

Pinellas County Schools

Fitzgerald Middle School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	9
III. Planning for Improvement	14
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	28
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	0
VI. Title I Requirements	28
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

Fitzgerald Middle School

6410 118TH AVE, Largo, FL 33773

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

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes (F.S.), requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a new, amended, or continuation SIP for each school in the district which has a school grade of D or F; has a significant gap in achievement on statewide, standardized assessments administered pursuant to s. 1008.22 by one or more student subgroups, as defined in the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), 20 U.S.C. s. 6311(b)(2)(C)(v)(II); has not significantly increased the percentage of students passing statewide, standardized assessments; has not significantly increased the percentage of students demonstrating Learning Gains, as defined in s. 1008.34, and as calculated under s. 1008.34(3)(b), who passed statewide, standardized assessments; has been identified as requiring instructional supports under the Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE) program established in s. 1008.365; or has significantly lower graduation rates for a subgroup when compared to the state's graduation rate. Rule 6A-1.098813, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.), requires district school boards to approve a SIP for each Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) school in the district rated as Unsatisfactory.

Below are the criteria for identification of traditional public and public charter schools pursuant to the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) State plan:

Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)

A school not identified for CSI or TSI, but has one or more subgroups with a Federal Index below 41%.

Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)

A school not identified as CSI that has at least one consistently underperforming subgroup with a Federal Index below 32% for three consecutive years.

Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)

A school can be identified as CSI in any of the following four ways:

1. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%;
2. Have a graduation rate at or below 67%;
3. Have a school grade of D or F; or
4. Have a Federal Index below 41% in the same subgroup(s) for 6 consecutive years.

ESEA sections 1111(d) requires that each school identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI develop a support and improvement plan created in partnership with stakeholders (including principals and other school leaders, teachers and parent), is informed by all indicators in the State's accountability system, includes evidence-based interventions, is based on a school-level needs assessment, and identifies resource inequities to be addressed through implementation of the plan. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as TSI, ATSI and non-Title I CSI must be approved and monitored by the school district. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as Title I, CSI must be approved by the school district and

Department. The Department must monitor and periodically review implementation of each CSI plan after approval.

The Department's SIP template in the Florida Continuous Improvement Management System (CIMS), <https://www.floridacims.org>, meets all state and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all ESSA components for a support and improvement plan required for traditional public and public charter schools identified as CSI, TSI and ATSI, and eligible schools applying for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) funds.

Districts may allow schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions to develop a SIP using the template in CIMS.

The responses to the corresponding sections in the Department's SIP template may address the requirements for: 1) Title I schools operating a schoolwide program (SWD), pursuant to ESSA, as amended, Section 1114(b); and 2) charter schools that receive a school grade of D or F or three consecutive grades below C, pursuant to Rule 6A-1.099827, F.A.C. The chart below lists the applicable requirements.

SIP Sections	Title I Schoolwide Program	Charter Schools
I-A: School Mission/Vision		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(1)
I-B-C: School Leadership, Stakeholder Involvement & SIP Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(2-3)	
I-E: Early Warning System	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-A-C: Data Review		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-F: Progress Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(3)	
III-A: Data Analysis/Reflection	ESSA 1114(b)(6)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(4)
III-B: Area(s) of Focus	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(i-iii)	
III-C: Other SI Priorities		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(5-9)
VI: Title I Requirements	ESSA 1114(b)(2, 4-5), (7)(A)(iii)(I-V)-(B) ESSA 1116(b-g)	

Note: Charter schools that are also Title I must comply with the requirements in both columns.

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 Department 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.

I. School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

Our mission is to provide the highest academic achievement through a positive and safe learning environment to prepare each scholar for college, career, and life.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Our vision is for 100% scholar success.

School Leadership Team, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring

School Leadership Team

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 as it relates to SIP implementation for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Hawthorne, Ija	Principal	
Douglass, Christine	Assistant Principal	
Donnelly, Leah	Assistant Principal	
O'Mara, Amanda	Assistant Principal	
Chan, Christina	Teacher, K-12	
Tunstall , Brittany	Teacher, K-12	This person has the responsibility for guiding and directing the learning experiences of students in a group or class within a middle school classroom.
Meridy, Desire	Teacher, K-12	

Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Development

Describe the process for involving stakeholders (including the school leadership team, teachers and school staff, parents, students (mandatory for secondary schools) and families, and business or community leaders) and how their input was used in the SIP development process. (ESSA 1114(b)(2))

Note: If a School Advisory Council is used to fulfill these requirements, it must include all required stakeholders.

