</b>                                                                                                                                | Yes                                                                                                                                                                                                                  |
| <b>2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b><br>(as reported on Survey 3)                                                                            | 99%                                                                                                                                                                                                                  |
| <b>2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b><br>(subgroups with 10 or more students)<br>(subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Students With Disabilities*<br>English Language Learners<br>Asian Students<br>Black/African American Students*<br>Hispanic Students<br>Multiracial Students<br>White Students<br>Economically Disadvantaged Students |
| <b>School Grades History</b>                                                                                                                                 | 2021-22: C (50%)<br>2018-19: C (51%)<br>2017-18: B (54%)                                                                                                                                                             |
| <b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>                                                                                                          |                                                                                                                                                                                                                      |
| <b>SI Region</b>                                                                                                                                             | Central                                                                                                                                                                                                              |
| <b>Regional Executive Director</b>                                                                                                                           | <a href="#">Lucinda Thompson</a>                                                                                                                                                                                     |
| <b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>                                                                                                                               | N/A                                                                                                                                                                                                                  |
| <b>Year</b>                                                                                                                                                  |                                                                                                                                                                                                                      |
| <b>Support Tier</b>                                                                                                                                          |                                                                                                                                                                                                                      |
| <b>ESSA Status</b>                                                                                                                                           | ATSI                                                                                                                                                                                                                 |
| * As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, <a href="#">click here</a> .                                         |                                                                                                                                                                                                                      |

## School Board Approval

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

## SIP Authority

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

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

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

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

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

## Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

---

## Table of Contents

---

|                                       |           |
|---------------------------------------|-----------|
| <b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b> | <b>4</b>  |
| <b>School Information</b>             | <b>7</b>  |
| <b>Needs Assessment</b>               | <b>10</b> |
| <b>Planning for Improvement</b>       | <b>14</b> |
| <b>Title I Requirements</b>           | <b>0</b>  |
| <b>Budget to Support Goals</b>        | <b>0</b>  |

## Pinellas Park High School

6305 118TH AVE, Largo, FL 33773

<http://www.pp-hs.pinellas.k12.fl.us>

### School Demographics

| School Type and Grades Served<br>(per MSID File) | 2021-22 Title I School | 2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate<br>(as reported on Survey 3) |
|--------------------------------------------------|------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| High School<br>9-12                              | Yes                    | 99%                                                                        |
| Primary Service Type<br>(per MSID File)          | Charter School         | 2018-19 Minority Rate<br>(Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)               |
| K-12 General Education                           | No                     | 59%                                                                        |

### 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 educate and prepare each student for 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     |
|--------------------|---------------------|-------------------------------------|
| Patterson, Brett   | Principal           | Instructional Leader                |
| Adams, James       | Assistant Principal | Assistant Principal for Athletics   |
| Peppers, Paul      | Assistant Principal | First Responders Magnet Coordinator |
| Bingler, Alyssa    | Instructional Coach | MTSS Coach                          |
| Napier, Jennifer   | Teacher, K-12       | Teacher leader                      |
| Newman, Kailynn    | Graduation Coach    | Acceleration and AICE Support       |
| Wiggers, Mary Beth | Instructional Coach | Student support                     |
| Bogatz, Cassandra  | Assistant Principal |                                     |
| Leitold, Kim       | Assistant Principal | Assistant Principal                 |

### Demographic Information

**Principal start date**

Wednesday 7/1/2015, Brett Patterson

**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.*

6

**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.*

16

**Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school**

86

**Total number of students enrolled at the school**

2,028

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

16

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

20

### 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 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 577 | 476 | 400 | 412 | 1865  |
| Attendance below 90 percent                              | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 278 | 276 | 230 | 251 | 1035  |
| One or more suspensions                                  | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 56  | 36  | 28  | 21  | 141   |
| Course failure in ELA                                    | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 116 | 60  | 75  | 7   | 258   |
| Course failure in Math                                   | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 117 | 81  | 90  | 22  | 310   |
| Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment             | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   |       |
| Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment            | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   |       |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   |       |
|                                                          | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   |       |

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 | 255 | 235 | 212 | 197 | 899   |

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 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2  | 0  | 0  | 4     |
| 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**

