Pinellas Park Middle School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Pinellas Park Middle School

6940 70TH AVE N, Pinellas Park, FL 33781

http://www.pp-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.

The mission of Pinellas Park Middle School is to educate students for college, career, and a global society.

Provide the school's vision statement.

100% Student 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
Miller, Kimberly	Principal	
Becker, Suzanne	Assistant Principal	
Sullivan, Rebecca	Assistant Principal	
Amstutz, Aubrey	Other	
Zimet, Jeanne	Math Coach	

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.

Data will be collected during PLC's and through surveys for parents and students. All stakeholders will have additional opportunities at SAC, PTSA and Title One meetings to provide additional information .As the SIP is a working document, it will be reviewed and updated throughout the school year to meet the needs of all our stakeholders.

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))

Each PLC will review current test results and classroom data as a measurement against the SIP. The SBLT will conduct a schoolwide review. Adjustments will be made based on student performance as indicated by the data.

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	Yes
2022-23 Minority Rate	57%
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: C 2018-19: C 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	142	185	194	521
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	32	19	23	74
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	2
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	3	7
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	114	123	148	385
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	127	84	85	296
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	110	90	149	349

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	3	0	5
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1

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	142	185	194	521
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	32	19	23	74
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	2
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	3	7
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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	

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	
Students retained two or more times	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	142	185	194	521
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	32	19	23	74
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	2
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	3	7
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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	

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	
Students retained two or more times	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*	42	49	49	39	46	50	37		
ELA Learning Gains				43			37		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				33			25		
Math Achievement*	54	58	56	44	30	36	43		
Math Learning Gains				48			35		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				45			33		
Science Achievement*	42	48	49	38	52	53	40		
Social Studies Achievement*	68	69	68	65	52	58	56		
Middle School Acceleration	76	77	73	67	44	49	65		
Graduation Rate					45	49			
College and Career Acceleration					66	70			
ELP Progress	44	38	40	47	72	76	36		

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	54
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	326
Total Components for the Federal Index	6
Percent Tested	98
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	TSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	47

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	469
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	97
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	22	Yes	4	4
ELL	49			
AMI				
ASN	67			
BLK	39	Yes	4	
HSP	54			
MUL	46			
PAC				
WHT	57			
FRL	50			

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	22	Yes	3	3
ELL	44			
AMI				
ASN	63			
BLK	38	Yes	3	
HSP	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%
MUL	46			
PAC				
WHT	44			
FRL	43			

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	42			54			42	68	76			44
SWD	8			21			12	30			5	38
ELL	32			52			26	57	81		6	44
AMI												
ASN	59			73			65	78	80		6	45
BLK	26			37			22	48	64		5	
HSP	38			54			38	67	84		6	45
MUL	39			50			24	89	30		5	
PAC												
WHT	44			55			48	71	79		6	43
FRL	37			51			35	63	72		6	40

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	39	43	33	44	48	45	38	65	67			47
SWD	9	23	22	13	35	36	8	21				27
ELL	29	40	38	41	45	45	27	62	63			47
AMI												
ASN	59	53	68	72	59	43	58	78	78			58

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
BLK	21	37	33	24	43	43	22	56	63			
HSP	35	44	35	39	47	49	26	64	61			44
MUL	38	42	33	37	43	46	42	60	77			
PAC												
WHT	41	40	24	45	47	42	43	65	64			33
FRL	32	38	30	38	45	46	29	60	63			47

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	37	37	25	43	35	33	40	56	65			36
SWD	6	17	15	13	27	27	12	7				
ELL	33	42	24	46	39	29	35	63	58			36
AMI												
ASN	58	55	38	70	51	36	68	87	83			42
BLK	20	34	30	25	34	37	16	38	46			
HSP	36	35	22	38	31	26	46	50	50			29
MUL	43	37	24	43	27	33	41	62	68			
PAC												
WHT	37	33	23	44	34	33	35	53	67			50
FRL	30	34	26	34	33	32	29	51	54			38

