Joseph L. Carwise Middle School

2023-24
Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Joseph L. Carwise Middle School

3301 BENTLEY DR, Palm Harbor, FL 34684

http://www.carwise-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 Carwise Middle School is to educate and prepare each student for high school, college, career, and life.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Carwise Middle School's vision is 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
Eiben, Chad	Principal	Ultimately responsible for all school decisions regarding school improvement and management. Receives feedback and input from teachers and the leadership team and sets a course for school improvement. Provides feedback to teachers and school leaders concerning best practices. With the team, collaboratively uses data from state and district assessments and reports to help plan and implement professional development for school improvement.
Patton, Asimina	Assistant Principal	Oversees 8th grade discipline, language arts and reading departments, and language arts and reading teacher observations and evaluations. Responsible for bringing feedback and input from respective teachers to the leadership team. Provides feedback to teachers concerning best teaching practices. With the team, collaboratively uses data from state and district assessments and reports to help plan and implement professional development for school improvement.
King, Tanya	Assistant Principal	Oversees 6th grade discipline, social studies and science departments, and social studies and science teacher observations and evaluations. Responsible for bringing feedback and input from respective teachers to the leadership team. Provides feedback to teachers concerning best teaching practices. With the team, collaboratively uses data from state and district assessments and reports to help plan and implement professional development for school improvement.
Mudd, Laura	Assistant Principal	Oversees 7th grade discipline, math and ESE departments, and math and ESE teacher observations and evaluations. Responsible for bringing feedback and input from respective teachers to the leadership team. Provides feedback to teachers concerning best teaching practices. With the team, collaboratively uses data from state and district assessments and reports to help plan and implement professional development for school improvement.

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.

Carwise Middle has a School Advisory Council (SAC) that meets monthly. This team includes school staff, parents, and community members. The SAC reviews and provides input regarding the School Improvement Plan.

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))

Carwise Middle is continuously monitoring student data (grades, discipline, attendance, test scores, etc.). We use this data to make needed changes to instructional practices.

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	34%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	40%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	ATSI
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: B 2019-20: A

	2018-19: A
	2017-18: A
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	42	93	89	224
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	15	19	42
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	2	6
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	35	63	83	181
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	51	56	66	173
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	56	73	102	231

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	4	0	3	7
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	65	91	109	265
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	18	26	45
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	20	19	56
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	7	29	45
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	56	87	96	239
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	50	70	43	163
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	7	21	32	60

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	1	1	2	4
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1

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	65	91	109	265
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	18	26	45
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	20	19	56
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	7	29	45
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	56	87	96	239
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	50	70	43	163
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	7	21	32	60

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	1	1	2	4
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1

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*	59	49	49	55	46	50	58		
ELA Learning Gains				45			51		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				34			30		
Math Achievement*	74	58	56	66	30	36	67		
Math Learning Gains				61			53		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				50			40		
Science Achievement*	57	48	49	54	52	53	53		
Social Studies Achievement*	71	69	68	75	52	58	70		
Middle School Acceleration	83	77	73	73	44	49	77		
Graduation Rate					45	49			
College and Career Acceleration					66	70			
ELP Progress	55	38	40	64	72	76	63		

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)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	67
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	399
Total Components for the Federal Index	6
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	58
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	577
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	99
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	41			
ELL	56			
AMI				
ASN	70			
BLK	42			
HSP	64			
MUL	72			
PAC				
WHT	71			

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%**
FRL	60			

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	35	Yes	1	
ELL	49			
AMI				
ASN	72			
BLK	37	Yes	1	
HSP	54			
MUL	55			
PAC				
WHT	61			
FRL	50			

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	59			74			57	71	83			55
SWD	20			41			26	46	73		5	
ELL	37			63			52	40	91		6	55
AMI												
ASN	64			76			53		88		4	
BLK	36			46			30	54			4	
HSP	57			68			51	67	84		6	57
MUL	62			81			64	70	85		5	

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
PAC												
WHT	61			78			60	73	83		5	
FRL	49			65			48	66	79		6	54

