
Table of Contents

| | |
|--|-----------|
| SIP Authority and Purpose | 3 |
| I. School Information | 6 |
| II. Needs Assessment/Data Review | 9 |
| III. Planning for Improvement | 15 |
| IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review | 22 |
| V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence | 0 |
| VI. Title I Requirements | 0 |
| VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus | 22 |

Plato Academy Palm Harbor Charter School

1601 CURLEW RD, Palm Harbor, FL 34683

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 the 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 vision of the Plato Academy Charter Schools is to progress as a family in which all are teachers and learners and are empowered and encouraged to exceed expectations, resulting in successful graduates ready to advance into their next stage of life, equipped with a well-rounded K-8 education fortified by the study of the Greek language and culture, and excited about continuing to achieve their full potential.

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 |
|-------------------|---------------------|--|
| Neptune, Kathleen | Principal | Handles personnel, curriculum, safety, budget, purchasing, public relations, plant operations, food service, and transportation. Position is responsible for the total operational management of the school. |
| | Assistant Principal | Oversee the daily operations of the school. |

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.

AYP data and Cognia survey results are gathered. This information is shared with various stakeholders (SBLT, other teachers, SAC, and staff). Strengths and areas in need of improvement are identified and analyzed. Using what has shown to be effective, and adjusting what has not, decisions are made to improve school outcomes.

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 supported and monitored through weekly PLCs, staff trainings, and monthly SAC meetings. Data will consistently be analyzed, with a focus on SWD and ELLs, to ensure growth. When results are poor, input from the various groups will be obtained and purposeful adjustments made with the intension of fostering positive improvements.

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) | Combination School KG-8 |
| Primary Service Type (per MSID File) | K-12 General Education |
| 2022-23 Title I School Status | No |
| 2022-23 Minority Rate | 20% |
| 2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate | 29% |
| Charter School | Yes |
| 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)* Hispanic Students (HSP) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL) |
| School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline. | 2021-22: A 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 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 4 | 5 | 21 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 6 |
| 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 | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 8 | 3 | 7 | 24 |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 8 | 1 | 0 | 11 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C. | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 12 | 14 | 16 | 19 | 70 |
| | 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 | 2 | 1 | 5 | 4 | 7 | 19 |

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 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| 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 | 8 | |
| Absent 10% or more school days | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 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 | 0 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 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 | 0 |
| Level 1 on statewide FSA Math assessment | 0 | 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 | 0 |

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

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | Total |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | |
| Students with two or more indicators | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

The number of students identified retained:

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | Total |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | |
| Retained Students: Current Year | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 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* | 67 | 55 | 53 | 70 | 55 | 55 | 71 | | |
| ELA Learning Gains | | | | 59 | | | 53 | | |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | 49 | | | 35 | | |
| Math Achievement* | 74 | 61 | 55 | 70 | 34 | 42 | 72 | | |
| Math Learning Gains | | | | 56 | | | 55 | | |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | 48 | | | 45 | | |
| Science Achievement* | 60 | 52 | 52 | 59 | 57 | 54 | 69 | | |
| Social Studies Achievement* | 95 | 69 | 68 | 86 | 57 | 59 | 77 | | |
| Middle School Acceleration | 65 | 69 | 70 | 80 | 44 | 51 | 84 | | |
| Graduation Rate | | 44 | 74 | | 49 | 50 | | | |
| College and Career Acceleration | | 17 | 53 | | 65 | 70 | | | |
| ELP Progress | | 56 | 55 | | 69 | 70 | | | |

* 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 | 72 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students | No |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 1 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 434 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 6 |
| Percent Tested | 99 |
| Graduation Rate | |

| 2021-22 ESSA Federal Index | |
|--------------------------------------|------|
| ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI) | ATSI |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students | 64 |

| 2021-22 ESSA Federal Index | |
|--|-----|
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students | No |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 2 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 577 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 9 |
| 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 | 36 | Yes | 2 | |
| ELL | | | | |
| AMI | | | | |
| ASN | | | | |
| BLK | | | | |
| HSP | 69 | | | |
| MUL | | | | |
| PAC | | | | |
| WHT | 72 | | | |
| FRL | 63 | | | |

| 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 | 33 | Yes | 1 | |
| ELL | 36 | Yes | 1 | |
| AMI | | | | |
| ASN | | | | |
| BLK | | | | |
| HSP | 56 | | | |

| 2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY | | | | |
|------------------------------------|---------------------------------|--------------------|---|---|
| ESSA Subgroup | Federal Percent of Points Index | Subgroup Below 41% | Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41% | Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32% |
| MUL | | | | |
| PAC | | | | |
| WHT | 65 | | | |
| FRL | 45 | | | |

