Palm Harbor Middle School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Palm Harbor Middle School

1800 TAMPA RD, Palm Harbor, FL 34683

http://www.ph-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.

100% student success

Provide the school's vision statement.

Educate and prepare each student for college, career and life.

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
Fowler, Peggy	Principal	Manage and oversee the operations of the school. Ensure a safe learning environment in which all stakeholders are involved.
Johnson, Melissa	Assistant Principal	Oversee the operations of the school. Mangaes the ESE department, Social Studies, Visual Arts and Advanced Placement.
Podkomorski, Zachary	Assistant Principal	Oversees the operations of the school. Manages Health and PE, Math, athletics and our technology academy.
Lampert, Michelle	Assistant Principal	Oversees the operations of our school. Manages ELA and Reading, Science and the Medical Academy.

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.

The leadership team developed their specific subject area goals based on the 2022-2023 data and the ongoing work with teachers and curriculum specialists. In addition, staff and students were involved through the use of a school wide survey provided by the principal at the end of the 2022-2023 school year in which staff and students were surveyed on the climate and the culture of the school and the overall goals that were implemented in the current school year.

SIP Monitoring

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

The SIP will be monitored on a monthly basis with the administrative team to ensure that we are progressing towards our intended goals. In addition, after each cycle of testing we will monitor where we are progressing and revamp as necessary. If we are lacking in certain goals or subgroups, we will work with District specialists to focus on those areas of need and make adjustments in the classrooms.

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	27%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	38%
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: C 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	24	14	0	38
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	30	45	0	75
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	5	2	0	7
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	69	54	0	123
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	62	62	0	124
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	0	0	0	

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	0	4	0	4
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	0	64	57	121
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	50	56
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	10	18
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	17	19
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	118	93	211

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	9	18	27

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	6	15	3	24
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	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	0	64	57	121
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	50	56
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	10	18
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	17	19
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	118	93	211

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	9	18	27

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	6	15	3	24
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	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*	55	49	49	52	46	50	57		
ELA Learning Gains				41			50		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				32			38		
Math Achievement*	66	58	56	59	30	36	58		
Math Learning Gains				50			44		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				44			35		
Science Achievement*	57	48	49	53	52	53	55		
Social Studies Achievement*	78	69	68	84	52	58	72		
Middle School Acceleration	63	77	73	64	44	49	74		
Graduation Rate					45	49			
College and Career Acceleration					66	70			
ELP Progress	38	38	40	54	72	76	61		

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	60
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	357
Total Components for the Federal Index	6

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	53
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	533
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	20	Yes	2	2
ELL	46			
AMI				
ASN	77			
BLK	42			
HSP	58			
MUL	63			
PAC				
WHT	64			
FRL	52			

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	23	Yes	1	1
ELL	46			
AMI				
ASN	83			
BLK	45			
HSP	46			
MUL	49			
PAC				
WHT	54			
FRL	47			

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY

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	55			66			57	78	63			38
SWD	14			24			3	41			5	20
ELL	26			39			33	93			5	38
AMI												
ASN	79			87			69		74		4	
BLK	42			42			33	50			4	
HSP	54			60			57	79	60		6	35
MUL	57			69			53	77	58		5	
PAC												
WHT	55			68			57	78	63		5	
FRL	48			55			50	71	60		6	29

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	52	41	32	59	50	44	53	84	64			54
SWD	8	13	10	18	30	32	20	36	43			
ELL	31	32	30	51	50	43	32	73	67			54
AMI												
ASN	73	70		84	81		80	91	100			
BLK	47	42	23	30	48	47	31	83	55			
HSP	47	36	25	52	48	35	46	78	57			36
MUL	55	50	33	56	47		47		53			
PAC												
WHT	52	41	34	61	50	46	55	87	64			
FRL	44	37	28	47	48	44	39	77	56			53

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20	ELP Progress
All Students	57	50	38	58	44	35	55	72	74			61
SWD	12	23	21	20	34	39	23	43				
ELL	37	49	44	36	39	38	15	65				61
AMI												
ASN	74	57		83	48			100	100			
BLK	38	43	32	33	40	32	18	61				
HSP	54	50	37	48	42	36	37	69	65			63
MUL	58	54	53	60	36		57	63				
PAC												
WHT	58	50	37	61	46	36	60	72	76			64
FRL	48	44	34	45	39	31	47	67	62			63

