
Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	7
III. Planning for Improvement	12
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	31
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	0
VI. Title I Requirements	31
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

Pinellas Park High School

6305 118TH AVE, Largo, FL 33773

<http://www.pp-hs.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.

To educate and prepare each student for college, career, and life.

Provide the school's vision statement.

100% Student success

School Leadership Team, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring

School Leadership Team

For each member of the school leadership team, select the employee name and email address from the dropdown. Identify the position title and job duties/responsibilities as it relates to SIP implementation for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Patterson, Brett	Principal	Monitoring of the overall SIP and specifically, Graduation Rate, Post-Secondary Readiness, and US History.
Peppers, Paul	Assistant Principal	Advanced Studies
Leitold, Kim	Assistant Principal	ELA, Reading, Biology, and EL
Adams, James	Assistant Principal	US History
Howe, Alea	Assistant Principal	Math
Bingler, Alyssa	Math Coach	Support teachers to increase student success.
Napier, Jennifer	Instructional Coach	Support teachers to increase student success.
Newman, Kailynn	Instructional Coach	Support teachers to increase student success.

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.

Faculty, and families were provided an opportunity to review the SIP draft and provide feedback.

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 expectations established in the SIP related to content areas, will be monitored twice per month during MTSS meetings.

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)	High School 9-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	Yes
2022-23 Minority Rate	59%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	99%
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: C 2018-19: C 2017-18: B
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

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*	39	47	50	38	51	51	35		
ELA Learning Gains				45			41		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				39			30		
Math Achievement*	20	36	38	30	38	38	26		
Math Learning Gains				41			26		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				41			31		
Science Achievement*	40	61	64	46	42	40	45		
Social Studies Achievement*	51	63	66	61	47	48	58		
Middle School Acceleration					45	44			
Graduation Rate	95	92	89	98	61	61	96		
College and Career Acceleration	74	69	65	61	70	67	53		
ELP Progress	39	47	45	47			41		

* 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	51
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	358
Total Components for the Federal Index	7

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
Percent Tested	95
Graduation Rate	95

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	50
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	547
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	97
Graduation Rate	98

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	39	Yes	4	
ELL	41			
AMI				
ASN	65			
BLK	39	Yes	1	
HSP	52			
MUL	53			
PAC				
WHT	52			
FRL	47			

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	34	Yes	3	
ELL	42			
AMI				
ASN	70			
BLK	44			
HSP	48			
MUL	52			
PAC				
WHT	49			
FRL	46			

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	39			20			40	51		95	74	39
SWD	15			12			24	29		60	7	35
ELL	22			14			27	32		66	7	39
AMI												
ASN	55			47			60	70		92	7	35
BLK	20			11			18	36		58	6	
HSP	37			15			36	58		74	7	44
MUL	26			19			42	55		73	6	
PAC												
WHT	45			24			46	50		76	7	25
FRL	34			18			34	49		71	7	32

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	38	45	39	30	41	41	46	61		98	61	47
SWD	19	34	28	15	26	30	29	40		89	38	27
ELL	20	42	45	20	45	31	29	35		98	50	47
AMI												
ASN	49	50		64	65		73	73		96	85	75
BLK	29	36	33	16	49	50	28	52		98	45	
HSP	38	48	39	30	41	33	42	55		97	57	47
MUL	42	51		37	33		44	44		100	64	
PAC												
WHT	39	45	43	31	38	41	52	68		98	64	24
FRL	32	43	38	25	42	43	41	51		97	55	44

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	35	41	30	26	26	31	45	58		96	53	41
SWD	17	27	22	28	35	40	33	49		84	22	27
ELL	20	37	27	23	24	39	34	52		99	45	41
AMI												
ASN	56	57		53	50		73	54		100	61	60
BLK	22	34	23	18	23	28	34	28		94	45	
HSP	34	38	24	22	22	40	42	62		98	46	37
MUL	28	46		19	23		25	47		100	62	
PAC												
WHT	38	41	39	31	28	27	48	66		95	58	54
FRL	27	36	26	22	25	32	37	50		94	49	34

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
10	2023 - Spring	41%	48%	-7%	50%	-9%
08	2023 - Spring	*	47%	*	47%	*
09	2023 - Spring	37%	46%	-9%	48%	-11%

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

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	23%	53%	-30%	50%	-27%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	26%	46%	-20%	48%	-22%

BIOLOGY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	39%	59%	-20%	63%	-24%

HISTORY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	50%	59%	-9%	63%	-13%

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.