Tuesday 6/28/2022

**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 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 545 | 503 | 492 | 381 | 1921  |
| Attendance below 90 percent                              | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 192 | 183 | 167 | 164 | 706   |
| One or more suspensions                                  | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 33  | 26  | 5   | 5   | 69    |
| Course failure in ELA                                    | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 95  | 97  | 84  | 5   | 281   |
| Course failure in Math                                   | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 157 | 125 | 110 | 22  | 414   |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment             | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 163 | 145 | 128 | 85  | 521   |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment            | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 75  | 51  | 43  | 0   | 169   |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 314 | 323 | 210 | 190 | 1037  |

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

| Indicator                            | Grade Level |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |     |     |     |     | Total |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|-----|-----|-----|-----|-------|
|                                      | K           | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9   | 10  | 11  | 12  |       |
| Students with two or more indicators | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 252 | 201 | 162 | 129 | 744   |

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

| Indicator                           | Grade Level |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |    |    | Total |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
|                                     | K           | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |       |
| Retained Students: Current Year     | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |       |
| 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 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 545 | 503 | 492 | 381 | 1921  |
| Attendance below 90 percent                              | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 192 | 183 | 167 | 164 | 706   |
| One or more suspensions                                  | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 33  | 26  | 5   | 5   | 69    |
| Course failure in ELA                                    | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 95  | 97  | 84  | 5   | 281   |
| Course failure in Math                                   | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 157 | 125 | 110 | 22  | 414   |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment             | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 163 | 145 | 128 | 85  | 521   |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment            | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 75  | 51  | 43  | 0   | 169   |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 314 | 323 | 210 | 190 | 1037  |

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

| Indicator                            | Grade Level |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |     |     |     |     |     | Total |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-------|
|                                      | K           | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9   | 10  | 11  | 12  |     |       |
| Students with two or more indicators | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 252 | 201 | 162 | 129 | 744 |       |

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

| Indicator                           | Grade Level |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |    |    | Total |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
|                                     | K           | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |       |
| Retained Students: Current Year     | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |       |
| 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             | 38%    | 51%      | 51%   |        |          |       | 42%    | 56%      | 56%   |
| ELA Learning Gains          | 45%    |          |       |        |          |       | 46%    | 51%      | 51%   |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile  | 39%    |          |       |        |          |       | 40%    | 43%      | 42%   |
| Math Achievement            | 30%    | 38%      | 38%   |        |          |       | 36%    | 45%      | 51%   |
| Math Learning Gains         | 41%    |          |       |        |          |       | 40%    | 44%      | 48%   |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 41%    |          |       |        |          |       | 34%    | 41%      | 45%   |
| Science Achievement         | 46%    | 42%      | 40%   |        |          |       | 50%    | 64%      | 68%   |
| Social Studies Achievement  | 61%    | 47%      | 48%   |        |          |       | 73%    | 71%      | 73%   |

**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 |

| MATH  |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|-------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |

| SCIENCE |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|---------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade   | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |

| BIOLOGY EOC  |        |          |                       |       |                    |
|--------------|--------|----------|-----------------------|-------|--------------------|
| Year         | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2022         |        |          |                       |       |                    |
| 2019         | 48%    | 62%      | -14%                  | 67%   | -19%               |
| CIVICS EOC   |        |          |                       |       |                    |
| Year         | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2022         |        |          |                       |       |                    |
| 2019         |        |          |                       |       |                    |
| HISTORY EOC  |        |          |                       |       |                    |
| Year         | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2022         |        |          |                       |       |                    |
| 2019         | 74%    | 70%      | 4%                    | 70%   | 4%                 |
| ALGEBRA EOC  |        |          |                       |       |                    |
| Year         | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2022         |        |          |                       |       |                    |
| 2019         | 28%    | 55%      | -27%                  | 61%   | -33%               |
| GEOMETRY EOC |        |          |                       |       |                    |
| Year         | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2022         |        |          |                       |       |                    |
| 2019         | 41%    | 56%      | -15%                  | 57%   | -16%               |