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	52%	48%	4%	47%	5%
08	2023 - Spring	52%	47%	5%	47%	5%
06	2023 - Spring	53%	47%	6%	47%	6%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	66%	58%	8%	54%	12%
07	2023 - Spring	44%	36%	8%	48%	-4%
08	2023 - Spring	70%	61%	9%	55%	15%

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	82%	53%	29%	50%	32%

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	76%	68%	8%	66%	10%

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 showed the lowest performance. ELA has continually trended low. Poor teacher performance contributes to the highest factor of low performance scores. Those factors included high teacher absence and poor classroom management which contributed to students not learning and the overall performance score being low. In addition we had three new teachers in the department and two quit and those positions had long term subs or multiple subs leading all the way into second semester before the students had consistent teachers.

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

Social Studies showed the highest decline. The major contributing factor was the shift of having only levels 3 and 4 in Civics in previous years in comparison to last year having level 1 and 2 students being added into the Civics classes.

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.

We were above the state in all tested subject areas. The only area we dropped in was Civics and the trend is that in the previous school year 2022-2023 only 10 8th graders took the test all the rest were 7th graders in comparison to this year where we had 113 students and that is where our lowest percentage rate of passing students were located. This is because the course progression leads the students who are usually level 3 and above along the track of taking Civics in 7th grade and Pre-AP in 8th grade where students who score below a level 3 do not take civics till 8th grade. Having so many level 1 and 2 students take the test this year is why we dropped 10 points in civics.

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

Math had the most improvement. This year we had a new Assistant Principal over Math who focused on strategies and skills specific to improving our scores. We brought in curriculum specialist to specifically work with our math teachers to prepare for testing. In addition, we had common planning for math teachers to plan together and strategically placed our strongest teachers in the areas of most need which was with our 7th grade students.

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

The main concern is having effective teachers in the department and the retention of those teachers. If we do not have consistency in the ELA department where our teachers can effectively impact our students we will continue to trend poorly in this subgroup.

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

1. ELA achievement and learning gains
2. Social Studies achievement

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.

The problem/gap is occurring because students are not consistently being challenged across all disciplines, lack of student-centered activities, use and application of complex tasks and critical thinking.

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

Current level of performance is 53% of our students are proficient on the 2022 FAST Reading. We expect our performance level to increase to 63% of our student's meeting proficiency by Spring 2024 FAST.

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

1. Invite teachers to observe classrooms where peers are using benchmark-aligned, student activities. Teachers will complete reflections and administration will monitor.
2. Attend professional development related to improving instructional practice. Administration will attend grade level and department PLCs and provide input and feedback.
3. Utilize District Road map and work with staff developers and peers to develop and implement lessons that focus on student centered activities. Staff developer and administrator will discuss observations and provide input.
4. Work with peers and staff developers to ensure differentiation is being used. Administrator will provide specific feedback.
5. Utilize a variety of modalities when presenting concepts and instruction to meet the needs of each student. Administration will conduct regular walk throughs and provide feedback.
6. Foster an environment of cooperation and collaboration amongst students including discussions and projects.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Michelle Lampert (lampertm@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.)

ACTION PLAN AROUND SPECIFIC PROBLEMS: Enhance staff capacity to identify critical content and teacher clarity from the BEST Benchmarks that will create higher order thinking tasks and allow students to collaborate with one another during various lessons.
Corrective feedback and differential instruction will need to be implemented.

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

If teachers intentionally planned higher order thinking tasks, provided clarity to students, allow more student center activities and provide student collaboration time to work through the tasks, our performance would increase.

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 2 - Moderate Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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

Ensure proper placement of students into reading and appropriate level of ELA, reading and CLI cohort.