EOC Data reflects the content area with the most significant need of support is Math. We did not maintain high level questions and expectations in Geometry which contributed to lower performance on the EOC exam.

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

Mathematics achievement was our lowest overall proficiency at 24% for the 23-24 school year based on the EOC exam.

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.

Biology had the greatest gap, the primary factor was the poor execution of Focused Note Taking and higher level questioning tactics.

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

College and career readiness, or acceleration, demonstrated the most improvement with an increase of 13 points over the previous year. A targeted approach to better monitor every student was implemented to track every student at every grade level.

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

Level I on state-wide ELA assessments
Level I on state-wide Math assessments

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

Create a classroom environment of trust, openness to dialogue, academic goal setting, and risk taking for all students.

Build engagement strategies incorporating all learning styles, with scaffolding, movement, and collaboration through the phases of Focused Notetaking.

Plan for ongoing assessment and time for student metacognition to drive teaching and learning.

Focus student learning on the process (try, fail, try again), not the product to increase growth mindset and transferability of learning to a new setting.

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 41% of students earning a level 3 or above as evidenced in the data from the PM3. The problem/gap is occurring because our students need to continually circle back to the benchmarks and compare and contrast how authors developed theme, character, mood, rhetorical devices/appeal and literary elements etc. to strengthen their understanding of the way authors develop things and the things they develop.

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 PM3 proficiency will increase from 41% to 55%, as measured by the F.A.S.T. PM3.

Monitoring:

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

Teachers will monitor learning routinely to ensure all students met the desired effect.

Teachers and administrator will monitor learning during a PLC biweekly and plan for intervention for benchmarks not met.

Students will also track their progress in meeting the benchmarks thru learning logs and PM 1, PM2 data chats.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Kim Leitold (leitoldk@pcsb.org)

Evidence-based Intervention:

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

Teachers:

will continue to utilize the curriculum pacing guide and required text.

develop a student-centered learning environment.

leverage the use of anchor charts and graphic organizers.

ask complex questions that require all students to critically think and respond at the rigor level of the benchmark. (Everybody answers every question)

ask students to compare and contrast how authors develop theme, plot, characters, utilize rhetoric etc.

provide ongoing test prep for each benchmark through bell work.

work with the team to provide small group instruction on a specific area of need.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Anchor charts consistently used by student will deepen their understanding over time.

Not all students were asked questions at the rigor level of the benchmark or required to respond.

Provide opportunities to ask students to analyze how authors develop theme etc. to continually circle back and provide incremental development to deepen learning.

Allowing students to understand what the question is asking and be able to eliminate wrong answers requires on going practice.

Teachers working together to support learners that struggle with understanding a benchmark may benefit from small group instruction with rotating groups.

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.

Engage in PD to develop a tracking system to support differentiation and drive student growth.

Engage in PLC discussions (bi-weekly) to monitor tracker data.

Join paid PD to develop common formative assessments.

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

By When: by the end of semester one

1. Determine what anchor charts students need and develop this support.
2. Provide a mentor for new teachers to ensure they are teaching at the rigor level of the benchmark and how to develop a student-centered classroom.
3. Provide HQT Question PD to ensure questions meet the rigor level of the benchmark.
4. Develop a protocol to engage students in critical reading with support.
5. Join paid PD to develop common assessments.

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

By When: End of quarter one

#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 24% of students earning a level 3 or above as evidenced in our school's Algebra and Geometry performance on the BEST assessments. We expect our performance to be 35% by June 2024.

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 24% to 35% as measured by BEST EOCs. The percent of all students achieving learning gains will increase from ____% to ____% as measured by BEST EOCs. The percent of L25 students achieving learning gains will increase from ____% to ____% as measured by BEST EOCs.

Monitoring:

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

Teachers will monitor learning routinely to ensure all students master the standards. Teachers and administrator will monitor learning during a PLC biweekly and plan for intervention for standards not met. Students will also track their progress in meeting the benchmarks thru learning logs, formative assessments and Cycle assessment data chats.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Alea Howe (howeal@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 critical content from the standards in alignment with district resources.
2. Strengthen staff ability to engage students in complex tasks.
3. Support staff to utilize data to organize students to interact with content in manners which differentiate/ scaffold instruction to meet the needs of every student.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

1. Classroom walkthroughs are showing that students struggle to identify the critical content of standards during instruction.
2. The problem/gap is occurring because there has been insufficient emphasis on engaging students in complex tasks that are aligned to the state standards and state test item specifications.
3. By utilizing data and district resources to increase the level of rigor and standards-based instruction, the problem/gap will be reduced and there will be an increase in overall math achievement levels.

