



---

## Table of Contents

---

<b>SIP Authority and Purpose</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>I. School Information</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>II. Needs Assessment/Data Review</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>III. Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review</b>	<b>19</b>
<b>V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>VI. Title I Requirements</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus</b>	<b>0</b>

## Plato Academy Clearwater

2045 PALMETTO ST, Clearwater, FL 33765

<http://www.platoacademy.net>

### SIP Authority

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

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

#### Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)

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

#### Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)

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

#### Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

## Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Department encourages schools to use the SIP as a “living document” by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

## I. School Information

### School Mission and Vision

**Provide the school's mission statement.**

The mission of Plato Academy Charter Schools is to assist students in achieving their full potential by requiring and nurturing high academic and behavioral standards in a safe, supporting, challenging and enthusiastic environment, providing a well-rounded K-8 education fortified by a study of the Greek language and culture, and fostered by a commitment and cooperative effort among the school, students, parents, and community: our family.

**Provide the school's vision statement.**

The Plato Academy family empowers all learners to exceed expectations

### 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
Sutera, Sara	Principal	The principal serves as an instructional leader, engages stakeholders and collaborates with others to meet our goals.
Beck, Melissa	Assistant Principal	The assistant principal assists the principal in serving as an instructional leader, engaging stakeholders and collaborating with others to meet our goals.
Keller, Jill	Assistant Principal	The assistant principal assists the principal in serving as an instructional leader, engaging stakeholders and collaborating with others to meet our goals.

**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 School Improvement Plan (SIP) development process is a collaborative and inclusive effort that involves various stakeholders to ensure that the plan reflects the needs, priorities, and aspirations of the entire school community. Here's a general outline of the process for involving stakeholders and incorporating their input into the

SIP development:

Identifying Stakeholders: The first step is to identify all relevant stakeholders who have a vested interest in the school's success. This includes the school leadership team, teachers, school staff, parents,

students (for secondary schools), families, and potentially business or community leaders.

#### Communication and Engagement Strategy:

Plato Academy Clearwater establishes open lines of communication through various means such as meetings and surveys. This ensures that stakeholders are aware of the SIP development process and their role in it.

#### Collecting Stakeholder Input:

Plato Academy Schools distribute surveys or questionnaires to gather input from stakeholders on their perceptions of the school's strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and challenges. This aligns with our Cognia accreditation. Plato Academy also conducts interviews with key stakeholders, such as school leaders, teachers, and community leaders, to gain a deeper understanding of their perspectives and recommendations. This occurs during annual Schools of Excellence reviews.

**Data Analysis:** Systematically analyze the collected data from surveys, interviews and academic performance to identify recurring themes, common concerns, and areas of consensus among stakeholders.

Plato Academy Clearwater identifies issues and opportunities based on the significance and potential impact they have on the school's improvement. We have an active School Advisory Committee that holds regular meetings to review progress, refine strategies, and ensure alignment with the overall SIP goals. While drafting the School Improvement Plan (SIP), insights, recommendations, and strategies proposed by the stakeholders are utilized as a foundation to ensure that the plan reflects a diverse range of perspectives and addresses the needs of all stakeholders.

#### **SIP Monitoring**

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

Monitoring the School Improvement Plan (SIP) for effective implementation and measuring its impact on student achievement, especially for those students with the greatest achievement gap, is a crucial aspect of the improvement process. Below are steps that Plato Academy Clearwater will take to monitor our SIP.

Plato Academy Clearwater defines specific metrics and indicators that align with the SIP goals and objectives. These include standardized test scores, attendance rates, disciplinary incidents, and other relevant data points.

We regularly collect data throughout the year related to the chosen metrics through ongoing assessments, surveys, classroom observations, and other relevant sources. We review and monitor this data during our quarterly SAC meetings with stakeholders as well as monthly during our teacher professional learning communities. The annual survey data collected from our Cognia Accreditation will serve as another area that allows us to review and reflect on goals that have been achieved and set new goals in our continuous growth and improvement model.

By following this monitoring and revision process, Plato Academy Clearwater can ensure that their SIP remains responsive to the needs of all students, especially those with the greatest achievement gaps, and continues to drive continuous improvement in student achievement.