During the end of the school year the leadership team met with their respective departments to review our previous SIP and gain input from teachers and school staff. This information was consolidated to assist in creating our 4 primary instructional focuses for this school year. The leadership team also met with our SAC to review where we started and how we ended the 2022-2023 school year.

SIP Monitoring

Describe how the SIP will be regularly monitored for effective implementation and impact on increasing the achievement of students in meeting the State's academic standards, particularly for those students with the greatest achievement gap. Describe how the school will revise the plan, as necessary, to ensure continuous improvement. (ESSA 1114(b)(3))

The SIP will be regularly monitored for effective implementation and impact on increasing the achievement of students through bi-weekly PLC's. During this time, teachers/leaders will review data from assessments and various AVID strategies to analyze student work and determine areas of success and areas needed for intervention. We will also review our SIP during our monthly faculty meeting to report out progress and gain feedback for areas that may need to be revised to ensure continuous improvement. The SBLT team and our SAC will work together to review areas of concern and gain feedback from all stakeholders throughout the school year. After each progress monitoring assessment, administration will conduct data chats with teachers using data driven feedback form.

Demographic Data

Only ESSA identification and school grade history updated 3/11/2024

2023-24 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
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	62%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	100%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	TSI
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD)* English Language Learners (ELL)* Asian Students (ASN) Black/African American Students (BLK)* Hispanic Students (HSP)* Multiracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)*
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: C 2019-20: B 2018-19: B 2017-18: C
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

Using 2022-23 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		
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	90	54	64	208	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	37	20	56	113	
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	19	33	14	66	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	12	6	25	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	75	123	116	314	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	90	112	91	293	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	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 that have two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	50	77	65	192

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	6	16
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	10	12	23

Prior Year (2022-23) As Initially Reported (pre-populated)

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

Indicator	Grade Level										Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	143	148	175	466	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	32	57	67	156	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	101	97	135	333	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	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

Prior Year (2022-23) Updated (pre-populated)

Section 3 includes data tables that are pre-populated based off information submitted in prior year's SIP.

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	143	148	175	466
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	32	57	67	156
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	101	97	135	333
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	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

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review

ESSA School, District and State Comparison (pre-populated)

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school or combination schools). Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school.

On April 9, 2021, FDOE Emergency Order No. 2021-EO-02 made 2020-21 school grades optional. They have been removed from this publication.

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	47	49	49	44	46	50	48		
ELA Learning Gains				41			48		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				23			31		
Math Achievement*	52	58	56	49	30	36	52		
Math Learning Gains				49			46		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				37			33		
Science Achievement*	46	48	49	37	52	53	44		
Social Studies Achievement*	70	69	68	64	52	58	52		
Middle School Acceleration	84	77	73	77	44	49	76		
Graduation Rate					45	49			
College and Career Acceleration					66	70			
ELP Progress	21	38	40	53	72	76	33		

** In cases where a school does not test 95% of students in a subject, the achievement component will be different in the Federal Percent of Points Index (FPPI) than in school grades calculation.*

See [Florida School Grades, School Improvement Ratings and DJJ Accountability Ratings](#).

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	TSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	53
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	320
Total Components for the Federal Index	6

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index

Percent Tested	97
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index

ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	TSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	47
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	5
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	474
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	96
Graduation Rate	

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)**2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY**

ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	19	Yes	4	4
ELL	28	Yes	2	1
AMI				
ASN	87			
BLK	41			
HSP	44			
MUL	66			
PAC				
WHT	61			
FRL	44			

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	24	Yes	3	3
ELL	33	Yes	1	
AMI				
ASN	81			
BLK	31	Yes	3	1
HSP	40	Yes	1	
MUL	61			
PAC				
WHT	52			
FRL	40	Yes	1	

Accountability Components by Subgroup

Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school. (pre-populated)

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY 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 2021-22	C & C Accel 2021-22	ELP Progress
All Students	47			52			46	70	84			21
SWD	12			20			8	43			5	14
ELL	13			30			6	37	58		6	21
AMI												
ASN	78			86			77	100	95		5	
BLK	26			27			28	46	76		5	
HSP	35			44			32	53	81		6	19
MUL	62			65			40	71	92		5	
PAC												
WHT	57			59			59	86	83		6	21
FRL	37			42			32	61	76		6	17