Person Responsible: Michelle Lampert (lampertm@pcsb.org)

By When: July-August 2023

Analyze FAST data and iReady diagnostic data and utilize it to conduct data chats and set individual student goals

Person Responsible: Michelle Lampert (lampertm@pcsb.org)

By When: Initial data chats: August 2023 Progress monitoring data chats will be conducted in September 2023 December 2023 and May 2024

Administer and analyze progress monitoring assessments; create remediation plans based upon data

Person Responsible: Michelle Lampert (lampertm@pcsb.org)

By When: August 2023, September 2023, December 2023, May 2024

ELA/reading teachers meet at least twice per month during PLCs. Teachers share ways to support students who continue to struggle with content and tasks

Person Responsible: Michelle Lampert (lampertm@pcsb.org)

By When: Bi-weekly

ELA and reading teachers receive professional development around BEST Benchmarks, HOT questions and collaborative structures

Person Responsible: Michelle Lampert (lampertm@pcsb.org)

By When: June 2023-April 2024 DWT Ongoing

Teachers will incorporate various AVID strategies into lessons

Person Responsible: Michelle Lampert (lampertm@pcsb.org)

By When: August 2023-May 2024

Administrators conduct classroom observations and provide feedback to individuals.

Person Responsible: Michelle Lampert (lampertm@pcsb.org)

By When: Weekly

Administration will schedule regular visits from staff developers for ELA/reading teachers throughout the year to provide guidance and support for teachers

Person Responsible: Michelle Lampert (lampertm@pcsb.org)

By When: Monthly

Facilitated planning within the grade level subject using road map and Study Sync

Person Responsible: Michelle Lampert (lampertm@pcsb.org)

By When: Monthly

#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.

The problem/gap is occurring because learning targets and learning tasks are not differentiated to address student readiness, interest and learning profile of the students in regard to mathematics.

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

Our 22-23 current level of performance is 69% Mathematics Achievement, as evidenced in PM3 FAST assessment. We expect our performance level to be at least 79% Mathematics Achievement by the 2023-2024 PM3 FAST assessment.

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

1. Teachers collaboratively plan learning targets and learning tasks to align to the FAST standards for Mathematics.
2. Within PLC and/or common planning, teachers utilize student data to collaboratively plan rigorous standard-based learning opportunities that address specific standards where students have opportunities to improve.
3. Teachers participate in ongoing professional development focused on Differentiation in Mathematics.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Zachary Podkomorski (podkomorskiz@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.)

Support staff to utilize data to organize students to interact with content in manners that differentiate/ scaffold instruction to meet the needs of each learner. Support staff with the implementation of on grade level instruction to ensure equity and access to rigorous course content to all students.

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

By creating a systematic plan that conducts routine data analysis will allow teachers to implement more focused lessons. By pinpointing areas of needed for growth they can be infused throughout a variety of other lessons through reinforcement and remediation. Additionally, data analysis affords opportunities for rotations and small group instruction to occur routinely.

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 2 - Moderate 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.

Mathematics teachers participate in professional learning opportunities around the FAST Standards, the Mathematical Thinking & Reasoning Standards, and Differentiation in the Math Classroom. Teachers will

utilize: Work with district Math ISD supporting PHMS, Biweekly PLCs, Ongoing Math PD Offerings, TDE day for planning

Person Responsible: Zachary Podkomorski (podkomorskiz@pcsb.org)

By When: Daily/Ongoing

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

Person Responsible: Zachary Podkomorski (podkomorskiz@pcsb.org)

By When: Daily/Ongoing

Teachers will conduct at least 1 data chat per quarter that addresses students' individual strengths and opportunities to improve. Teacher will differentiate and provide remediation based identified strengths and weakness in FAST standards. Data to be used will be from PM1, PM2, formative assessments, and IXL diagnostic data.

Person Responsible: Zachary Podkomorski (podkomorskiz@pcsb.org)

By When: Ongoing, each quarter

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

Person Responsible: Zachary Podkomorski (podkomorskiz@pcsb.org)

By When: Daily/Weekly student goals

Administrators and teachers engage in mathematics-focused ghost walks/discussions with a focus on target/task alignment and differentiated learning opportunities for students. Teachers will also use TDE(if available) to plan and collaborate and plan with district math specialist and colleagues.