#### **Demographic Data**

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

<b>2023-24 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Combination School KG-8
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2022-23 Title I School Status</b>	No
<b>2022-23 Minority Rate</b>	42%
<b>2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b>	42%
<b>Charter School</b>	Yes
<b>RAISE School</b>	No
<b>ESSA Identification</b> *updated as of 3/11/2024	ATSI
<b>Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)</b>	No
<b>2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (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) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
<b>School Grades History</b> *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: B 2019-20: A 2018-19: A 2017-18: A
<b>School Improvement Rating History</b>	
<b>DJJ Accountability Rating History</b>	

**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	1	1	3	3	1	9
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	3	1	1	0	7	6	19
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	2
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	9	6	6	14	7	42
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	8	7	9	6	7	37
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	5	4	5	5	2	21



**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	7	6	8	11	6	38

**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	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
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
Absent 10% or more school days		
One or more suspensions		
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)		
Course failure in Math		
Level 1 on statewide FSA ELA assessment		
Level 1 on statewide FSA Math assessment		
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.		

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

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Students with two or more indicators		

**The number of students identified retained:**

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Retained Students: Current Year		
Students retained two or more times		

**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	
Absent 10% or more school days	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

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

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

**The number of students identified retained:**

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

**II. Needs Assessment/Data Review**

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

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

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

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	56	55	53	63	55	55	72		
ELA Learning Gains				54			60		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				46			38		
Math Achievement*	70	61	55	68	34	42	73		
Math Learning Gains				54			53		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				46			42		

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
Science Achievement*	59	52	52	55	57	54	69		
Social Studies Achievement*	73	69	68	82	57	59	76		
Middle School Acceleration	78	69	70	79	44	51	82		
Graduation Rate		44	74		49	50			
College and Career Acceleration		17	53		65	70			
ELP Progress	62	56	55	57	69	70	58		

\* 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	65
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	456
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

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	604
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

**ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)**

<b>2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY</b>				
<b>ESSA Subgroup</b>	<b>Federal Percent of Points Index</b>	<b>Subgroup Below 41%</b>	<b>Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%</b>	<b>Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%</b>
SWD	25	Yes	2	2
ELL	46			
AMI				
ASN	88			
BLK	47			
HSP	60			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	67			
FRL	55			

<b>2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY</b>				
<b>ESSA Subgroup</b>	<b>Federal Percent of Points Index</b>	<b>Subgroup Below 41%</b>	<b>Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%</b>	<b>Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%</b>
SWD	28	Yes	1	1
ELL	46			
AMI				
ASN	71			
BLK	44			
HSP	52			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	64			
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	56			70			59	73	78			62
SWD	31			31			12				3	
ELL	38			59			25				4	62
AMI												
ASN	81			95							2	
BLK	35			59							2	
HSP	48			61			48	55	80		7	70
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	59			72			61	74	75		6	
FRL	49			57			47	65	69		7	50

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	63	54	46	68	54	46	55	82	79			57
SWD	25	24	13	28	30	38	36					
ELL	41	57	56	50	36		25					57
AMI												
ASN	81	82		81	59		50					
BLK	34	42	50	48	46	50	36					
HSP	56	52	35	59	50	47	23	76	71			
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	67	54	48	72	56	44	69	85	85			
FRL	46	47	43	49	45	43	29	56	54			

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	72	60	38	73	53	42	69	76	82			58
SWD	39	31		55	31	30						
ELL	50	53		67	60							58

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
AMI												
ASN	90	69		90	54							
BLK	54	53		54	53							
HSP	66	56	33	67	52	44	59	71	73			
MUL	55	70		40								
PAC												
WHT	75	60	32	78	53	38	82	79	89			
FRL	51	52	44	60	42	35	42	61	77			

**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
05	2023 - Spring	51%	57%	-6%	54%	-3%
07	2023 - Spring	64%	48%	16%	47%	17%
08	2023 - Spring	53%	47%	6%	47%	6%
04	2023 - Spring	63%	58%	5%	58%	5%
06	2023 - Spring	48%	47%	1%	47%	1%
03	2023 - Spring	58%	53%	5%	50%	8%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	71%	58%	13%	54%	17%
07	2023 - Spring	74%	36%	38%	48%	26%
03	2023 - Spring	77%	62%	15%	59%	18%
04	2023 - Spring	63%	66%	-3%	61%	2%
08	2023 - Spring	70%	61%	9%	55%	15%
05	2023 - Spring	65%	61%	4%	55%	10%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	58%	47%	11%	44%	14%
05	2023 - Spring	57%	60%	-3%	51%	6%

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

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

CIVICS						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	74%	68%	6%	66%	8%

### 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.**

Students with Disabilities (SWD) - 28%

Most of our students with Disabilities are identified as having significant reading deficiencies. It takes specialized designed instruction over a longer period of time to show and maintain growth in students who struggle with significant deficiencies in reading. Additionally, students with disabilities are showing the need for more time than the average performing student to close the achievement gaps from Covid and online learning. Many students lost access to their regular schedule and while specifically designed instruction was maintained, it was in a much different capacity and setting for many students with disabilities.