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	44	41	23	49	49	37	37	64	77			53
SWD	10	23	20	17	36	33	7	24				50
ELL	14	27	22	18	38	39	13	35	69			53
AMI												
ASN	77	71		90	77		67	93	93			
BLK	25	28	21	29	38	26	21	53	42			
HSP	31	33	18	33	41	33	27	57	78			50
MUL	49	42		65	47		57	75	91			
PAC												
WHT	53	45	29	58	54	48	43	66	75			45
FRL	33	36	21	36	41	33	31	54	66			53

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	48	48	31	52	46	33	44	52	76			33
SWD	11	28	23	16	26	26	10	19				8
ELL	24	38	34	31	38	37	9	36	59			33
AMI												
ASN	78	71		85	66		63	81	88			
BLK	34	41	27	38	39	32	26	45	67			
HSP	38	41	30	39	36	31	32	44	62			32
MUL	55	54		63	68		64	57				
PAC												
WHT	55	52	37	58	50	37	55	53	77			50
FRL	36	39	25	40	38	28	29	46	63			32

Grade Level Data Review– State Assessments (pre-populated)

The data are raw data and include ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data. The percentages shown here represent ALL students who received a score of 3 or higher on the statewide assessments.

An asterisk (*) in any cell indicates the data has been suppressed due to fewer than 10 students tested, or all tested students scoring the same.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
07	2023 - Spring	46%	48%	-2%	47%	-1%
08	2023 - Spring	46%	47%	-1%	47%	-1%
06	2023 - Spring	39%	47%	-8%	47%	-8%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	41%	58%	-17%	54%	-13%
07	2023 - Spring	35%	36%	-1%	48%	-13%
08	2023 - Spring	53%	61%	-8%	55%	-2%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	44%	47%	-3%	44%	0%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	90%	53%	37%	50%	40%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	100%	46%	54%	48%	52%

CIVICS						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	69%	68%	1%	66%	3%

III. Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis/Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources.

Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year's low performance and discuss any trends.

ELA achievement increased from 44% to 45%, Math achievement increased from 49% to 53%, Science Achievement increased from 37% to 44%, Civics Achievement increased from 64% to 69%. All areas showed improvement from the 2021-2022 school year, however the area with the lowest percentage increase was ELA with 1% increase in percent of scholars at proficiency. ELA's lower increase resulted from lack of understanding for the depth of standards at the start of the school year, misalignment between the questions during lessons versus assessment questions, and release of learning.

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

There was not an area that had a decline from the 2021-2022 school year to the 2022-2023 school year. All 5 areas showed improvement. ELA achievement increased from 44% to 45%, Math achievement increased from 49% to 53%, Science Achievement increased from 37% to 44%, Civics Achievement increased from 64% to 69%, and Acceleration increased from 77% to 88%.

Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends.

ELA average proficiency was 45% compared to the ELA state average, which was 47% proficiency. Fitzgerald Middle School was 2% lower than the state average.
Math average proficiency was 53% compared to the Math state average which was 52% proficiency. Fitzgerald Middle school was 1% higher than the state average.
Science average proficiency was 44% compared to the Science state average which was 44%. Fitzgerald Middle School was at the same percentage as the state average.
Civics average proficiency was 69% compared to the Civics state average which was 66%. Fitzgerald Middle School was 3% higher than the state average.

The area with the greatest gap compared to the state average is ELA. The factors that contributed to this gap are misalignment of lessons to the BEST standards/assessments, release of learning, and knowledge of the rigor required in the BEST standards.

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

The data component that showed the most improvement was our acceleration with an increase of 11% and in science with an increase of 7%.
In the area of Science there was an in depth look at data from GAP and district cycle assessments that lead to intervention groups being created. During interventions scholars focused on the areas of need to ensure proficiency on the end of year Science Assessment.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I, identify one or two potential areas of concern.

One area of concern from the EWS data is that we have 23 scholars who have been retained two or more times. Another area of concern is that there are 192 scholars who meet two of more indicators from the EWS.

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

1. Teachers/leaders will use data to identify and plan to meet the needs of each scholar in order to close the achievement gap.
2. Teachers/leaders will use progression of standards-based learning targets to identify the critical

content during a lesson.