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	55	45	34	66	61	50	54	75	73			64
SWD	24	32	27	31	41	41	24	52	40			
ELL	35	38	33	49	56	53	21	71	67			64
AMI												
ASN	68	60		62	70		77	85	81			
BLK	26	33	36	37	45	33	20	65				
HSP	51	40	27	58	64	60	52	70	63			54
MUL	59	57	31	60	54	42	53	75	64			
PAC												
WHT	58	46	36	71	62	51	57	76	76			73
FRL	43	39	34	52	56	50	44	62	55			67

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	58	51	30	67	53	40	53	70	77			63
SWD	24	26	18	32	34	24	26	45				
ELL	37	44	38	58	56	47	24	58				63
AMI												
ASN	69	76		81	62		75	82	100			
BLK	39	41	31	42	42	25	29	60	40			
HSP	53	51	37	57	48	44	54	63	79			
MUL	61	54	27	62	49	35	53	80				
PAC												
WHT	59	50	25	70	54	40	52	72	77			
FRL	47	43	27	54	46	37	45	57	73			

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. <u>The percentages shown here represent ALL students who received a score of 3 or higher on the statewide assessments</u>.

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	58%	48%	10%	47%	11%
08	2023 - Spring	54%	47%	7%	47%	7%
06	2023 - Spring	55%	47%	8%	47%	8%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	77%	58%	19%	54%	23%
07	2023 - Spring	60%	36%	24%	48%	12%
08	2023 - Spring	75%	61%	14%	55%	20%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	56%	47%	9%	44%	12%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	87%	53%	34%	50%	37%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	97%	46%	51%	48%	49%

CIVICS						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	70%	68%	2%	66%	4%

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.

The lowest performing area for Carwise Middle School for 2022-23 was in the area of ELA. Our ELA score was 56% proficiency. This score was a one-point increase from the following year; however, it was still our lowest area. Learning gains are still lagging after the COVID learning loss. However, ELA scores were relatively low across the district and state at the middle school level. On a positive note, the proficiency losses from the 2021-22 school year have ended and Carwise Middle is now moving in the positive direction again.

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

The greatest decline in tests scores for Carwise Middle for 2022-23 was in the area of Civics. Our Civics score decreased by 4 points. This decline may have resulted from a teacher leaving mid-year and needing to find a replacement. Additionally, we had a large number of students who are struggling readers (Level 1 & 2) taking this course.

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.

Carwise Middle did not have any negative gaps (scores below state averages). However, if looking at positive gaps, Carwise had the greatest gap with our Geometry EOC scores. We had 97% of test takers score a level three or higher. Compared to the state average of 49% of test takers scoring a level three or higher. This gap may be due to only our most advanced students taking Geometry at the middle school level.

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

The greatest improvement in tests scores for Carwise Middle for 2022-23 was in the area of Math. Our Math score increased by 11 points. We believe this increase may have been due to scheduling our Level 1 & 2 sixth grade students into in foundational math class along with their regular math class. Additionally, our math team has embraced common planning and PLC's.

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

The biggest area of concern is that the greatest number of students with two or more early waring indicators are in the 8th grade.

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

1. Writing across all content areas (FRAME Strategy).
2. Focused Note Taking Process (AVID Strategy).
3. Higher Order Thinking and Questioning (Question Exploration Routine - QER).
4. Staff collaboration through structured PLC's including peer observations (strategy walks).
5. Positive learning environment created through school-wide PBIS system and the Olweus Bullying Prevention Program.

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 56% of our students are proficient on the 2023 FAST ELA assessment. We expect our performance level to increase to 62% of our students meeting proficiency by Spring 2024 Progress Monitoring assessment (F.A.S.T.). The problem/gap is occurring because students are not consistently being challenged across all disciplines, insufficient writing across curricula, lack of student-centered activities, lack of differentiation in instruction, use and application of complex tasks and critical thinking. In common PLCs, if teachers focus on differentiation, writing in the content areas, intentionally planning higher order thinking tasks that are student centered and provided student collaboration, and use data to drive instruction targeting B.E.S.T. standards, our performance would increase by 6%.