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	40%	48%	-8%	47%	-7%
08	2023 - Spring	40%	47%	-7%	47%	-7%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	33%	47%	-14%	47%	-14%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	53%	58%	-5%	54%	-1%
07	2023 - Spring	33%	36%	-3%	48%	-15%
08	2023 - Spring	54%	61%	-7%	55%	-1%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	40%	47%	-7%	44%	-4%

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	96%	46%	50%	48%	48%

CIVICS						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	65%	68%	-3%	66%	-1%

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 is the data component that showed the lowest performance. One of the main contributing factors is the lack of content/standard knowledge by teachers which led to inconsistent target/task alignment.

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

None of the areas showed a decline in achievement.

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 data had the greatest gap when compared to the state average. One of the main contributing factors is the lack of content/standard knowledge by the teachers which led to inconsistent task/target alignment. In addition, a lack of explicit instruction which is needed to help clear up any student misconceptions.

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

The Math data showed the most improvement due to consistency and collaboration. Teachers planned for student-centered lessons including collaboration and formative assessment. Teachers intentionally planned for remediation and guided students in tracking their own data. Students were also pulled for small group instruction provided by the math coach and the math interventionist.

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

Students that are absent 10% or more days.

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

Language Arts
Teacher Retention/Teacher Content Knowledge

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.

1. Our current level of performance is 40% proficiency, as measured by the 22-23 FAST Cycle 3 assessment.
2. The problem/gap is occurring because of a lack of content/standard knowledge by the teachers which led to inconsistent target/task alignment, aligning lessons to the appropriate cognitive complexity, and embedding rigorous activities into daily lessons developed through common planning.

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 40% to 50% as measured by the 2023-2024 FAST ELA.

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

The area of focus will be continually monitored through unit assessment, cycle assessments, and remediation tracking though PLC's, in collaboration with teachers and administrators. Additionally, administrators will monitor through walkthroughs and observations.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Rebecca Sullivan (sullivanre@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.)

Explicit Instruction- target/task alignment with appropriate level of rigor.
Student-Centered Classroom- collaboration and peer review.
Focused Note-Taking- provide opportunities for students to re-engage in critical content.
Enrichment- connecting reading and writing to real-world application.
Weekly PLC's to analyze data to guide instruction, identify strengths and weaknesses and provide opportunities for equitable grading.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

By providing support and professional development to assist staff with enhancing their capacity to identify the critical content of the standards, students will have access to content at the appropriate complexity. By implementing PLCs with fidelity, teachers will collaborate to identify areas of strength and weakness from student data, develop highly effective lessons and increase equitable practices.

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.

Teachers will use district resources (gold document) to create and implement lesson plans aligned to the appropriate level of cognitive complexity and standards.

Person Responsible: Rebecca Sullivan (sullivanre@pcsb.org)

By When: on-going

Teachers will review assessment data and classroom performance to determine remediation and enrichment activities/lessons.

Person Responsible: Rebecca Sullivan (sullivanre@pcsb.org)

By When: On-going

The reading coach will demonstrate model lessons and lesson studies with grade-level teachers to increase teacher knowledge and capacity around highly-effective teaching practices such as gradual release, monitoring and conferring with feedback, ensuring ample time is reserved for authentic student practice.

Person Responsible: Rebecca Sullivan (sullivanre@pcsb.org)

By When: On-going

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Social Studies

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a 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.

1) Our current level of performance is 68% proficiency, as measured by the 2022-23 Civics EOC assessment.
2) Our current level of performance in Reading is 40%, as measured by the 22/23 FAST.
3) The problem/gap is occurring because of the lack of complex literacy skills and focus on rigorous, standards-based inquiry instruction and assessment, with very little tangible use of notes being taken.

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

Students taking the Civics EOC will move from 68% proficient to 70% proficient on the 2024 Civics EOC.

Students taking the Reading FAST will move from 40% proficient to 50% proficient on the 2024 FAST.