## 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                                       | 19       | 34     | 28          | 15        | 26      | 30           | 29       | 40      |           | 89                | 38                  |
| ELL                                       | 20       | 42     | 45          | 20        | 45      | 31           | 29       | 35      |           | 98                | 50                  |
| ASN                                       | 49       | 50     |             | 64        | 65      |              | 73       | 73      |           | 96                | 85                  |
| BLK                                       | 29       | 36     | 33          | 16        | 49      | 50           | 28       | 52      |           | 98                | 45                  |
| HSP                                       | 38       | 48     | 39          | 30        | 41      | 33           | 42       | 55      |           | 97                | 57                  |
| MUL                                       | 42       | 51     |             | 37        | 33      |              | 44       | 44      |           | 100               | 64                  |
| WHT                                       | 39       | 45     | 43          | 31        | 38      | 41           | 52       | 68      |           | 98                | 64                  |
| FRL                                       | 32       | 43     | 38          | 25        | 42      | 43           | 41       | 51      |           | 97                | 55                  |
| 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                                       | 17       | 27     | 22          | 28        | 35      | 40           | 33       | 49      |           | 84                | 22                  |
| ELL                                       | 20       | 37     | 27          | 23        | 24      | 39           | 34       | 52      |           | 99                | 45                  |
| ASN                                       | 56       | 57     |             | 53        | 50      |              | 73       | 54      |           | 100               | 61                  |
| BLK                                       | 22       | 34     | 23          | 18        | 23      | 28           | 34       | 28      |           | 94                | 45                  |
| HSP                                       | 34       | 38     | 24          | 22        | 22      | 40           | 42       | 62      |           | 98                | 46                  |
| MUL                                       | 28       | 46     |             | 19        | 23      |              | 25       | 47      |           | 100               | 62                  |
| WHT                                       | 38       | 41     | 39          | 31        | 28      | 27           | 48       | 66      |           | 95                | 58                  |
| FRL                                       | 27       | 36     | 26          | 22        | 25      | 32           | 37       | 50      |           | 94                | 49                  |
| 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                                       | 28       | 40     | 24          | 27        | 40      | 39           | 31       | 44      |           | 87                | 27                  |
| ELL                                       | 21       | 40     | 40          | 25        | 30      | 36           | 27       | 55      |           | 93                | 38                  |
| ASN                                       | 55       | 48     |             | 71        | 57      |              | 72       | 87      |           | 98                | 66                  |
| BLK                                       | 27       | 41     | 29          | 20        | 30      | 28           | 22       | 70      |           | 95                | 47                  |
| HSP                                       | 39       | 45     | 43          | 32        | 39      | 46           | 44       | 67      |           | 95                | 45                  |
| MUL                                       | 47       | 24     |             | 32        | 36      |              | 67       | 57      |           | 100               | 60                  |
| WHT                                       | 46       | 50     | 45          | 39        | 41      | 24           | 57       | 78      |           | 91                | 58                  |
| FRL                                       | 36       | 45     | 37          | 35        | 40      | 35           | 45       | 71      |           | 91                | 52                  |

## 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)                 | ATSI |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students         | 50   |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students | NO   |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 1    |

| ESSA Federal Index                                                              |     |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|
| Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency | 47  |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index                                       | 547 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index                                          | 11  |
| Percent Tested                                                                  | 97% |
| Subgroup Data                                                                   |     |
| Students With Disabilities                                                      |     |
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities                                      | 34  |
| Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?              | YES |
| Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%       | 0   |
| English Language Learners                                                       |     |
| Federal Index - English Language Learners                                       | 42  |
| English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?               | NO  |
| 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                                                  | 70  |
| 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                                 | 44  |
| Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?         | NO  |
| Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%  | 0   |
| Hispanic Students                                                               |     |
| Federal Index - Hispanic Students                                               | 48  |
| Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?                       | NO  |
| Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%                | 0   |

| Multiracial Students                                                               |     |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|
| Federal Index - Multiracial Students                                               | 52  |
| Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?                       | NO  |
| 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                                                     | 49  |
| 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                                | 46  |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?        | NO  |
| 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?

FSA EOC Data reflects the content area with the most significant need of support is Math. Although the math data reflects the most significant need, ELA has the largest student impact and must be an area of focus for the 2022-23 school year.

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

Mathematics achievement was our lowest overall proficiency at 30% for the 21-22 school year. Although math represents the lowest overall achievement, math gains represents the highest overall growth. This growth reflects a similar growth pattern established during progress monitoring cycle 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?