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

**Students with Disabilities (SWD)**

Most of our students with Disabilities are identified as having significant reading deficiencies. It takes specialized designed instruction over a longer period of time to show and maintain growth in students who struggle with significant deficiencies in reading. Additionally, students with disabilities are showing the need for more time than the average performing student to close the achievement gaps from Covid and online learning. Many students lost access to their regular schedule and while specifically designed instruction was maintained, it was in a much different capacity and setting for many students with disabilities.

**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.**

**Students with Disabilities (SWD)**

Most of our students with Disabilities are identified as having significant reading deficiencies. It takes specialized designed instruction over a longer period of time to show and maintain growth in students who struggle with significant deficiencies in reading. Additionally, students with disabilities are showing the need for more time than the average performing student to close the achievement gaps from Covid and online learning. Many students lost access to their regular schedule and while specifically designed instruction was maintained, it was in a much different capacity and setting for many students with disabilities.

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

Our School Mathematics Achievement showed the most improvement school-wide using preliminary data, as we are still waiting for full data to be released from the State of Florida accountability department. Last year, our school provided additional Math tutoring after school and we focused on identifying specific areas that students lacked mastery to provide support to both teachers providing intervention and to students with targeted intervention. Additionally, our professional learning communities focused greatly on math instruction, best practices and data evaluation in order to make data-driven decisions for student improvement.

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

While reflecting on EWS data, I believe that our potential areas of concern are for the students who received a level one in Reading for our current 7th-grade students.

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

- 1- Academic growth in reading for SWD
- 2- Academic growth in math for SWD
- 3- Learning gains in ELA, specifically for 7th grade
- 4- Increase in positive attendance data
- 5- Decrease in discipline referrals that result in suspensions

**Area of Focus**

(Identified key Area of Focus that addresses the school's highest priority based on any/all relevant data sources)



**#1. 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.

Because we were identified as ATSI, we chose to focus on the subgroup of Students with Disabilities

**Measurable Outcome:**

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

As a school, our goal is to increase our percentage of students with disabilities meeting required learning gains from 28% to the state minimum of 41%.

**Monitoring:**

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

The school will use quarterly IEP progress reports, T3 intervention data and state progress monitoring to regularly assess growth in our students with disabilities. This ensures that teachers, administrators, parents and intervention specialists are all actively monitoring and adjusting interventions for our students with disabilities in order to reach the desired outcome.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Sara Sutera (c.suteras@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.)

Our school stays focused on the Science of Reading for all student's grade level learning, as well as, for students with reading deficits to ensure skills are built upon following research data. Our Exceptional Student Educators and Intervention specialists use a variety of evidence-based interventions for students with disabilities. FCRR, Reading A-Z and Barton are a few of the examples of interventions being actively used in our school.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:**

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Our school ensures that the resources we are using are research and evidence-based while providing a variety so that students always have something to fit their needs and prevent them from becoming satiated with the intervention.

**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.

The school will use quarterly IEP progress reports, T3 intervention data and state progress monitoring to regularly assess growth in our students with disabilities. This ensures that teachers, administrators, parents and intervention specialists are all actively monitoring and adjusting interventions for our students with disabilities in order to reach the desired outcome.

**Person Responsible:** Sara Sutera (c.suteras@pcsb.org)

**By When:** Quarterly, to be completed by the end of the academic year

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

### Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

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

Because we were identified as ATSI, we chose to focus on the area of positive culture and environment.

### Measurable Outcome:

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

As a school, our goal is to decrease the number of students with discipline referrals that result in suspension from 19 to a maximum of 15.

### Monitoring:

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

Referral and suspension data will be reviewed quarterly by the School-Based Leadership Team. We will assess the referrals and the reasons for them. Based on that data we will then plan for interventions and positive behavioral supports to continue to work on reduction.

### Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Sara Sutera (c.suteras@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.)

Plato Academy Clearwater will be using CHAMPS and PBIS strategies to help us make improvements in this area of focus.

### Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Many staff members from Plato Academy Clearwater have been trained in CHAMPS and also attended the Ron Clark Academy to learn more about positive behavior intervention systems. We maintain that keeping students in school with a positive and encouraging atmosphere is best for the teaching and learning environments.

### 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.

Referral and suspension data will be reviewed quarterly by the School-Based Leadership Team. We will assess the referrals and the reasons for them. Based on that data we will then plan for interventions and positive behavioral supports to continue to work on reduction.

**Person Responsible:** Sara Sutera (c.suteras@pcsb.org)

**By When:** Quarterly, to be completed by the end of 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).

Plato Academy Clearwater has not been designated to receive funding allocations to support the SIP.