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

The area of focus will be continually monitored through unit assessment, cycle assessments, and remediation tracking though PLC's, in collaboration with teachers and administrators. Additionally, administrators will monitor through walkthroughs and observations.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Matt Miller (millermat@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.)

Explicit Instruction- target/task alignment with appropriate level of rigor.
Student-Centered Classroom- collaboration and peer review.
Focused Note-Taking- provide opportunities for students to re-engage in critical content.
Enrichment- connecting reading and writing to real-world application.
Weekly PLC's to analyze data to guide instruction, identify strengths and weaknesses and provide opportunities for equitable grading.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

By providing support and professional development to assist staff with enhancing their capacity to identify the critical content of the standards, students will have access to content at the appropriate complexity. By implementing PLCs with fidelity, teachers will collaborate to identify areas of strength and weakness from student data, develop highly effective lessons and increase equitable practices.

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.

Teachers will use district resources to create and implement lesson plans aligned to the appropriate level of cognitive complexity and standards.

Person Responsible: Matt Miller (millermat@pcsb.org)

By When: Ongoing

Social Studies staff will plan with ELA staff to develop common language regarding argumentative writing for DBQs and other writing in Social Studies.

Person Responsible: Matt Miller (millermat@pcsb.org)

By When: Ongoing

Teachers will review assessment data and classroom performance to determine remediation and enrichment activities/lessons. Cycle scores and Mid-Term scores will be used to assess student performance, projection and to guided remediation.

Person Responsible: Matt Miller (millermat@pcsb.org)

By When: Ongoing

DBQs will be used in all Social Studies courses to hone student skills on document analysis and writing to defend a position/argument. Monitoring of DBQ teaching/progress will occur by Admin.

Person Responsible: Matt Miller (millermat@pcsb.org)

By When: Q1,Q2 and Q3.

Social Studies teachers will take DBQ Training (or something similar regarding writing in Social Studies) if not trained in DBQ.

Person Responsible: Matt Miller (millermat@pcsb.org)

By When: Semester 2

Teachers will be intentional regarding usage of notes being taken in class, with a focus on summary/reflection on notes.

Person Responsible: Matt Miller (millermat@pcsb.org)

By When: Ongoing

#3. 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.

1) Our current level of performance in Science is 42% proficiency, as measured by the 22/23 SSA.
2) Our current level of performance in Reading is 40%, as measured by the 22/23 FAST.
3) The problem/gap is occurring because of the lack of complex literacy skills and focus on rigorous, standards-based inquiry instruction and assessment, with very little tangible use of notes being taken.

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

The percentage of all students achieving Science proficiency will increase from 42% to 46% as measured by the 2023-24 SSA.

Students taking the Reading FAST will move from 40% proficient to 50% proficient on the 2024 FAST.

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

The area of focus will be continually monitored through unit assessment, cycle assessments, and remediation tracking though PLC's, in collaboration with teachers and administrators. Additionally, administrators will monitor through walkthroughs and observations.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Matt Miller (millermat@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.)

Explicit Instruction- target/task alignment with appropriate level of rigor.
Student-Centered Classroom- collaboration and peer review.
Focused Note-Taking- provide opportunities for students to re-engage in critical content.
Enrichment- connecting reading and writing to real-world application.
Weekly PLC's to analyze data to guide instruction, identify strengths and weaknesses and provide opportunities for equitable grading.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

By providing support and professional development to assist staff with enhancing their capacity to identify the critical content of the standards, students will have access to content at the appropriate complexity. By implementing PLCs with fidelity, teachers will collaborate to identify areas of strength and weakness from student data, develop highly effective lessons and increase equitable practices.

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.

Teachers will use district resources to create and implement lesson plans aligned to the appropriate level of cognitive complexity and standards.

Person Responsible: Matt Miller (millermat@pcsb.org)

By When: Ongoing

Teachers will review assessment data and classroom performance to determine remediation and enrichment activities/lessons after school and District assessments.