Math made gains in all assessed areas, however the algebra/geometry achievement score of 30 still represents a marked need of improvement. Increase site-based and district support would equip the teachers to better support their students.

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

Math demonstrated the highest growth in achievement and gains.

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

The inclusion of the Algebra I tutor to support individual students as well as the use of an equitable grading process. Math teachers collaborated to establish common assessments and restorative practices to ensure students had multiple opportunities to demonstrate mastery of content.

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

Increase in content PLC's to build on common assessment usage and review of student work to adjust instruction to maximize learning.

**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.**

Instructional staff will participate in professional development related to Focused Note Taking and Equitable Grading. Both areas support our goal of providing students an equitable opportunity to instruction and learning.

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

Pinellas Park High School has been heavily engaged with Restorative Practice and equity for the past four years. The efforts have been demonstrating positive trends in our gap data in several measured areas. We will continue our dedication to the engagement of instructional staff related to increasing differentiating the support of our students.

### **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.**

In the classrooms, we are seeing tasks that lack benchmark alignment and appropriate complexity. The problem/gap is occurring because learning tasks are not designed to meet the full depth and rigor of the benchmarks. If student tasks were more aligned and at the appropriate level of complexity, the problem would be reduced, and student performance would increase.

**Measurable Outcome:**

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

The percent of all students achieving ELA proficiency will increase from 38% to 45%, as measured by the Spring 2023 State ELA/Reading Assessment.

**Monitoring:**

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

The Area of Focus will be monitored through common formative assessments, unit assessments, and PM assessment data, as well as administrative walk-through assessments, lesson planning, PLC's, Intervention programs: Lexia PowerUP , and Oral Reading Fluency assessments.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Kim Leitold (leitoldk@pcsb.org)

**Evidence-based Strategy:**

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

1. Enhance staff capacity to identify critical content from the BEST Benchmark to ensure appropriate complexity.
2. Support staff to incorporate collaboration in daily activity.
3. Organize students for effective differentiation.
4. Continued use of Focused Note Taking in classrooms.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:**

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

1. The FAST Assessment has complex questions that require students to respond at a higher level than historically practiced in the classroom. Collaboration/differentiation will help students reach the complexity of the benchmarks.
2. With the new ELA/Reading BEST Benchmarks teachers will collaborate with site-based and district support to ensure proficiency of instructional practice.

**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.

1. ELA and Reading teachers will receive professional development around BEST Benchmarks, student collaboration, differentiation strategies.
2. ELA/Reading teachers will PLC around effective data analysis/interpretation.
3. ELA and Reading teachers conduct data chats with students to support students with setting goals and action plans to increase their learning.
4. ELA teachers collaborate to design the tasks that will drive the needs of a variety of learners and uphold the rigor identified in critical content.
5. ELA and Reading teachers will collaborate to implement the use of Focused Notetaking to enhance the rigor of lessons.



6. Teachers will utilize their monthly PLC's and common planning to review student work to determine how students are making gains towards benchmarks through cognitively complex tasks.
7. Teachers will facilitate the use of Focused Note Taking and student choice materials.
8. Teachers will use district resources/support to support student growth based on assessment data.

**Person Responsible**      Kim Leitold (leitoldk@pcsb.org)

**#2. 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.**

1. Our current level of performance is 30% of students earning a level 3 or above as evidenced in our school mathematics achievement data on FSA Mathematics End of Course Assessments. We expect our performance level to be 35% by June 2023.
2. Learning gains were 41%, in our school mathematics learning gains data on FSA Mathematics End of Course Assessments. We expect our learning gains to be 45% by June 2023.
3. Learning gains of L25 were 41%, in our school mathematics L25 learning gains data on FSA Mathematics End of Course Assessments. We expect our performance level to be 45% by June 2023.

**Measurable Outcome:**

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

The percent of all students achieving Math proficiency will increase from 30% to 35%, as measured by FSA EOC's. The percent of all students achieving learning gains will increase from 41% to 45%, as measured by FSA EOC's. The percent of L25 students achieving learning gains will increase from 41% to 45%, as measured by FSA EOC's.