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

The percent of students achieving ELA proficiency will increase from 56% to 62%, as measured by the Spring 2024 Progress Monitoring Assessment (F.A.S.T.).

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

Monitoring will take place using routine and continuous formative and summative assessments created by teachers and/or the district. Teachers will meet with administrators in PLCs to review data following progress monitoring assessments and use common planning PLCs to plan and remediate based on the data. Administrators will also conduct walkthroughs to help monitor teacher implementation.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Asimina Patton (pattona@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. Enhance staff capacity to identify content from the BEST Benchmarks that will create higher order thinking tasks and allow students to collaborate with one another during various lessons.
2. Use of student data to drive instruction.
3. Enhance teacher capacity to incorporate reading and writing strategies in all content areas schoolwide.

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

These strategies were based on 2023 FSA, teacher formative assessment data, and District and administrative walkthrough feedback. These strategies were chosen to engage students in more complex tasks to encourage higher expectations and student achievement. It will be important with the implementation of B.E.S.T. standards that teachers continue to collaboratively plan while also incorporating reading and writing into weekly lessons to ensure for higher student success.

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. ELA and reading teachers will Intentionally collaboratively plan and design lessons with rigorous, student-center activities; to provide on grade specific exemplar activities/strategies aligned to B.E.S.T. standards in monthly PLC meetings to plan for differentiation, scaffolding and address gaps in student learning.

Person Responsible: Asimina Patton (pattona@pcsb.org)

By When: Ongoing

2. Teachers will analyze FAST data and iReady diagnostic data and utilize it to conduct data chats and set individual student goals. To help meet student goals, teachers will administer and analyze progress monitoring assessments and create remediation plans based upon data to address learning gaps so that students fully understand the expected outcomes of the standards.

Person Responsible: Asimina Patton (pattona@pcsb.org)

By When: Ongoing

3. ELA and reading teachers will receive professional development around BEST Benchmarks from district content specialists, Teachers will utilize district road map, work with staff developers and peers to develop and implement lessons that focus on student-centered activities to fully understand the expected outcomes that carry the full weight of the standards.

Person Responsible: Asimina Patton (pattona@pcsb.org)

By When: Ongoing

4. ELA and Reading teachers will utilize a variety of modalities when presenting concepts and instruction to meet the needs of each student; include small groups for differentiation of presentation; work with peers and staff developers to ensure differentiation is being used to maximize student learning.

Person Responsible: Asimina Patton (pattona@pcsb.org)

By When: Ongoing

5. School-wide literacy and writing strategies (FRAME), including writing evidence-based elaboration, will continue to be implemented in all content area classes. Additional support and enrichment will be provided at ELP for all students, especially focusing on students identified in various subgroups (504, ESE, EL, etc.) to close learning gaps.

Person Responsible: Asimina Patton (pattona@pcsb.org)

By When: Ongoing

#2. 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.

Our current level of performance is 77% proficiency, as evidenced by the 2023 Math FAST assessment. We expect our performance level to be 83% proficiency by May 2024. If differentiated instruction that focuses on authentic and on-pace curriculum, along with collaborative planning in equity-centered, data-driven PLCs, the problem would be reduced by more students being engaged in class resulting in a 6% increase as evidenced by the F.A.S.T.

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 77 percent to 83 percent, as measured by Spring Math F.A.S.T. data.

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

Monitoring will take place using routine and continuous formative and summative assessments created by teachers and/or the district. Teachers will meet with administrators in PLCs to review data following progress monitoring assessments and use common planning PLCs to plan and remediate based on the data. Administrators will also conduct walkthroughs to help monitor teacher implementation.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Laura Mudd (muddl@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. Support staff to utilize data to organize students to interact with content in manners which differentiates/scaffolds instruction to meet the needs of each student.
2. Collaboration between ESE and content teachers to integrate specially designed instruction into core content.

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

These strategies were selected based on FAST data and teacher formative assessment data. Teachers will work on connecting prior knowledge and make connections to real-world applications to help students interact with critical content in an authentic manner. Having teachers focus on differentiation with the correct amount of scaffolding will help meet students where they are move them forward.