3. Teachers/Leaders coaches and supports students in complex tasks that require analysis, inquiry, critical thinking, and real-world application skills.

4. Teachers/ Leaders will use formative assessments to facilitate the tracking of student progress aligned to learning targets which will be used to celebrate student successes or provide immediate intervention.

Area of Focus

(Identified key Area of Focus that addresses the school's highest priority 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 crucial need from the data reviewed.

One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Our current level of performance is 45% of our students are proficient based on the 2023 FAST PM 3 Assessment. We expect our performance level to increase to 54% proficiency as measured by the 2024 FAST PM 3 assessment.

The problem/gap is occurring because students are not encouraged to productively struggle as it relates to the BEST standards. Teachers are in need of more training centered around the complexity of the standards. Teachers need to deepen understanding of the B.E.S.T ELA standards and benchmarks as a non-negotiable for improving student outcomes.

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 45% to 54%, as measured by the Spring 2024 F.A.S.T Progress Monitoring Assessment.

Monitoring:

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

The desired outcome will be monitored through biweekly PLC's in which we analyze effectiveness of strategies used to provide scholars opportunity to productively struggle. Teachers will made decisions regarding impact on student learning through grade level student work analysis to determine areas for improvement and strength. During PLC's teachers will strengthen their understanding of the standards through use of district curriculum resources to provide all students with consistent opportunities to engage in complex grade level standards.

Teachers will utilize district assessments (Performance Matters and Standards Mastery) and student work analysis to make strategic decisions about implementation of the curriculum to maximize impact on student learning.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Leah Donnelly (donnellyl@pcsb.org)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Enhance staff capacity to use data to identify and plan to meet the needs for each scholar in order to close the achievement gap.

Strengthen staff's practice to utilize formative assessments to track scholar progress and use to celebrate student success or provide immediate intervention.

Strengthen staff's ability to engage scholars in complex tasks to release learning to the scholar through analysis, inquiry, critical thinking, and real-world application skills.

Engage staff in identifying critical content through the use of AVID strategies in alignment with district resources.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

If teachers understand the depth and complexity of the standards and align their lessons to formatively assess scholars and monitor with timely, focused feedback, engage scholars in analysis, inquiry, critical thinking, real-world application skills, and intentionally plan using data to drive instruction, then the percentage of student proficiency will increase by 9%.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

ELA and Reading teachers will receive professional development on B.E.S.T standards, use of question stems, and use of common language around writing to support teacher clarity in understanding the depth and complexity of the standards.

Person Responsible: Leah Donnelly (donnellyl@pcsb.org)

By When: By the end of the 23-24 school year, as evidenced by PM3 data.

ELA and Reading teachers will unpack standards to identify critical content and align those standards to assessments to formatively assess scholars progress and use just in time data to drive instruction.

Person Responsible: Leah Donnelly (donnellyl@pcsb.org)

By When: By the end of the 23-24 school year, as evidenced by PM3 data.

ELA and Reading teachers will meet in PLC's biweekly. Teachers will analyze student work/data and collaborate on ways to celebrate successes and provide on the spot intervention, review Focused Notetaking to determine ways to enhance scholars processing and connecting their notes, and create common standard aligned questions as mini formative assessments to make shared data driven instructional decisions.

Person Responsible: Leah Donnelly (donnellyl@pcsb.org)

By When: By the end of the 23-24 school year, as evidenced by PM3 data.

We will schedule scholars based on FAST PM scores 22-23 and group according to specific needs. We will provide ESE support in reading classes.

Person Responsible: Christine Douglass (douglassc@pcsb.org)

By When: By the start of the 23-24 school year, as evidenced by the master schedule.

Intentionally scheduling to keep classes small for our Intensive Reading courses to ensure differentiation is provided to support our scholars.

Person Responsible: Christine Douglass (douglassc@pcsb.org)

By When: By the start of the 23-24 school year, as evidenced by the master schedule.

Purposefully combine/stack standards and benchmarks to support learning, so that a benchmark is spotlighted and supporting benchmarks (such as ELA Expectations) that enhance instruction are incorporated in the lesson to meet the demands of the spotlighted benchmark.

Person Responsible: Leah Donnelly (donnellyl@pcsb.org)

By When: By the end of the 23-24 school year, as evidenced by PM3 data.