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 | 67 | | | 74 | | | 60 | 95 | 65 | | | |
| SWD | 23 | | | 48 | | | | | | | 2 | |
| ELL | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| AMI | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ASN | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| BLK | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| HSP | 62 | | | 75 | | | | | | | 2 | |
| MUL | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| PAC | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 67 | | | 75 | | | 60 | 94 | 63 | | 6 | |
| FRL | 57 | | | 60 | | | 29 | 92 | | | 5 | |

| 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 | 70 | 59 | 49 | 70 | 56 | 48 | 59 | 86 | 80 | | | |
| SWD | 26 | 33 | | 32 | 42 | | | | | | | |
| ELL | 45 | | | 27 | | | | | | | | |
| AMI | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ASN | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| 2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|----------|--------|-------------|-----------|---------|--------------|----------|---------|-----------|-------------------|---------------------|--------------|
| Subgroups | ELA Ach. | ELA LG | ELA LG L25% | Math Ach. | Math LG | Math LG L25% | Sci Ach. | SS Ach. | MS Accel. | Grad Rate 2020-21 | C & C Accel 2020-21 | ELP Progress |
| BLK | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| HSP | 72 | 63 | | 62 | 45 | | 40 | | | | | |
| MUL | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| PAC | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 70 | 57 | 43 | 71 | 59 | 54 | 63 | 84 | 84 | | | |
| FRL | 52 | 64 | 47 | 54 | 43 | 33 | 20 | | | | | |

| 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 | 71 | 53 | 35 | 72 | 55 | 45 | 69 | 77 | 84 | | | |
| SWD | 28 | 42 | 40 | 17 | 25 | | | | | | | |
| ELL | 60 | | | 53 | | | | | | | | |
| AMI | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ASN | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| BLK | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| HSP | 53 | 33 | | 55 | 38 | | | | | | | |
| MUL | 73 | | | 64 | | | | | | | | |
| PAC | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 72 | 55 | 33 | 73 | 58 | 47 | 67 | 74 | 85 | | | |
| FRL | 55 | 53 | 38 | 57 | 53 | 55 | 73 | | | | | |

Grade Level Data Review– State Assessments (pre-populated)

The data are raw data and include ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data. 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 | 69% | 57% | 12% | 54% | 15% |
| 07 | 2023 - Spring | 57% | 48% | 9% | 47% | 10% |

| ELA | | | | | | |
|-------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 08 | 2023 - Spring | 64% | 47% | 17% | 47% | 17% |
| 04 | 2023 - Spring | 73% | 58% | 15% | 58% | 15% |
| 06 | 2023 - Spring | 65% | 47% | 18% | 47% | 18% |
| 03 | 2023 - Spring | 76% | 53% | 23% | 50% | 26% |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|-------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 06 | 2023 - Spring | 63% | 58% | 5% | 54% | 9% |
| 03 | 2023 - Spring | 83% | 62% | 21% | 59% | 24% |
| 04 | 2023 - Spring | 91% | 66% | 25% | 61% | 30% |
| 08 | 2023 - Spring | 69% | 61% | 8% | 55% | 14% |
| 05 | 2023 - Spring | 71% | 61% | 10% | 55% | 16% |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
|---------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 05 | 2023 - Spring | 57% | 60% | -3% | 51% | 6% |

| ALGEBRA | | | | | | |
|---------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| N/A | 2023 - Spring | 91% | 53% | 38% | 50% | 41% |

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

| BIOLOGY | | | | | | |
|---------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| N/A | 2023 - Spring | 63% | 59% | 4% | 63% | 0% |

| CIVICS | | | | | | |
|--------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| N/A | 2023 - Spring | 94% | 68% | 26% | 66% | 28% |

III. Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis/Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources.

Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year's low performance and discuss any trends.

The area with the lowest performance for the 22-23 school year was the 8th grade ELA. I believe a factor that influenced this low proficiency was the ELA teacher. As a new educator, he struggled with building rapport with his students. This evolved into off-task student behavior and; ultimately, extreme frustration for the teacher, which the students could sense.

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

The component that had the greatest decline from the 21-22 school year to the 22-23 one was 6th grade ELA. Student proficiency dropped 14 points, from a 79 to 65 percent. In this case, the teacher was dealing with some personal issues and failed to create an environment conducive to learning. She ended up leaving her position at the end of the second quarter. That teacher was replaced immediately with an enthusiastic, MTSS teacher we already had on staff. Unfortunately, the students were unable to recoup the quality instructional time they lost by the end of the year.

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.

While we have a couple of areas with a positive gap, the largest difference is between our geometry proficiency and the state's. The state average is a 49%, while our school's is 100%. This incredible performance is the result of the dedicated teacher and a group of hard-working, conscientious students. This teacher, who is also responsible for our amazing Algebra 1 scores, makes geometry fun and engaging, as well as often gives up her lunch break to provide tutoring to her students.

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

Our data shows that Algebra 1 (advanced) made the largest gains when compared to the 21-22 year. Without a doubt, these results are predominately due to the teacher we hired. She is an experienced teacher, who has an incredible passion for math, and creates a positive learning environment.

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

When looking at the EWS data, I would say one area that is a concern are the number of tardies and absences some of our students have. This was identified as a problem needing more attention about half way through the second semester. As a school, we need to be more vigilant with reaching out to parents, sending truancy letters, and bringing children who miss too much school up to our SBLT for discussion.