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. Math teachers will continue to utilize district pacing guides and resources to collaboratively and effectively plan rigorous, aligned lessons around instructional shifts, standards, and assessment data that regularly include longer, challenging word problems and mathematical performance tasks that have a progression of difficulty to stair-step students into increasingly complex tasks and instructional methods.

Person Responsible: Laura Mudd (muddl@pcsb.org)

By When: Ongoing

2. Teachers continue to attend ongoing Facilitated Planning Sessions to analyze course standards and effectively implement instructional plans emphasizing on-grade level, standards aligned learning tasks that foster a student-centered environment, cooperation, and collaboration amongst students.

Person Responsible: Laura Mudd (muddl@pcsb.org)

By When: Ongoing

3. Math teachers will continue to implement standards-based scales, learning goals, and learning targets, with embedded differentiation, designed to encourage productive-struggle in complex tasks and promote high expectations of students.

Person Responsible: Laura Mudd (muddl@pcsb.org)

By When: Ongoing

4. Math teachers will utilize a variety of modalities when presenting concepts and instruction to meet the needs of each student, including IXL to have students practice benchmark aligned skill to achieve proficiency or mastery.

Person Responsible: Laura Mudd (muddl@pcsb.org)

By When: Ongoing

5. Teachers will conduct regular, monthly, PLCs inclusive of 'data chats' to review student responses to tasks and formative assessments and plan for instructional lessons incorporating the Thinking and Reasoning Standards and rigorous performance tasks aligned to the B.E.S.T. Benchmarks based on classroom and student level data. Data can come from FAST assessments, IXL, and district/classroom assessments.

Person Responsible: Laura Mudd (muddl@pcsb.org)

By When: Ongoing

6. Teachers will conduct regular 'data chats' with students and support setting learning goals by utilizing data such as the monthly IXL Diagnostics Snapshot results and personalized actions plans form the diagnostic snapshot to address mathematic skill gaps and strengthen mathematical foundational knowledge and fluency.

Person Responsible: Laura Mudd (muddl@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.

Our current level of performance is 57% proficiency, as evidenced by 2023 SSA data. We expect our performance level to be 65% proficiency by May 2024. Our current level of performance on our 6th and 7th grade final exams was an approximately an average of 50%. We expect our current performance level to be an average of 56% by May 2024. The problem/gap is occurring because of lack of differentiation in instruction to support students to meet high expectations and the ability to understand complex text in science. If engagement in close reading of higher-level Science text and more engagement in differentiated complex tasks would occur, the problem would be reduced by 8% on the SSA and 6% on final exams.

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 demonstrating proficiency in Science will increase from 57% to 63%, as measured by SSA data. The average score on the 6th and 7th grade final exams will increase from 50% to 56%, as measured by PCS Final Exam data.

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

Monitoring will take place using routine and continuous formative and summative assessments created by teachers and/or the district. Teachers will meet with administrators in PLCs to review data following cycle assessments and use common planning PLCs to plan and remediate based on the data. Administrators will also conduct walkthroughs to help monitor teacher implementation of lesson plans that include complex text and tasks.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Tanya King (kingtan@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.)

Instructional staff to utilize data to organize students to interact with content in manners which differentiates/scaffolds instruction to meet the needs of each student, including the use of inquiry based instruction which includes opportunities for students to think scientifically through research, content exploration, and writing opportunities (claims and evidence).

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

These strategies were selected based on the need for more complex tasks in the science classroom. By utilizing the inquiry and literacy strategies, we will address the use of complex text to help prepare our students for the FAST and Science SSA. The focus on differentiation will help create an environment that supports to students to meet high expectations and high complexity of questioning. FAST Progress Monitoring and teacher formative assessment data were also considered.

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.Teacher will follow district pacing guides and utilize a variety of resources and modalities to strategically and intentionally plan and deliver inquiry-based lessons that is responsive and engaging while meeting the needs of each student. Students will engage in activities using scientific language and be provided appropriate time to apply and show learning by using various modes of expression and response (e.g. multimedia formats, speeches, presentations, collaborative discussions, etc.).