Person Responsible: Matt Miller (millermat@pcsb.org)

By When: Ongoing

Focus on Nature of Science in student writing, note taking and analysis will take place throughout the school year with an emphasis on students being able to summarize through the above tasks.

Person Responsible: Matt Miller (millermat@pcsb.org)

By When: Ongoing

PLCs will be teacher led and will be attended by Admin.

Person Responsible: [no one identified]

By When: Ongoing

Administrator and Science Coach will work together to ensure Science staff is receiving the proper support in class through walkthroughs and suggested Science Professional Development.

Person Responsible: Matt Miller (millermat@pcsb.org)

By When: Ongoing

#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.

1) Our current level of performance is 50% proficiency, a measured by the FAST Math (this figure represents our current population of students).
2) The problem/gap is occurring because of lack of rigor, standards-based instruction and intentionally planned data-driven remediation practices, in addition to the lack of common planning and collaboration.
3) By increasing use of rigorous tasks, differentiated instruction, and intentional standards-based planning and instruction developed through collaborative planning and using the B1G M components and the achievement level descriptors, the problem would be reduced by 10% as measured by the 2023-24 Math FAST.

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 50% to 60% as measured by the Math FAST.

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

The area of focus will be continually monitored through unit assessment, cycle assessments, FAST Progress Monitoring Assessments and remediation tracking though PLC's, in collaboration with teachers and administrators. Additionally, administrators will monitor through walkthroughs and observations.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Suzanne Becker (beckers@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.)

Explicit Instruction- target/task alignment with appropriate level of rigor.
Student-Centered Classroom- collaboration and peer review.
Focused Note-Taking- provide opportunities for students to re-engage in critical content.
Enrichment- connecting reading and writing to real-world application.
Weekly PLC's to analyze data to guide instruction, identify strengths and weaknesses and provide opportunities for equitable grading.
Use the B1G M components and achievement level descriptors to increase instructional proficiency.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

By providing support and professional development (guidance on using the B1M and achievement level descriptors for planning) to assist staff with enhancing their capacity to identify the critical content of the standards, students will have access to content at the appropriate complexity. By implementing PLCs with fidelity, teachers will collaborate to identify areas of strength and weakness from student data, develop highly effective lessons and increase equitable practices.

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

<table>
<tr><td>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.</td></tr>
</table>

Teachers will use district resources (navigating the B1G M and achievement level descriptors) to create and implement lesson plans aligned to the appropriate level of cognitive complexity and standards.

Person Responsible: Suzanne Becker (beckers@pcsb.org)

By When: on-going

Teachers will review assessment data and classroom performance to determine remediation and enrichment activities/lessons.

Person Responsible: Suzanne Becker (beckers@pcsb.org)

By When: on-going

Teachers will utilize iXL weekly, requiring students to complete one or more skills at proficiency/mastery with a minimum of forty questions attempted.

Person Responsible: Suzanne Becker (beckers@pcsb.org)

By When: ongoing

Math Coach will provide professional development through PLCs to build content knowledge, hone collaboration skills for students and utilization of high-yield strategies.

Person Responsible: Jeanne Zimet (zimetj@pcsb.org)

By When:

#5. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Teacher Retention and Recruitment

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 teacher retention rate is 68%.

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

To increase retention of teachers to 95%.

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

Administration will meet regularly with new teachers (new to the profession and new to the building) to discuss needed supports and/or professional development in a timely manner.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Kimberly Miller (millerkimb@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.)

1) Provide additional professional development opportunities to teachers.
2) Provide coaching to increase positive student behavior and curriculum.
3) Continue with monthly mentoring sessions to address concerns.
4) Implement a teacher recognition program.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

By implementing a teacher recognition program and providing more comprehensive support services to our teachers, we expect retain 95% of our staff into the next school year.

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.

Implement a teacher recognition program.

Person Responsible: Kimberly Miller (millerkimb@pcsb.org)

By When: ongoing

#6. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Black/African-American

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a 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.