**Monitoring:**

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

The Area of Focus will be monitored through common unit assessments, cycle assessment data, and classroom walkthroughs.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Paul Peppers (peppersp@pcsb.org)

**Evidence-based Strategy:**

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

1. Enhance staff's capacity to identify critical content from the standards in alignment with district resources.
2. Strengthen staff's ability to engage students in complex tasks and use questioning strategies to help students elaborate.
3. 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.**

1. We are seeing some positive shifts of high impact instructional practices in walk-throughs of FSA EOC courses.
2. The problem/gap is occurring because there has been insufficient emphasis on engaging students in complex tasks that are aligned to the state standards and state test item specifications.
3. If an increased level of standards-based instruction at an increased level of rigor and relevance would occur, the problem would be reduced and we would see an increase in our overall math achievement levels.

**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 intentionally plan in Professional Learning Community (PLC) groups and plan for:

- students to engage in complex tasks that are aligned to the content standards.
- students to engage in Collaborative Study Groups and writing to reflect learning.
- utilization of questioning strategies to deepen student understanding.

- students to take focused notes and purposefully use them.
- differentiation and scaffolding to meet all student's needs.
- effective use of the Algebra 1 Tutor.

**Person Responsible** Paul Peppers (peppersp@pcsb.org)

Teachers will implement targeted tutoring with the Algebra 1 Tutor.

**Person Responsible** Paul Peppers (peppersp@pcsb.org)

Teachers utilize performance matters, IXL, and other data points to conduct frequent data chats with student to offer support for student achievement, individualized goal setting, and differentiated instruction.

**Person Responsible** Paul Peppers (peppersp@pcsb.org)

Administrators monitor implementation of the district scope and sequence, district pacing, and district adopted curricular materials.

**Person Responsible** Paul Peppers (peppersp@pcsb.org)

Teachers will include in their DPP's that they will attend and participate in on and off site based professional development and continue growth through PLC's.

**Person Responsible** Paul Peppers (peppersp@pcsb.org)

Teachers will use include AVID Focused Note Taking strategies and standards based grading practices in math classes to create equability by engaging all student in cognitively complex tasks.

**Person Responsible** Paul Peppers (peppersp@pcsb.org)

**#3. 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 46% of students earning a level 3 or above as evidenced in the data from the Biology EOC. The problem/gap is occurring because grade 10 Biology rigor is low and grade 9 and 10 Biology classrooms are heavily teacher-centered. If grade 10 biology rigor increased and grades 9 and 10 shift towards student-centered instruction using AVID, Focused Note Taking Processes, the problem/gap could be reduced, and student achievement will increase by 9%.

**Measurable****Outcome:**

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

The percent of all students achieving Biology proficiency will increase from 46% to 55%, as measured by Biology EOC.

**Monitoring:**

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

The Area of Focus will be monitored through common formative assessments, unit assessments, and cycle assessment data, as well as administrative walk-through assessments

**Person**

**responsible for monitoring outcome:**

James Adams (adamsjam@pcsb.org)

**Evidence-based Strategy:**

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

1. Strengthen staff's ability to plan and implement instructional tasks that are rigorous, aligned to the standards, pacing guides, and learning scales.
2. Enhance staff capacity to identify critical content from the Standards in alignment with district resources.
3. Support staff to utilize data to organize students opportunity to revisit content reflecting a deficit in comprehension.
4. Increase student's ability to accurately monitor their academic progress through the use of equitable grading practices.
5. Heavily embed the use of Focused Note Taking to ensure students are revisiting targeted content.

**Rationale for****Evidence-based Strategy:**

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

1. The EOC has complex questions that require students to respond to at a higher level than historically practiced in the classroom. Exposing students to similar level activities and questions during instruction will increase success on the EOC.
2. Teachers can use cycle assessment data and unit assessment data to provide students with deliberate remediation in bellwork activities.
3. Teachers will use results from common assessments in PLC's to share successful instructional strategies.
4. Efficiently using Focused Note Taking and other Science Through Writing strategies increases comprehension in identified topics.

**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.

Meet in bi-weekly PLC groups to plan and reflect on instructional tasks that are rigorous, aligned to the standards, pacing guides, and learning scales.

Teachers will participate in district provided site-based PD to increase instructional rigor and inquiry.

**Person Responsible** James Adams (adamsjam@pcsb.org)

Analyze cycle assessment data and common unit assessments data for areas of remediation and build questions into daily bellwork and future assessments.