Person Responsible: Zachary Podkomorski (podkomorskiz@pcsb.org)

By When: ongoing

Conduct regular, monthly, Professional Learning Communities (PLCs) inclusive of 'data chats' to review student data to identify opportunities for improvement in instructional practices and student achievement. Data can come from the FAST PM1 and PM2 assessments, IXL, Instructional Materials assessments, and/or teacher and district formal and informal assessments.

Person Responsible: Zachary Podkomorski (podkomorskiz@pcsb.org)

By When: Monthly

#3. 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.

I came in as a new principal in the 2022-2023 school year. Staff had a high turn over in the school and were unhappy with their previous principal. Staff felt bullied by their former principal and unheard in their concerns.

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

My goal was to decrease the amount of turnover in staff by 75% by improving the climate and culture in my school. In addition to raise the school grade from a C to an A.

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

Staff and student surveys administered for feedback
Culture committee monthly meetings to work on initiatives in the school
Staff turnover decreases throughout the school year

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Peggy Fowler (fowlerp@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.)

Extensive initiatives were placed into the school to help with building up the culture in the school for both staff and students

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

Staff felt that they were not heard in the school so by having meetings and allowing for feedback staff felt heard through all the initiatives that were put into place.

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.

Met with individual stakeholders to address concerns and steps to move forward.

Person Responsible: Peggy Fowler (fowlerp@pcsb.org)

By When: 2023-2024 school year

Implemented initiatives to encourage staff turnover.
*Perfect attendance lunch
*Shout outs at faculty meetings
*Breakfast at all faculty meetings

*Use of food and rewards to encourage staff to participate in school initiatives
*Be the One

Person Responsible: Peggy Fowler (fowlerp@pcsb.org)

By When: Ongoing

Implemented student initiatives to help with positive behavior to decrease teacher turnover.
*PBIS
*Student of the month breakfast
*Fieldtrips
*Food rewards for academic and behavior success

Person Responsible: Peggy Fowler (fowlerp@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.

We will focus on incorporating rigorous coursework involving complex tasks and critical thinking skills within our social studies courses. A specific focus will be geared towards placing an emphasis on the students processing new information using writing and discussion. This will help students have a greater understanding of the concepts within this core content area. Our goal is to create a positive culture utilizing purposeful PLC meetings to improve student learning and professional practice through collaborative structures. During our school's PLC work, our goal is to gain a deeper understanding of the Next Generation Sunshine State Standards (NGSSS) and benchmarks to improve student performance. The teachers will be delving into the BEST ELA standards with a focus on writing in response to text.

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 reaching proficiency of the Civics EOC will increase from 76%-86% as measured by the Civics EOC in May 2023. The percentage of US History students demonstrating proficiency will increase from 75% to 80% on their final exam.

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

Monitored through cycle assessments, formative and summative assessments, project-based learning and walk throughs (bi-weekly). Teachers will be responsible for monitoring student performance on unit assessments following completion and data performance will be discussed through student led data chats. The teachers will conduct data analysis after each cycle assessment to set learning goals and work collaboratively to lesson plan using the cycle assessment data.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Melissa Johnson (johnsonmel@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.)

Schoolwide Literacy (Writing in all Content areas and examining text for response).

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

Complex writing tasks are embedded in the Civics EOC, U.S History curriculum and Pre- AP course work. Students need to be exposed to these writing concepts routinely and have support scaffolded to meet the needs of each learner before mastery can occur.

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 2 - Moderate 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.

A Professional development calendar will be established to support monthly Professional Development for teachers using AVID strategies schoolwide with an emphasis on writing.

Person Responsible: Melissa Johnson (johnsonmel@pcsb.org)

By When: Pre school

Teachers will incorporate AVID strategies throughout their lessons to support student achievement in writing using response to text at all levels.

Person Responsible: Melissa Johnson (johnsonmel@pcsb.org)

By When: Ongoing

Teachers will assign bi-monthly, schoolwide writing prompts to students and provide corrective feedback to students to improve writing skills across all content areas.