Person Responsible: Tanya King (kingtan@pcsb.org)

By When: Ongoing

2. Ensure implementation of literacy in science content area - including the use of text-dependent questions, grade-appropriate complex texts that elicit close and critical reading, and performance tasks aligned to the standards. Teachers use strategies like Frame, Focused Note Taking and QER to help students break down more complex questions and understand what is being ask. These strategies will also help students identify key ideas, comprehend informational text and reflect on information in the science content. Strategies include text marking, graphic organizers and summarizing.

Person Responsible: Tanya King (kingtan@pcsb.org)

By When: Ongoing

3. Plan and implement opportunities specifically during the Elaborate phase of the 5E instructional model for students to make a claim, test it and defend their results, with evidence through written lab reports during inquiry-based science projects aligned to state standards. Utilize common short and extended writing and lab rubrics. Lessons are built to make real world content connections to make content more meaningful.

Person Responsible: Tanya King (kingtan@pcsb.org)

By When: Ongoing

4. Teachers will attend professional development (including Facilitated Planning Sessions, Literacy in the Content Area, Using Data to intentionally Plan and Differentiate Lessons, UDL in Science) to help effectively implement strategies that focus on inquiry and literacy strategies to foster a student-centered environment focused on equity, SEL, cooperation, and collaboration amongst students.

Person Responsible: Tanya King (kingtan@pcsb.org)

By When: Ongoing

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

Person Responsible: Tanya King (kingtan@pcsb.org)

By When: Ongoing

6. Sixth and seventh grade science teachers will engage students in problem-based learning activities with support from the Innovation Foundation that are centered around concept-based projects to offer more authentic experiences in learning science.

Person Responsible: Tanya King (kingtan@pcsb.org)

By When: Ongoing

#4. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Social Studies

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a 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 71% proficiency as evidenced by the 2023 Civics EOC. Our current level of performance on our US Semester Exams is an average of 51% and in World History Semester Exams is a 45% (from 2021-2022). We expect our performance level to be 75% proficiency in Civics, 55% in US and 51% in World History by May 2024. The problem/gap is occurring because inconsistent usage of complex text, lack of rigor, and higher order thinking practices. If engagement in close reading of higher-level complex text along aligned with Social Studies and B.E.S.T. standards with the implementation of rigorous assignments would occur, the problem would be reduced by 4% proficiency on the Civics EOC and 4% on the US and World History mid-term and final semester exams.

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 demonstrating proficiency in the EOC exams for Civics will increase from 71% to 75% as measured by EOC exam scores. The average of US History mid-term and final exams will increase from 51% to 55%. The average of World History mid-term and final exams will increase from 45% (in 2021-2022) to 51%.

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

Monitoring will take place using routine and continuous formative and summative assessments created by teachers and/or the district. Teachers will meet with administrators in PLCs to review data following cycle assessments and use common planning PLCs to plan and remediate based on the data. Administrators will also conduct walkthroughs to help monitor teacher implementation.

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.)

1. Instructional staff will utilize data to organize students to interact with content in manners which differentiates/scaffolds instruction to meet the needs of each student.
2. Strengthen staff ability to engage in students in complex tasks in Social Studies, incorporating the B.E.S.T. Standards for literacy.

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

These strategies were selected based on EOC data, FAST data, and teacher formative assessment data. By engaging students in more complex tasks, teachers will create an environment with high expectations of students with a high complexity of questioning. Having teachers focus on differentiation with the correct amount of scaffolding will help meet students where they are move them forward.

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. Teacher will follow district pacing guides and utilize a variety of resources and modalities to strategically and intentionally plan and deliver instruction that is responsive and engaging while using differentiation and scaffolding to meet the needs of each student. Students will engage in activities using academic language and be provided appropriate time to apply and show learning by using various modes of expression and response (e.g. multimedia formats, speeches, presentations, collaborative discussions, etc.)

Person Responsible: Tanya King (kingtan@pcsb.org)

By When: Ongoing

2. Ensure implementation of literacy and Historical Thinking Skills in Social Studies content area - including the use of text-dependent questions, grade-appropriate complex texts that elicit close and critical reading, and performance tasks aligned to the standards. Teachers use strategies to help students identify key ideas, comprehend informational text and reflect on information in primary and secondary source documents. Strategies include text marking, graphic organizers and summarizing.