#2. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Other**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

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

One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Our 2022-2023 level of performance in school-wide behavior was 1,747 referrals. This is a decrease of 1% from the 2021-2022 school year. Although the number of referrals did decrease, there was significant increases in referrals for defiance, classroom disruption, and skipping during the 2022-2023 school year. The problem/gap in behavior performance is occurring because scholars are not being provided with classroom rules/expectations that are explicitly taught and reinforced each day. Schoolwide expectations were not evident in all classrooms and classroom processes/procedures were not maintained consistently or taught/reinforced explicitly to scholars from each of their teachers.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Using PBIS, our keys to success- Three A's, as well as ensuring teachers are trained and monitored with their behavior management plans, the occurrence of referrals will be reduced by 10% as evidenced by the total number of referrals at the end of the 2023-2024 school year.

Monitoring:

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

We will review and analyze discipline data during MTSS meetings and faculty meetings.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Leah Donnelly (donnellyl@pcsb.org)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Classroom management plans are developed and effective procedures for dealing with discipline are established.

Expectations are clearly defined, visible, taught, and reinforced.

Establish and maintain positive relationships with scholars.

Staff training centered around classroom managed discipline versus administrator managed discipline.

Staff training on common language for what each discipline code looks like and sounds like.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Scholar discipline data should be addressed to meet the needs of individual scholars. These should be firm, fair, consistent, and restorative to ensure our campus is a safe, comfortable, and engaging environment where scholars are actively participating in their education.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

During the first 4 days of school, scholars will engage in lessons on common area expectations from the PBIS Three A's matrix.

Person Responsible: Leah Donnelly (donnellyl@pcsb.org)

By When: August 2023

Teachers will be trained on classroom management plans and develop their classroom management plan. Classroom managements should be aligned to the Three A's , taught, reviewed frequently, and be visible to scholars in the classroom.

Person Responsible: Leah Donnelly (donnellyl@pcsb.org)

By When: August 2023 (ongoing)

Quarterly PBIS celebrations are planned and coverage is arranged so that staff can participate and interact with scholars in a social setting.

Person Responsible: Leah Donnelly (donnellyl@pcsb.org)

By When: Ongoing throughout the 2023-2024 school year.

Grade level teams collaborate to develop grade level specific expectations that are consistent with all teachers within the grade level to ensure common understanding by scholars.

Person Responsible: Leah Donnelly (donnellyl@pcsb.org)

By When: August 2023

Schoolwide discipline matrix provided to staff and reviewed with staff to determine classroom managed versus administrator managed behavior,

Person Responsible: Leah Donnelly (donnellyl@pcsb.org)

By When:

Common language for discipline codes will be created and taught. This will provide teachers the opportunity to create consistency in their classrooms to assist with schoolwide goals.

Person Responsible: Leah Donnelly (donnellyl@pcsb.org)

By When: August 2023 (ongoing)

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

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

One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Our achievement level for 22-23 was 69%.

Eighth grade and ESSA subgroups, particularly L25, SWD, ELL scholars and AA scholars achieve at a lower rate than seventh grade general education and gifted scholars.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Improve proficiency among L25, SWD and ELL scholars by 10% as measured by the Florida Civics EOC.

Monitoring:

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

Progress will be monitored through daily formal and informal formative assessments in the classroom as well as monthly unit and quarterly district cycle assessments.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

[no one identified]

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Based on classroom and district formative assessments, both formal and informal, we will provide weekly small group interventions specifically targeting students' areas of need. Interventions for scholars not meeting the standards will include pull out weekly in-school extended learning. Classroom teachers will employ rotations where scholars are grouped according to systematic formative and summative assessment analysis.

We will incorporate literacy strategies in all social studies classes. This will include the use of graphic organizers, chunking complex texts, and providing a variety of primary sources with varying levels of complexity. We will plan and facilitate consistent collaboration between 8th grade Civics and 8th grade reading to reinforce reading strategies specific to Civics texts.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Small group instruction is supported by research as an effective method to remediate areas of need and improve overall performance.

Providing L25 scholars with strategies specific to reading social study's text, such as vocabulary building activities, graphic organizers, chunking complex text, jigsaw activities for lengthy texts, jeopardy and social studies texts at all grade levels will improve performance on the EOC as the test is vocabulary and reading centered.

ELL scholars new to the county lack background knowledge applicable to Civics.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

Ensure teachers have access to mini-assessments, pre and post, to determine students specific needs to facilitate remediation.