**Person Responsible** James Adams (adamsjam@pcsb.org)

Meet with students to review their common assessment/unit assessment data in performance matters. Conduct student data chats to examine areas of success and areas of needed growth in specific standards. Teachers will guide students to set goals for their common, unit, and cycle assessments, and develop action steps to reach individual goals.

**Person Responsible** James Adams (adamsjam@pcsb.org)

Teachers will collaborate to establish equitable grading practices including standards based proficiency recovery.

Teachers can utilize district resources to support remediating lower performing standards.

**Person Responsible** James Adams (adamsjam@pcsb.org)

**#4. 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 61% of students earning a level 3 or above as evidenced in the data from the US History EOC. The problem/gap is occurring because the focus is on memorization/recording of notes rather than revising, processing, retention and making connections to apply the learning.

**Measurable Outcome:**

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

The percent of all students achieving US History proficiency will increase from 61% to 65%, as measured by the US History EOC.

**Monitoring:**

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

The Area of Focus will be monitored through common formative assessments, unit assessments, and cycle assessment data, as well as administrative walk-through assessments.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Cassandra Bogatz (bogatzc@pcsb.org)

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

1. Strengthen staff's ability to select an appropriate note-taking format that will engage students in the note-taking process.
2. Enhance staff's understanding of how to revisit notes with students in a way where they are connecting the learning to previous knowledge.
3. Support staff to utilize cycle assessment data that plans for remediation of standards using prior notes as a resource.
4. Heavily embed the use of Focused Note Taking to ensure students are revisiting targeted content.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:**

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

1. The EOC has complex questions that require students to analyze political cartoons
2. Teachers can use cycle assessment data and unit assessment data to provide students with deliberate remediation in bellwork activities.
3. Teachers will use results from common assessments in PLC's to share successful instructional strategies.

**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.

Meeting in bi-weekly PLC groups to look at pacing, cycle assessment blueprints, and discuss appropriate note-taking formats for each unit, increase writing practices through SHEG and DBQ activities.

**Person Responsible**

Cassandra Bogatz (bogatzc@pcsb.org)

Analyze cycle assessment data to determine areas for remediation and build in revision of previous notes to activate and apply previous knowledge.

**Person Responsible**

Cassandra Bogatz (bogatzc@pcsb.org)

Meet with students individually to look at cycle assessment data. Set goals for each cycle assessment and individual areas of remediation.

**Person Responsible**

Cassandra Bogatz (bogatzc@pcsb.org)

**#5. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Graduation****Area of Focus  
Description and****Rationale:**

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

The percentage of seniors meeting college and career readiness will increase to 95% as measured by successful completion of CAPE Industry Certifications, passing of an AP or AICE exam, or passing of a Dual Enrollment course.

**Measurable Outcome:**

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

The percent of all seniors achieving college and career readiness will increase from 61% to 95%.

**Monitoring:**

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

Graduation Coach, in conjunction with administration and school counselors, will monitor the progress of all students with a specific focus on seniors in their Industry Certification, dual enrollment, AICE, and AP classes. The monitoring tools will be teacher feedback, classroom grades, completion status on industry certification exams, and AP courses.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Kailynn Newman (newmank@pcsb.org)

**Evidence-based Strategy:**

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

1. Strengthen staff's ability to engage students in complex task through the incorporation of AVID strategies, such as, Focused Note Taking and Close Reading.
2. Strengthen staff's understanding of AICE through teacher training.
3. 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.
4. Ensure students follow guidance, and receive support, to meet graduation and college/career expectations.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:**

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

The problem/gap with college/career is the caused by the increased need to monitor students in grades 9-11 for appropriate course completion and working towards post-secondary goals.

**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.

Increase awareness for students and families, through increased AVID enrollment and FASFA outreach campaigns, the impact of graduation and college/career readiness on the student's future opportunities.

**Person Responsible**

Kailynn Newman (newmank@pcsb.org)

Meeting with counselors and graduation coaches biweekly to discuss students who needs extra support in acceleration courses.

**Person Responsible**

Cassandra Bogatz (bogatzc@pcsb.org)



**#6. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Graduation****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 96% of seniors earn a high school diploma. The problem/gap is occurring because students cannot meet Math/ELA testing requirements.