1) Our current level of performance is 37% proficiency, as measured by the 2022-23 FAST ELA assessment.
2) The problem/gap is occurring because of a lack of equitable practices school-wide and utiizing intentional, personalized learning practices in all content areas.
3) By increasing use of rigorous and intentional standards-based planning, UDL and differentiated instruction, the problem would be reduced by 10% as measured by the 2023-24 FAST ELA assessment.

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

The percent of Black-African American students achieving ELA proficiency will increase from 37% to 57% as measured by the FAST ELA assessment.

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

The area of focus will be continually monitored through unit assessment, cycle assessments, and remediation tracking though PLC's, in collaboration with teachers and administrators. Additionally, administrators will monitor through walkthroughs and observations.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Matt Miller (millermat@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.)

Explicit Instruction- target/task alignment with appropriate level of rigor.
Student-Centered Classroom- collaboration and peer review.
Focused Note-Taking- provide opportunities for students to re-engage in critical content.
Enrichment- connecting reading and writing to real-world application.
Weekly PLC's to analyze data to guide instruction, identify strengths and weaknesses and provide opportunities for equitable grading.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

By providing support and professional development to assist staff with enhancing their capacity to identify the critical content of the standards, students will have access to content at the appropriate complexity. By implementing PLCs with fidelity, teachers will collaborate to identify areas of strength and weakness from student data, develop highly effective lessons and increase equitable practices.

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.

Teachers will use district resources to create and implement lesson plans aligned to the appropriate level of cognitive complexity and standards.

Person Responsible: Matt Miller (millermat@pcsb.org)

By When: ongoing

Teachers will review assessment data and classroom performance to determine remediation and enrichment activities/lessons.

Person Responsible: Matt Miller (millermat@pcsb.org)

By When: ongoing

#7. 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 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.

1) Our current level of performance is 5% proficiency, as measured by the 2022-23 FAST ELA assessment.
2) The problem/gap is occurring because of a lack of rigor and student-centered standards-based instruction, in addition to a lack of intentional equitable practices and SDI for students with disabilities through common planning/PLCs.
3) By increasing the use of rigorous and intentional standards-based instruction utilizing UDl, differentiation and SDI the problem would be reduced by 10% as measured by the 2023-24 FAST ELA assessment.

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

The percent of all ESE students achieving ELA proficiency will increase from 5% to 51% as measured by the 2023-24 FAST ELA assessment.

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

The area of focus will be continually monitored through unit assessment, cycle assessments, and remediation tracking though PLC's, in collaboration with teachers and administrators. Additionally, administrators will monitor through walkthroughs and observations.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Suzanne Becker (beckers@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.)

Explicit Instruction- target/task alignment with appropriate level of rigor.
Student-Centered Classroom- collaboration and peer review.
Focused Note-Taking- provide opportunities for students to re-engage in critical content.
Enrichment- connecting reading and writing to real-world application.
Weekly PLC's to analyze data to guide instruction, identify strengths and weaknesses and provide opportunities for equitable grading.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

By providing support and professional development to assist staff with enhancing their capacity to identify the critical content of the standards, students will have access to content at the appropriate complexity. By implementing PLCs with fidelity, teachers will collaborate to identify areas of strength and weakness from student data, develop highly effective lessons and increase equitable practices.

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.

Teachers will use district resources to create and implement lesson plans aligned to the appropriate level of cognitive complexity and standards.

Person Responsible: Suzanne Becker (beckers@pcsb.org)

By When: ongoing

Teachers will review assessment data and classroom performance to determine remediation and enrichment activities/lessons.

Person Responsible: Suzanne Becker (beckers@pcsb.org)

By When: ongoing

#8. 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.

This is a district expectation to utilize PBIS to reinforce academics and behavior in a positive upward trend. Pinellas Park Middle School will be able to track student progress individually and by grade level through in-depth reporting to make data driven decisions about our school and monitor consistency. The PBIS system will also be utilized by the MTSS Coach in order to track behavioral, academic and attendance data. The MTSS team meets weekly to discuss a variety of data (e.g., attendance, behavior, common assessments, etc.) and the PBIS data will help to drive the meetings.