Person Responsible: Christine Douglass (douglassc@pcsb.org)

By When: At the start of the year and ongoing throughout.

Create collaboration opportunities for reading and Civics – design lessons for reading using Civics materials.

Person Responsible: Christine Douglass (douglassc@pcsb.org)

By When: This will begin in early September.

Provide professional development for teachers on differentiation and collaborative structures.

Measure with mini assessments pre and post to drive remediation.

Person Responsible: Christine Douglass (douglassc@pcsb.org)

By When: By October 1, 2023

Plan in school intervention during electives using data.

Person Responsible: Christine Douglass (douglassc@pcsb.org)

By When: Immediately following Cycle 1 assessment

#4. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Math achievement increased from 49% to 53%. However, 53% is still just over half of the student body proficient in mathematics, so math still remains an area of focus.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Achievement levels overall for the school will increase by 10%, from 53% to 63% on the 2024 FAST Assessment.

Monitoring:

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

The desired outcome will be monitored through:

- 1.) monthly student work analysis PLC's to determine if focused notetaking protocols are being used with fidelity
- 2.) weekly walkthroughs with timely feedback provided to teachers specific to the use of focused notetaking, in particular the "processing" phase (review and revise)
- 3.) IXL and cycle data to identify learning gaps and ensure that they are addressed in a timely fashion.
- 4.) Weekly walkthroughs to observe and give timely feedback on the use of student-centered learning strategies, including intentionally designed productive struggle and peer collaboration to create and uncover schema for conceptual mathematics

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Ija Hawthorne (hawthornei@pcsb.org)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

This year, we will focus solely on improving the quality and effectiveness of the initial tier 1 core instruction. Our initial core instruction will aligned tightly to the BEST standards, at the rigor of achievement level 3-5.

After doing a year of professional development on the AVID strategy of focused note-taking, this year, math teachers will continue this professional development and expand their use of focused note-taking to reviewing and revisiting notes to increase retention. In addition, we will host a school-wide incentive program to increase grade-level usage of IXL. Those IXL results will be used, in concert with progress monitoring assessments and district-wide unit assessments, to develop a rigorous and timely intervention program to address current misconceptions and prerequisite standards. This data analysis and intervention creation will happen as part of our weekly PLCs. We will also incorporate activities that are intentionally designed to promote productive struggle and peer collaboration in order to reach the rigor of achievement levels of 3-5.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Focused Note-Taking, an AVID WICOR strategy, is a proven strategy to increase the release of learning to the scholars. In addition, focused notetaking also increases retention of content as well as student engagement and willingness to engage in academic risk taking. Focused notetaking is also a strategy to increase academic habits of mind and student self-efficacy with new content.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

Provide professional learning opportunities around implementing the "processing" phase (review and revise) of focused notetaking in class. Provide opportunities within this PLC for teachers to co-solve problems of practice and initiate peer observations and feedback.

Person Responsible: Amanda O'Mara (omaraa@pcsb.org)

By When: Biweekly

Create a schedule for biweekly PLC's and develop meeting protocols to ensure we are examining unit, progress monitoring, and IXL data and taking a problem-solving approach to deficits in student learning. We will further establish data-chat and tracking protocols to improve our transfer of learning ownership from the teachers to the students.

Person Responsible: Amanda O'Mara (omaraa@pcsb.org)

By When: Weekly

Targeted weekly walkthroughs and subsequent feedback to teachers around formative assessment. Are teachers using formative assessment? What instructional decisions are they making as a result of that formative assessment?

Person Responsible: Amanda O'Mara (omaraa@pcsb.org)

By When: Each semester

PD in PLC to promote teacher-to-teacher collaboration to design activities that are intentionally designed to promote productive struggle and peer collaboration.

Person Responsible: Amanda O'Mara (omaraa@pcsb.org)

By When: Biweekly

Weekly observations to monitor and provide feedback on the execution and effectiveness of those activities that are intentionally designed to promote productive struggle and peer collaboration from biweekly PLCs.

Person Responsible: Amanda O'Mara (omaraa@pcsb.org)

By When: Weekly

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

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Science Achievement as measured by the 2023 SSA increased from 37% to 44%. Achievement among general education scholars and gifted scholars is 20% and 97% respectively.

Measurable Outcome:

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

SSA achievement will increase overall with a 2% increase among gifted to 99% and a 15% increase among general education scholars to 35%.