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.

Teachers intentionally plan together in Professional Learning Community (PLC) groups to plan for utilizing district and state resources in order to help students engage in complex standards-aligned tasks.

Person Responsible: Alea Howe (howeal@pcsb.org)

By When: Routinely throughout the year

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

Teachers engage in PD to develop a tracking system to support differentiation and drive student growth. Teacher and administrator engage in PLC discussions (bi-weekly) to monitor tracker data and plan for intervention.

Join paid PD to develop common formative assessments.

Person Responsible: Alea Howe (howeal@pcsb.org)

By When: Routinely throughout the year

Teachers engage in district provided professional learning on increasing rigor and classroom culture that support productive struggle and on the use of structures for inquiry-based learning and utilizing higher-level questions to promote class discussion and problem solving.

Person Responsible: Alea Howe (howeal@pcsb.org)

By When: At least once per quarter

Administrators monitor classrooms, provide constructive feedback and participate in teacher reflection to increase effective teaching practices and monitor implementation of the district scope, sequence, and curricular materials for math courses.

Person Responsible: Alea Howe (howeal@pcsb.org)

By When: Routinely throughout the year

Teachers intentionally plan for students to engage in complex tasks by embedding the new Mathematical Thinking and Reasoning Standards (MTRs).

Person Responsible: Alea Howe (howeal@pcsb.org)

By When: Daily

#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 38% of students earning a level 3 or above as evidenced in the data from the Biology EOC. The problem/gap is occurring because the focus is on memorization/recording of notes rather than revising, processing, retention and making connections to apply the learning.

Measurable Outcome:

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

The percent of all students achieving Biology EOC proficiency will increase from 38% to 55%, as measured by the Biology EOC.

Monitoring:

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

Teachers will monitor learning routinely to ensure all students master the standards. Teachers and administrator will monitor learning during a PLC biweekly and plan for intervention for standards not met. Students will also track their progress in meeting the benchmarks thru learning logs, formative assessments and Cycle assessment data chats.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Kim Leitold (leitoldk@pcsb.org)

Evidence-based Intervention:

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

Teachers will plan and implement student centered instructional practices that support, Writing, Inquiry, Collaboration, Organization, and Reading (WICOR) to ensure higher order thinking. Science teachers will utilize timely formative and summative assessment data to inform spiral reteaching through the course. Teachers leverage the use of anchor charts and graphic organizers. Teachers ask complex questions that require all students to critically think and respond at the rigor level of the benchmark. (Everybody answers every question)

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The EOC has complex questions our students must have familiarity and confidence in completing successfully. Critical reading is an area of needed growth for our student to ensure their success on the EOC.

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. Teachers incorporate instructional engagement activities, such as 10-2-2 or gradual release, that support student success with literacy within the Science curriculum.
- 2.. Determine what anchor charts students need and develop this support.
3. Provide HOT Question PD to ensure questions meet the rigor level of the benchmark.
4. Develop a protocol to engage students in critical reading with support.
5. Join paid PD to develop common assessments.
6. Engage in PD to develop a PPH tracking system to support differentiation to drive student growth.

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

By When: Quarter 1

Engage in PLC discussions (bi-weekly) to monitor tracker data.

Teachers utilize common formative assessments and use the collected data to gauge student progress toward master of the course content.

Teachers use student data to plan small group instruction and station rotations.

Teachers use benchmark-level data to plan reteaching for whole-class, small group, and individual students based on trends.

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

By When: Bimonthly

#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 51% of students earning a level 3 or above as evidenced in the data from the US History EOC. The problem/gap is occurring because the focus is on memorization/recording of notes rather than revising, processing, retention and making connections to apply the learning.

Measurable Outcome:

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

The percent of all students achieving US History proficiency will increase from 51% to 65%, as measured by the US History EOC.