Person Responsible: Tanya King (kingtan@pcsb.org)

By When: Ongoing

3. Teachers will encourage productive struggle by providing multiple different opportunities for research and document analysis using primary source documents at varying complexity levels and writing (claims and evidence) through the use of activities such as DBQs, NHD, and Socratic Seminars. DBQs should be implemented through the writing stage to integrate B.E.S.T. standards into the content area.

Person Responsible: Tanya King (kingtan@pcsb.org)

By When: Ongoing

4. Teachers will attend professional development (including FRAME, QER, Focused Note Taking, Facilitated Planning Sessions, Data Analysis, Teaching with Rotations and a partnership with ELA to support teaching writing in the DBQ process) to help effectively implement strategies focusing on rigorous tasks with differentiation to foster a student-centered environment focused on cooperation and collaboration amongst students.

Person Responsible: Tanya King (kingtan@pcsb.org)

By When: Ongoing

5. Teachers will regularly engage in department and common planning PLCs to deconstruct upcoming benchmarks and utilize systemic documents (adopted curriculum, pacing guides, etc.) to effectively plan for units that incorporate rigorous performance tasks aligned to Standards. PLCs will also be used to review data including unit assessments as well as formative assessments to plan for instructional lessons that meet the remediation and enrichment needs of all students.

Person Responsible: Tanya King (kingtan@pcsb.org)

By When: Ongoing

6. Administrators will monitor implementation of strategies and best practices (usage of complex text, rigorous activities, and HOT practices), along with alignment of standards and activities during walkthroughs and classroom observations and provide timely and meaningful feedback for teacher growth.

Person Responsible: Tanya King (kingtan@pcsb.org)

By When: Ongoing

#5. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Early Warning System

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 in school-wide behavior is 617 discipline referrals for 2022-2023. We expect our performance level to be 555 or less by May 2024 (a reduction of 10%). The problem in behavior/positive culture performance is occurring due to the lack of positive behavior management strategies and positive teacher/student relationships. If more positive behavior management strategies were used and positive teacher/student relationships were formed, the problem would be reduced by at least 10% as evidenced by quarterly discipline reports from Focus.

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

The number of student referrals will decrease from 617 to 555 (10%), as measured by FOCUS reports.

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

Monitoring will take place at weekly Administration PLCs as well as bi-monthly MTSS PLCs. Data will be shared with teachers following MTSS PLCs. Administrators will also conduct walkthroughs to help monitor teacher implementation of Tier 1 MTSS interventions, as well as Tier 2 and 3 interventions as needed.

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.)

Strengthen the ability of all staff to establish and maintain positive relationships with all students through use of school-wide PBIS.

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

Strategies and actions are based on research and evidence-based nationally recognized programs (PBIS). Discipline data shows a trend of more referrals meaning teachers need more support with maintaining positive relationships with students.

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. Continue use of Positive Behavior Monday morning lessons to teach student school-wide expectations, procedures, and behaviors on a weekly basis. SBLT will plan and establish lessons monthly based on current data trends and for use in routine morning restorative circles, celebrating growth, and updating systems.

Person Responsible: Chad Eiben (eibenc@pcsb.org)

By When: Ongoing

2. Continue use of the Shark Bite (token economy) positive behavior support and recognition system to provide rewards for students for demonstration of positive and appropriate behaviors that are identified by the school expectations. By the end of first semester, at least 90% of school members (students and staff) will participate in the Shark Bite system and the rewards will be varied and reflect students interests (based on student input).

Person Responsible: Chad Eiben (eibenc@pcsb.org)

By When: Ongoing

Utilize team meetings to discuss students in need of behavior support. Teams will appropriate interventions and deploy strategy. If continued student issues occur, the team will refer student to the MTSS team.

Person Responsible: Chad Eiben (eibenc@pcsb.org)

By When: Ongoing

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).

School Improvement Plan funding is reviewed by school staff as well as our School Advisory Council (SAC).