Monitoring:

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

The desired outcome will be monitored through:

- 1.) monthly student work analysis PLC's to determine if the rigor required of the standard was met
- 2.) weekly walkthroughs with timely feedback provided to teachers specifically to formative assessment results
- 3.) Walkthrough feedback and subsequent coaching will focus intently on examining formative assessment results to see how teachers can adapt instruction to increase achievement based on those results.

Additionally, cycle assessment and progress monitoring assessment data will be closely monitored and interventions implemented for scholars who do not perform as expected.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Ija Hawthorne (hawthornei@pcsb.org)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

After doing a year of professional development on the AVID strategy of focused note-taking, this year, science teachers will continue this professional development and expand their use of focused note-taking to reviewing and revisiting notes to increase retention. In addition, with the use of district-wide progress monitoring assessments 3 times a year, science teachers will develop, in PLCs, a rigorous and timely intervention program to address previous standards. This intervention will be instituted at a school-wide level to shore up the 8th grade FSA Science test.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Focused Note-Taking, an AVID WICOR strategy, is a proven strategy to both increase the release of learning to the scholars as well as increase student engagement and content retention. Small-group rotations allow teachers to differentiate and to meet the needs of diverse student populations. Highly engaging strategies that reach a diverse group of learners will increase engagement and create an inclusive environment.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

Provide ongoing professional development around the Science standards ensuring that teachers are able to break the standards down into manageable and measurable student tasks.

Person Responsible: Amanda O'Mara (omaraa@pcsb.org)

By When: Weekly

Create a schedule for biweekly PLC's and develop meeting protocols to ensure we are examining data and taking a problem-solving approach to deficits in student learning. We will further establish data-chat and tracking protocols to improve our transfer of learning ownership from the teachers to the students.

Person Responsible: Amanda O'Mara (omaraa@pcsb.org)

By When: Bi-weekly

Engage and monitor all teachers in the second phase of schoolwide focused note taking strategy implementation. Specifically, pedagogical walkthrough feedback will focus on how teachers are engaging students in reviewing and revisiting ("processing") their notes.

Person Responsible: Amanda O'Mara (omaraa@pcsb.org)

By When: Weekly

Provide professional development opportunities around AVID strategy of focused notetaking. Monitor through targeted walk-throughs

Person Responsible: Amanda O'Mara (omaraa@pcsb.org)

By When: Each semester

#6. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

The Federal Percentage Points Index for Black/African American , Hispanic, ELL students and students with disabilities is below 41% as measured by proficiency on FAST and EOC's.

Measurable Outcome:

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

We will raise our African American achievement from 24% to 35% over one year with the two- year goal of reaching the 41% threshold.

We will raise the Hispanic achievement level from 33% to meet the 41% threshold.

We will raise our achievement level among students with disabilities from 15% to 25% with a two-year goal of meeting the 41% threshold.

We will raise our ELL Achievement level in ELA from 15% to 30% and from 22% to 35% in math with a two-year goal of 41%.

Monitoring:

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

We will monitor student achievement, attendance and academic data from the start of the year, using this data to create interventions and monitor the outcome of the interventions. CST, MTSS and subject area PLC's will all

monitor data for subgroups. Progress Monitoring Plans will be created and monitored throughout the school year for all at risk scholars.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Christine Douglass (douglassc@pcsb.org)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Teachers will be trained in the elements of highly engaging strategies that reach a diverse group of learners to include instructional and behavioral strategies proven effective with all students across cultures and abilities.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The implementation of proven engagement strategies, for example, focused note taking, and behavioral systems adapted from CHAMPS will meet the needs and learning styles of diverse learners.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

Provide ongoing professional development for teachers in the areas of highly engaging strategies that reach a diverse group of learners and Restorative Practices.

Person Responsible: Christine Douglass (douglassc@pcsb.org)

By When: Professional development will begin pre-school in August and continue through the year.

Students will be grouped in classes based on their IEP goals. Support Facilitators will push in to the classes and deliver Specially Designed Instruction to support scholars in meeting their IEP goals. They will monitor student progress closely and work with case managers to adjust goals as needed.

Person Responsible: Christine Douglass (douglassc@pcsb.org)

By When: ESE scholar schedules will be complete with supports by August 10, 2023.

Child Study Team will closely monitor our Hispanic population and provide support through the social worker and student services.

Person Responsible: Christine Douglass (douglassc@pcsb.org)

By When: Child Study Team meets bi-weekly.