Monitoring:

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

Teachers will monitor learning routinely/daily to ensure all students met the learning objective/standard. Teachers and administrator will monitor learning using formative assessments during biweekly PLC and plan for intervention for benchmarks not met. Students will also track their progress in meeting the benchmarks thru learning logs and Cycle 1 , Cycle 2 data chats.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

James Adams (adamsjam@pcsb.org)

Evidence-based Intervention:

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

Teachers utilize instructional practices that support, Writing, Inquiry, Collaboration, Organization, and Critical Reading (WICOR) to raise achievement levels and close the achievement gap in Social Studies.

Teachers incorporate instructional engagement activities that support student success with literacy within the Social Studies Curriculum.

Teachers will utilize assessment data to drive instruction through constant spiraled scaffolding.

Teachers will utilize anchor charts to support learning.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The EOC has complex questions our students must have familiarity and confidence in completing successfully.

Critical reading is an area of needed growth for our student to ensure their success on the EOC.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

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

Teachers will attend WICOR Training and FOCUS Notes training during pre-school.
Teachers include WICOR strategies into daily lesson plans that support students at all levels.
Teachers determine what anchor charts students need and develop this support.
Provide PD for teachers how to develop a student-centered classroom.
Provide HOT Question PD to ensure questions meet the rigor level of the benchmark.
Develop a protocol to engage students in critical reading with support.

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

By When: End of quarter one

Social studies teachers continue to integrate literacy standards into the social studies content via Document Based Question (DBQ) Project materials and Stanford History Education Group (SHEG) lessons.

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

By When: Bimonthly

Teachers regularly incorporate knowledge checks (formative assessments) and use the collected data in their PLC to identify what standards are met and develops a plan to circle back to standards not met.
Teachers will engage in PD to develop a data tracking system.
Teachers will engage in paid common formative assessments development.

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

By When: PD during Quarter One PLC with administrator bimonthly

#5. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

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

1. Our current level of performance is __%, as evidenced in Spring 2023 ESSA Assessment Data.
2. We expect our performance level to be __% by June 2024.
3. The problem/gap is occurring because insufficient emphasis on using high impact instructional practices and providing intentional support in ELA courses.
4. If engaging students in their own learning through intentional support and using high impact instructional practices and complex tasks would occur, the performance would increase by 6%.

Measurable Outcome:

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

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

Monitoring:

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

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

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

[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.)

Students requiring ESE services work towards mastery of meaningful Individualized Education Plan (IEP) goals in their Least Restrictive Environment (LRE).

Support students with disabilities in learning the foundational skills they need to engage in rigorous, grade level content.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

1. Students requiring ESE services work towards mastery of meaningful Individualized Education Plan goals while learning the foundational skills they need to engage in rigorous, grade-level content in the Least Restrictive Environment.
2. Ensure that students requiring ESE services receive instruction designed to each students to advocate for their academic, social, and emotional needs.
3. Support staff to utilize data to organize students to interact with content in manners which differentiates/ scaffolds instruction to meet the needs of each student.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

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

- Implement a process for placing students requiring ESE services in master schedules first in order to optimize service delivery.
- Plan intentionally for specially designed instruction to address IEP goals and grade level standard

Person Responsible: Brett Patterson (pattersonb@pcsb.org)

By When: Throughout the year

Provide differentiated, individualized or small-group instruction that is aligned to student's IEP goals and Specially Designed Instruction. Differentiated, individualized, or small group instruction should be aligned to Individualized Education Plan (IEPs).

- Make rigorous texts, materials, content, and activities accessible to students through supplementary aids including annotated texts and assistive technology.

Person Responsible: Brett Patterson (pattersonb@pcsb.org)

By When: Throughout the year

#6. Graduation specifically relating to Graduation**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 percentage of seniors meeting college and career readiness will increase to 90% as measured by successful completion of CAPE Industry Certifications, passing of an AP or AICE exam, or passing of a Dual Enrollment course.

Measurable Outcome:

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

The percent of all seniors achieving college and career readiness will increase from 74% to 90%.

Monitoring:

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

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

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Paul Peppers (peppersp@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.)

Ensure school has systems of support for meeting state graduation standards to meet the personalized needs of ALL students

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

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

Ensure school has robust systems of support so all students can complete at least one college and career readiness measure by end of senior year

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

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

Utilize the PCS COHORT REPORTING SYSTEM to progress monitor each factor impacting graduation rate and implementing interventions at the whole school, grade level, course level, or student level as needed and appropriate

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

By When: Throughout the year

Utilize the AP Potential Report to guide course selection recommendations that match each student's greatest opportunity for success.