**Measurable Outcome:**

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

The percent of all students meeting graduation requirements will increase from 96% to 97% as measured by graduation rate data.

**Monitoring:**

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

Weekly review of current senior off-track status to implement needed supports.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

[no one identified]

**Evidence-based Strategy:**

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

1. Strengthen staff's ability to engage students in complex tasks.
2. Increase student interest and support through PBIS and Social Emotional learning.
3. Utilize data to organize students to interact with content that differentiates/scaffolds instruction to meet the needs of each student to increase achievement on needed assessments.

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

1. Students can become disengaged in learning when they have been unsuccessful on assessments for multiple years and grades.
2. Providing opportunities and support increases the probability students will meet graduation assessment requirements.

**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.

Increase awareness for students and families the impact of graduation and college/career readiness on the student's future opportunities.

Ensure students receive needed support for successful completion of needed assessments.

**Person Responsible**

Brett Patterson (pattersonb@pcsb.org)

Increase monitoring processes for all students through weekly SBLT.

**Person Responsible**

Brett Patterson (pattersonb@pcsb.org)



**#7. 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.

1. The percentage of Black students receiving D/Fs in core instruction is disproportionate as compared to non-Black students. Black students are 1.25 times more likely to have a D or F in a core class at the end of each semester.
2. We expect our ratio to decrease to 1 or less each semester.
3. The problem/gap can be mitigated by engaging instructional and administrative staff in conversations, professional development, and practice related to equitable grading.
4. If more teachers employ effective equitable grading practices, the problem would be reduced, and the gap between Black and non-Black students on the D/F list would decrease by .25. This specific focus will impact all students positively by providing more equitable access to standards-based instruction by incorporating systems that are restorative and responsive to students' unique academic needs.

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

The ratio of Black to non-Black students receiving a D or F will decrease by .25 each semester as measured by course semester grades.

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

1. Students will be monitored through weekly gradebook reviews to ensure supports and interventions are implemented in a timely manner.
2. Monitoring will be conducted by Student Success Coaches, MTSS Specialist,
3. Guidance and Admin through weekly progress report review, cycle assessment data when available

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Brett Patterson (pattersonb@pcsb.org)

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

Including common assessments and equitable grading practices will increase the student's knowledge of their academic status and provide a clear path to remediation and recovery.

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

Establishing a clear path for our students that measures their proficiency in standards-based learning must be the guiding principle of our practice.

**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.

***No action steps were entered for this area of focus***

**#8. 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.**

1. Our current level of performance is 34%, as evidenced in Spring 2022 ESSA Assessment Data.
2. We expect our performance level to be 45% by June 2023.
3. The problem/gap is occurring because insufficient emphasis on using high impact instructional practices and providing intentional support in ELA courses.
4. If engaging students in their own learning through intentional support and using high impact instructional practices and complex tasks would occur, the performance would increase by 6%.

**Measurable Outcome:**

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

The percent of ESE students achieving ELA proficiency will increase from 34% to 45% , as measured by FAST ELA.

**Monitoring:**

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

The Area of Focus will be monitored through teacher generated unit assessments, district cycle assessment, and course grades.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Brett Patterson (pattersonb@pcsb.org)

**Evidence-based Strategy:**

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

1. Students requiring ESE services work towards mastery of meaningful Individualized Education Plan goals while learning the foundational skills they need to engage in rigorous, grade-level content in the Least Restrictive Environment.
2. Ensure that students requiring ESE services receive instruction designed to each students to advocate for their academic, social, and emotional needs.
3. 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.**

1. The problem/gap is occurring because insufficient emphasis on using high impact instructional practices and providing intentional support in ELA Courses.
2. Students will have more use of their IEP Accommodations if they know when and how to ask for them. Students that are part of their IEP action plan will have more success by getting the help they are afforded.
3. Differentiating and scaffolding ensure that all students meet the same rigorous standards. SWD's can especially benefit from this type of teaching and pacing. (teachers and support staff)

**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.

Classroom teachers will receive an increased level of support from scheduled VE teacher to ensure teaching and learning reach every student.

**Person Responsible**

Brett Patterson (pattersonb@pcsb.org)

Teachers conduct intentional data chats with students to offer support for student achievement and individualized goal setting.