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

1. Ensure quality support for ELLs - teacher training, materials
2. Ensure quality support for ESE students - teacher training, materials
3. Continue to work on improving the school culture and climate

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 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 focus will be to improve proficiency in the ELL subgroups for reading and math. Although it appears there were learning gains in math, there was a decrease in ELA, leading to neither reaching the required threshold of 41% or higher.

2021-2022 2022-2023

ELA 45% 33%

Math 27% 36%

Measurable Outcome:

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

The desired outcome is to have our ELL ELA and Math subgroups reach a proficiency level of at least 41% on PM 3 FAST Assessments this school year.

Monitoring:

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

This focus area will be monitored through PM 1 and PM 2. Additional opportunities will be provided in between the three existing monitoring periods, as necessary.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Kathleen Neptune (c.neptunek@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.)

Administration will use EduGAINS, an internet based resource that provides exemplary ELL teaching practices that can be put to immediate use in the classroom and in the school. It also shares how effective schools welcome ELL newcomers and work with their community partners and families. This is a 10 lesson program with aligned resources. Lessons will be sent out bi-monthly for all teachers at PAPH to complete. Completion will be monitored by teachers turning in their finished graphic organizer from each of the 10 lessons.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The rationale for using this program is the ease of implementation and use, as well as the cost.

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 3 - Promising 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.

Lessons will be sent out bi-monthly for all teachers at PAPH to complete. Completion will be monitored by teachers turning in their finished graphic organizer from each of the 10 lessons. After PM 1 and 2, administration will review results to determine if additional intervention is needed.

Person Responsible: Kathleen Neptune (c.neptunek@pcsb.org)

By When: Bi-weekly EduGAINS lessons will begin no later than September 11th.

#2. 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.

Our focus will be to improve proficiency in the SWDs subgroups for reading and math. There we no learning gains in either of the subgroups which were already below the required threshold of 41% or higher from the previous school year.

2021-2022 2022-2023

ELA 26% 22%

Math 32% 31%

Measurable Outcome:

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

The desired outcome is to have our SWDs ELA and Math subgroups reach a proficiency level of at least 41% on PM 3 FAST Assessments this school year.

Monitoring:

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

This focus area will be monitored through PM 1 and PM 2. Additional opportunities will be provided in between the three existing monitoring periods, as necessary.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Kathleen Neptune (c.neptunek@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.)

Administration will use Center for the Developing Child from Harvard University. This is an internet based guide that provides information on Executive Function. This is a three step/lesson program with aligned resources. Lessons will be sent out monthly for all teachers at PAPH to complete. Completion will be monitored by teachers turning in a paragraph of something they learned and how they could implement that with their SWD population.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The rationale behind choosing this intervention is the ease of implementation and use. The cost is also a reason for using this program.

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.

Lessons will be sent out monthly for all teachers at PAPH to complete. Completion will be monitored by teachers turning in a paragraph of something they learned and how they could implement that with their SWD population. After PM 1 and 2, administration will review results to determine if additional intervention is needed.

Person Responsible: Kathleen Neptune (c.neptunek@pcsb.org)

By When: The first step/lesson will be sent out by September 18, 2023.

#3. 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.

An area of focus is continuing to build a positive culture and environment for all stakeholders.

Measurable Outcome:

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

The expected outcome is to increase stakeholder satisfaction scores gathered from our annual Cognia end of year surveys. An increase in Family scores to a 4.35 and Staff scores to a 4.25.

Family Survey 23 4.29
 Family Survey 22 4.29
 Family Survey 21 4
 Family Survey 20 4.05

Staff Survey 23 4.18
 Staff Survey 22 4.09
 Staff Survey 21 4.03
 Staff Survey 20 4.36

Monitoring:

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

An end of year Cognia survey is given to all families, students, and staff. Prior to that survey, administration will randomly poll these stakeholders to see how they are feeling about our school's culture and climate.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Kathleen Neptune (c.neptunek@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.)

Family and Staff survey results will be shared with the staff. A discussion about this data will follow and areas of growth and need will be shared. The team will come up with list of items to continue or implement moving forward.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The rationale for this intervention is it's ease of use and implementation, as well as the cost (free).

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 4 - Demonstrates a Rationale

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 Cognia survey data will be disseminated to staff ahead of time for their review. Then staff will gather, discuss the outcomes, and share thoughts of how to make improvements with the staff at the next PD day.

Person Responsible: Kathleen Neptune (c.neptunek@pcsb.org)

By When: The Cognia survey data will be discussed with the staff at the next PD day.

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).

Budget to Support Areas of Focus

Part VII: Budget to Support Areas of Focus

The approved budget does not reflect any amendments submitted for this project.

| | | | |
|---------------|--------|--|---------------|
| 1 | III.B. | Area of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: English Language Learners | \$0.00 |
| 2 | III.B. | Area of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities | \$0.00 |
| 3 | III.B. | Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Other | \$0.00 |
| Total: | | | \$0.00 |

Budget Approval

Check if this school is eligible and opting out of UniSIG funds for the 2023-24 school year.

No