Work with the district ESOL office and Center for Hispanic Heritage in Highpoint to bring academic and social resources to our families removing transportation barriers.

Person Responsible: Christine Douglass (douglassc@pcsb.org)

By When: Work will be ongoing.

Invite ESOL personnel to train our staff to use the translation features on PowerPoint to provide instruction in multiple languages, and to use Lionsbridge to contact families

Person Responsible: Christine Douglass (douglassc@pcsb.org)

By When: August 30, 2023

We will increase family engagement by identifying our Tier 3 economically disadvantaged students and engaging all adults in the school to call home to check in.

Person Responsible: Amanda O'Mara (omaraa@pcsb.org)

By When: September 15, 2023

CSI, TSI and ATSI Resource Review

Describe the process to review school improvement funding allocations and ensure resources are allocated based on needs. This section must be completed if the school is identified as ATSI, TSI or CSI in addition to completing an Area(s) of Focus identifying interventions and activities within the SIP (ESSA 1111(d)(1)(B)(4) and (d)(2)(C).

Our administrative team, teacher leaders, and SAC have analyzed the state data to determine the best way to allocate school improvement funding and Title I funding in an effort to build capacity and improve student achievement for all students. We will continue to monitor progress towards these goals in our PLC's, SAC Meetings, and through monthly school-based leadership team meetings to monitor tiered data.

Title I Requirements

Schoolwide Program Plan (SWP) Requirements

This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A SWP and opts to use the SIP to satisfy the requirements of the SWP plan, as outlined in the ESSA, Public Law No. 114-95, § 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

Provide the methods for dissemination of this SIP, UniSIG budget and SWP to stakeholders (e.g., students, families, school staff and leadership and local businesses and organizations). Please articulate a plan or protocol for how this SIP and progress will be shared and disseminated and to the extent practicable, provided in a language a parent can understand. (ESSA 1114(b)(4))

List the school's webpage* where the SIP is made publicly available.

SIP, UniSIG budget and SWP will be shared with stakeholders in the modalities listed below:

- 1.) School website
- 2.) Monthly School-Based Leadership Team meetings (all stakeholders welcome and invited)
- 3.) Biannual Title I Meetings (12/19/23 and 05/14/24)
- 4.) Biannual Family Fun Nights (family activities combined with student data dive) after PM1 and PM2
- 5.) Title I Center with resources available for all community members in the lobby

Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission, support the needs of students and keep parents informed of their child's progress.

List the school's webpage* where the school's Family Engagement Plan is made publicly available. (ESSA 1116(b-g))

The school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families and other community stakeholders in order to fulfill the school's mission, support the needs of students and keep parents informed of their child's progress in the following ways:

- 1.) Posting the Family Engagement Plan on the school website (list here)
- 2.) Biannual Title I Meetings (12/19/23 and 05/14/24)
- 3.) Biannual Family Fun Nights (family activities combined with student data dive) after PM1 and PM2
- 4.) Title I Center with resources available for all community members in the lobby
- 5.) Funding 10 hr./week additional Parent and Family Community Liaison

Describe how the school plans to strengthen the academic program in the school, increase the amount and quality of learning time and help provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum. Include the Area of Focus if addressed in Part III of the SIP. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(ii))

We will strengthen the academic program in the school, increase the amount and quality of learning time and help provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum in the following ways:

- 1.) Biannual Family Fun Nights (family activities combined with student data dive) after PM1 and PM2
- 2.) ELP (Extended Learning Program) available in both mornings and afternoons all year long
- 3.) Saturday tutoring opportunities available both on-site and off-site, clustered in areas where ESSA subgroups are highly concentrated to ameliorate transportation barriers
- 4.) Increased growth in the presence of the PTSA, as evidenced by a spring teacher mini-grant program to increase access to engaging and extraordinary classroom learning experiences
- 5.) Stipend-funded visits for effective educators to visit other data-backed effective teachers at other schools, with preference given to those who are proven effective with ESSA subgroups

If appropriate and applicable, describe how this plan is developed in coordination and integration with other Federal, State, and local services, resources and programs, such as programs supported under ESSA, violence prevention programs, nutrition programs, housing programs, Head Start programs, adult education programs, career and technical education programs, and schools implementing CSI or TSI activities under section 1111(d). (ESSA 1114(b)(5))

NA