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

Absence rate will decrease 20% from 521 (students missing 10% or more) to 417 as measured by the early warning indicators.

Referrals will decrease 20% from 74 students to 59 students as measured by the early warning indicators.

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

Weekly CST/MTSS meetings and PBIS data.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Suzanne Becker (beckers@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.)

PBIS computer-based tracking, parameters will include, but are not limited to SOAR (safe, organized, accountable, responsible).

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

To align our schoolwide expectations with specific, trackable data and outcomes.

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.

1) Set up PBIS online platform and train staff and students.
2) Weekly review of platform data.
3) Update areas of focus in platform based on attendance, academic and discipline data.

Person Responsible: Suzanne Becker (beckers@pcsb.org)

By When: Ongoing. Training to occur with staff preschool and with students first week of school.

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).

Based on the 2021-2022 Federal Index and ESSA Support Categories by School, our school has been identified as TSI based on 47%of points index of all students. Our two ESSA groups are Black-African American and Students with Disabilities.

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 and SWP are available on the website
• They are both located in the front office.
• They are shared with families through PTSA and SAC
• They are also shared with families at the Title I Annual Meeting

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))

Pinellas Park Middle School invites families to events at the school for example: Special 6th Grade event to meet the counselors, administration team, and learn about opportunities the students will have to get involved in throughout the year, Back to School Night, Resource Night and Data Nights to discuss their child's progress.

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))

•Pinellas Park Middle School offers ELP before school daily as well as after school ELP by subject area to support students academically
•Provide a variety of opportunities for clubs such as STEM and Civics Club
•Provide Common Planning time for teachers to increase cross curricular planning as well as common planning to support the SIP goals such as focused note taking.

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))

• Utilize the JWB Program for group counseling services and push into the 6th grade classes for social skills lessons.
• Counselors provide community resources to families
• Counselors share Clothes to Kids with families when families are struggling.
• Social Worker shares a variety of community resources with families and refers them to the HEAT program for homeless services
• Pack a Snack program is available to students in need

Optional Component(s) of the Schoolwide Program Plan
Include descriptions for any additional strategies that will be incorporated into the plan.

Describe how the school ensures counseling, school-based mental health services, specialized support services, mentoring services, and other strategies to improve students' skills outside the academic subject areas. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(I))

• PPMS utilizes the JWB program for small groups and classroom social skills lessons.
• School Counselors work with student and families to ensure that they are being emotionally and socially supported as well as communicating a variety of community resources to families as needed.
• School Social Worker and Psychologist counsel students
• Counselors and staff members mentor students for Take Stock in Children
• Staff members mentor students that struggle academically

Describe the preparation for and awareness of postsecondary opportunities and the workforce, which may include career and technical education programs and broadening secondary school students' access to coursework to earn postsecondary credit while still in high school. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(II))

• Students are scheduled into advanced courses to ensure they are able to earn as many high school credits as possible
• School Counselors teach Naviance lessons to all students to learn about a variety of careers and technical education programs as well as high school options for their specific interests

Describe the implementation of a schoolwide tiered model to prevent and address problem behavior, and early intervening services, coordinated with similar activities and services carried out under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. 20 U.S.C. 1400 et seq. and ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(III).

• MTSS team meets weekly to review student behavior data and steps to address those behaviors.

Describe the professional learning and other activities for teachers, paraprofessionals, and other school personnel to improve instruction and use of data from academic assessments, and to recruit and retain effective teachers, particularly in high need subjects. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(IV))

• Teachers participate in weekly PLC's and common planning as well as meeting with academic coaches to consistently learn new strategies.
• Teachers participate in data chats on a regular basis with administration and academic coaches. This allows them to plan for future lessons and review what teaching strategies have been effective versus

not effective. It also allows academic coaches to determine who needs assistance through the use of a coaching cycle.

Describe the strategies the school employs to assist preschool children in the transition from early childhood education programs to local elementary school programs. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(V))

n/a