- Utilize AVID strategies schoolwide and increase enrollment in the AVID elective to provide supports to students accessing AP, AICE, and/or DE coursework.

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

By When: Monthly

#7. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to English Language Learners**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a 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 ___% of students earning a level 3 or above as evidenced in the data from State Assessments. The problem/gap is occurring because the focus is on memorization/recording of notes rather than revising, processing, retention and making connections to apply the learning.

Measurable Outcome:

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

The percent of EL students achieving proficiency on State Assessments will increase from ___% to ___%, as measured by the FAST and EOC Assessments.

Monitoring:

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

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

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Kim Leitold (leitoldk@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.)

Establish and implement processes that create a system of support for ELs.

Establish meaningful communication with families and a parent involvement plan that is carried out in the home language, is sustained over time, and is responsive to the cultural experiences of the EL families.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The EOC has complex questions our students must have familiarity and confidence in completing successfully.

Critical reading is an area of needed growth for our student to ensure their success on the EOC.

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.

Create a plan for each student coded LY and LF to receive appropriate testing accommodations starting day one for each assessment; create a plan for monitoring.

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

By When: September 1st, 2023

Develop a school-wide plan to build a positive relationship with EL families, community, culture and increase involvement.

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

By When: September 1st, 2023

#8. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Black/African-American**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

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

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

Measurable Outcome:

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

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

Monitoring:

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

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

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jennifer Napier (napierj@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.)

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

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

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

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.

Black males in 10th grade will be pulled from various elective courses to build on reading/writing skills to help with overall academic success.

Person Responsible: Jennifer Napier (napierj@pcsb.org)

By When: Weekly

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

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

We are working this year to expand our PBIS system to support our students and staff. The ultimate goal is that students and staff will have a more positive experience here in the school, which will grow the collegial culture and overall climate of the school. We expect to see a decrease in student tardiness and an increase in attendance as a result of these efforts.

Measurable Outcome:

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

With the increased PBIS efforts, we expect to see a growth of 5% in regular student attendance from approximately 85% daily attendance to 90% attendance.

Monitoring:

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

Weekly attendance percentages will be monitored in our MTSS meetings and our success coaches, guidance counselors, social worker, and administrators will be regularly reaching out to students with poor attendance or students at risk.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Alea Howe (howeal@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.)

Establishing cooperative learning structures to promote student engagement and positive relationships (utilizing PBIS and Restorative Practices as needed)

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

This is based on the national PBIS project and work with restorative practices. Our specific needs are based on our data-analysis of school processes. With the development of deeper and more meaningful relationships, the increased use of the PBIS system within classrooms, and the active monitoring of campus, students should have a stronger desire to get to class on time and to stay in class.

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.

Reconfigure the daily bell schedule to give the students enough time on passing periods to get to class.

Person Responsible: Alea Howe (howeal@pcsb.org)

By When: By the start of the school year

Administration will complete regular walk throughs to ensure standards-based curriculum is being taught at the appropriate level of engagement and rigor

Person Responsible: Brett Patterson (pattersonb@pcsb.org)

By When: Routinely throughout the year

A system of recognition will be used routinely to provide rewards to students for demonstration of positive and appropriate behaviors that are identified in the schoolwide expectations. By the end of the first semester, at least 90% of school members (students and staff) will participate in reward/recognition system and the rewards will be varied to reflect student interests (based on student input).

Person Responsible: Alea Howe (howeal@pcsb.org)

By When: Routinely throughout the year

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 Funding is focused on increasing attendance and academic engagement. Attendance will be monitored daily for individual students and bi-monthly for school-wide trends through the Child Study Team. Additionally, academic engagement will be structured through strategic planning and monitored through Learning Community meetings as well as administrative walk-throughs. Continual review of the implemented systems will be reviewed and adjusted as necessary through the support and inclusion of the Leadership Team.

Title I Requirements

Schoolwide Program Plan (SWP) Requirements

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

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

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

<https://www.pcsb.org/pp-hs>

Title I information events are held monthly prior to the SAC meetings and participates are provided updates and feedback is collected during the meeting.

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

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

<https://www.pcsb.org/pp-hs>

In addition to monthly meeting opportunities, the principal provides weekly academic and attendance progress reports to every family member.

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

Pinellas Park High School operates on a block schedule that provides an increase in instructional time for every teacher/student. Additionally, PPHS has an open access practice for advanced courses further supporting an accelerated curriculum.

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

N/A