**Person Responsible**

Brett Patterson (pattersonb@pcsb.org)

ESE Teachers to attend content PLC's to incorporate strategies and course focus; as well as, attending ESE PLC for compliance

**Person Responsible**

Brett Patterson (pattersonb@pcsb.org)

**#9. 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.**

1. Our current level of performance is 42%, as evidenced in Spring 2022 FSA ESSA data .
2. We expect our performance level to be 45% by June 2023.

**Measurable Outcome:**

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

The percent of ELL students achieving ELA proficiency will increase from 39% to 45%, as measured by FSA ESSA Data.

**Monitoring:**

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

The Area of Focus will be monitored through unit assessments and cycle assessment data of identified students.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Kim Leitold (leitoldk@pcsb.org)

**Evidence-based Strategy:**

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

1. Each teacher plans and delivers lessons that meet the needs of EL students based on English language proficiency levels and length of time in U.S. schools to ensure academic success of each EL in their class
2. Establish meaningful communication with families and a parent involvement plan that is carried out in the home language, is sustained over time, and is responsive to the cultural experiences of the EL families.

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

1. The problem/gap is occurring because insufficient emphasis on using high impact instructional practices and providing intentional support in ELA Courses.
3. Differentiating and scaffolding ensure that all students meet the same rigorous standards. EL's can especially benefit from this type of teaching and pacing. (teachers and support staff)

**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.

Monitor placement into AVID and accelerated classes to increase access of Hispanic and EL students to acceleration opportunities.

**Person Responsible**

Kim Leitold (leitoldk@pcsb.org)

Develop and implement an effective process to distribute information on language proficiency levels and length of time in U.S. schools information and data for each student coded LY to each teacher who works with the student

**Person Responsible**

Kim Leitold (leitoldk@pcsb.org)

Improve school plan for meaningful and ongoing communication with families via the website, newsletter, parent letters, etc. and ensure communication is available in languages spoken by ELs; Utilize Lion Bridge Interpretation phone services and bilingual assistant services.

**Person Responsible**

Kim Leitold (leitoldk@pcsb.org)

Communicate availability, benefits, purpose, and structure of ELP programs available in school, as well as the parent information nights to the families in Spanish.

**Person Responsible**

Kim Leitold (leitoldk@pcsb.org)

Monitor the LF student performance to ensure academic success or provide appropriate supports; monitor implementation of testing accommodations for LF students to ensure consistency schoolwide

**Person Responsible**

Kim Leitold (leitoldk@pcsb.org)

## #10. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Career & Technical Education

### Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

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

Enrollment and success in CTE programs increased, prompting student engagement in school creating a positive impact on attendance and grades. Additionally, CTE courses are directly tied to students opportunity for post-secondary credits and certifications.

### Measurable Outcome:

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

College and Career Readiness is 61% and expected to increase to 95% by May 2023.

### Monitoring:

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

The Area of Focus will be monitored through examining student schedules and completion of programs.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Cassandra Bogatz (bogatzc@pcsb.org)

### Evidence-based Strategy:

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

1. School Counselors, teachers and administrators will discuss the importance CTE programs and the relationship between school engagement and academic success.
2. The addition of new program offerings align student interests and career and college preparations increases excitement and opportunity.

### Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

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

1. School Counselors, teachers and administrators will discuss the importance CTE programs and the relationship between school engagement and academic success.

### 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.

Establish clear paths/programs that resonate with students to increase enrollment and engagement.

**Person Responsible**

Cassandra Bogatz (bogatzc@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.

1. Increase communication and opportunity for parents/guardians to participate in school related offerings.
2. Utilize social media to increase communication with parents
3. Parent/family meetings/webinars to communicate school and classroom processes and procedures.
4. Develop and implement activities to build respect and trust between home and school
5. Utilize focus groups to gather parents and family input for development of school improvement
6. Provide parent/family events to increase opportunities and knowledge of how students can receive more support from home.

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

Teachers-support student success, promote PBIS, create a positive, equitable, culturally inclusive climate in the classroom

Students and their families- attend student success nights, follow school Social Media accounts

Volunteers- mentor students and support them towards achieving academic and personal goals

Local Business partners- provide opportunities for students to shadow or on the job train. Provide employment opportunities after high school.

Local colleges-work with school counselors and students to support the transition between high school and college.