Person Responsible: Melissa Johnson (johnsonmel@pcsb.org)

By When: Ongoing

Conduct regular, monthly purposeful PLC meetings to address the use of AVID strategies in the classroom. Teachers will engage in dialog and reflection utilizing the cycle of improvement that analyzes data, student work, instructional strategies, lesson observation and study, and discusses opportunities to improve student learning and professional practice through PLC. US History teachers and Civics teachers will work together to make sure the students are adequately prepared for Civics in their US History class. Social studies teachers will team up with ELA teachers during PLC meetings to create consistent and deliberate writing techniques and practices.

Person Responsible: Melissa Johnson (johnsonmel@pcsb.org)

By When: monthly

Teachers will use multiple forms of data to drive conversations and decisions with the support and collaboration of school administrators aligning goals to the SIP.

Person Responsible: Melissa Johnson (johnsonmel@pcsb.org)

By When: Ongoing

All social studies teachers will incorporate at least one DBQ per quarter to support our school wide writing goal to increase literacy. Teachers will provide students with corrective feedback following completion of quarterly DBQs. Administrators will closely monitor this process throughout the school year.

Person Responsible: Melissa Johnson (johnsonmel@pcsb.org)

By When: Ongoing

All social studies teachers will incorporate at least one DBQ per quarter to support our school wide writing goal to increase literacy. Teachers will provide students with corrective feedback following completion of quarterly DBQs. Administrators will closely monitor this process throughout the school year.

Person Responsible: Melissa Johnson (johnsonmel@pcsb.org)

By When: Ongoing

All social studies teachers will incorporate at least one DBQ per quarter to support our school wide writing goal to increase literacy. Teachers will provide students with corrective feedback following completion of quarterly DBQs. Administrators will closely monitor this process throughout the school year.

Person Responsible: Melissa Johnson (johnsonmel@pcsb.org)

By When: Ongoing

#5. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science

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

Science data has fallen and risen in the last couple of years. A greater focus on data, standard/target alignment that utilizes complex questioning at the depth of the standard needs to be implemented routinely.

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 reaching proficiency will increase from 56% to 66% as measured by the FAST

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

Monitoring will occur through GAP Diagnostic assessment, cycle assessments, formative and summative assessments and classroom walkthroughs. Data chats will occur and either remediation or enrichment will occur.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Peggy Fowler (fowlerp@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.)

Strengthen staff ability to develop and plan for content that is engaging and cognitively complex student tasks.
Support staff to utilize data to organize students to interact with content in manners which differentiate/ scaffold instruction to meet the needs of each learner.

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

There is a lack of reading comprehension /exposure to informational and rigorous text especially in science. By exposing these students to passages and engaging them in lessons that require application of critical thinking skills it should result in higher comprehension of science concepts.

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 2 - Moderate 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.

Professional development in AVID strategies through PLC's

Person Responsible: Peggy Fowler (fowlerp@pcsb.org)

By When: Pre school and ongoing

Provide lessons that allow for students to walk through the steps of the Scientific Process at the depth of the standard.

Person Responsible: Peggy Fowler (fowlerp@pcsb.org)

By When: ongoing through PD with teachers to develop and implement in classes on a regular basis

Conduct regular monthly data chats both with students and colleagues at PLC's to determine performance on standard based benchmarks. Utilize and determine what data sources will be used to plan for instruction, intervention and enrichment

Person Responsible: Peggy Fowler (fowlerp@pcsb.org)

By When: monthly

Ensure teachers receive professional development with a heavy focus on reading and writing strategies.

Person Responsible: Peggy Fowler (fowlerp@pcsb.org)

By When: Pre school PLC and ongoing

#6. -- Select below -- specifically relating to

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.

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

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

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.)

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

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.

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

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).

The district allocates SIP funds to each school as prescribed by the legislature. Principals present to the School Advisory Council the amount of their SIP Funds, their SIP, and how the SIP funds will support the plan. The SAC reviews and votes on approval of the SIP and use of SIP funds. The SIP funds are spent in alignment with the SIP, and reviewed by the SAC throughout the year. Expenditures that deviate from the approved SIP are presented to the SAC, which votes to approve or deny the expense.