Plato Seminole School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Plato Seminole

10888 126TH AVE N, Largo, FL 33778

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 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
Jones, Nichole	Principal	Data analysis, plan development, plan monitoring and communication.
Christopher, Marie	Assistant Principal	Data analysis, plan development, and plan monitoring.
Sikes, Tamara	Teacher, ESE	Data analysis and plan development
Thomas, Jessica	Teacher, K-12	Data analysis and plan development
Sipe, Amber	Behavior Specialist	Data analysis, plan development, and strategy formulation.

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.

In involving stakeholders for our SIP development, we took a comprehensive approach. We formed two crucial groups, the School-Based Leadership Team (SBLT) and the School Advisory Council (SAC), consisting of principals, teachers, counselors, specialists, parents, community members, and student

representatives.

Meetings, both in-person and virtual, balanced flexibility and engagement. This inclusive platform encouraged open dialogue, collaborative thinking, and direct participation.

We gathered insights through surveys targeting students, families, faculty, and staff. Additionally, focused focus groups delved into specific topics, unearthing valuable insights.

Data analysis pinpointed recurring themes, concerns, and consensus. These patterns formed the basis of our SIP.

Goals, strategies, and actions were closely tied to stakeholder input, reflecting their perspectives. This approach validated the plan's authenticity and showcased dedication.

The SIP development journey embodied inclusion, participation, and collaboration. Each stakeholder's view was embraced and integrated. The result was a SIP reflecting collective aspirations and expertise, setting a strong foundation for effective improvement.

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))

Our school has devised a systematic process for regular evaluation and adaptation, ensuring continuous improvement.

Regular Monitoring and Evaluation:

Data Collection and Analysis: We will continuously gather data on student performance, both academically and socio-emotionally, to track progress. This includes standardized test scores, formative and summative assessments, attendance rates, and behavior records. Special attention will be given to students with the greatest achievement gaps.

Performance Metrics: We have established clear benchmarks aligned with the State's academic standards. These metrics will serve as indicators to evaluate the effectiveness of the SIP's strategies in narrowing the achievement gap.

Regular Reviews: Our School-Based Leadership Team (SBLT) and School Advisory Council (SAC) will conduct regular reviews of progress. These reviews will occur on a quarterly basis, allowing us to identify trends, challenges, and successes in a timely manner.

Stakeholder Engagement: Parents, teachers, students, and community members will be engaged in the monitoring process. Feedback from these stakeholders will provide valuable insights into the plan's impact on student achievement and inform necessary adjustments.

Plan Revision for Continuous Improvement:

Data-Driven Decision-Making: Data collected during the monitoring process will guide our decisions. If performance metrics indicate that certain strategies are not yielding the expected outcomes, we will be prepared to pivot and adjust.

Identifying Successes and Challenges: Regular reviews will help us identify successful interventions that

contribute to closing achievement gaps, as well as any challenges hindering progress.

Flexible Implementation: We recognize that no plan is set in stone. If changes are needed to address new challenges or opportunities, we will adjust our strategies accordingly, always with a focus on the ultimate goal of improved student achievement.

Inclusive Collaboration: Our SBLT and SAC will convene for plan revision discussions. Stakeholders' feedback and insights will be incorporated to ensure that the plan remains responsive to the needs of our school community.

Immediate Adjustments: If during the monitoring process we identify strategies that are not producing the intended impact, we will promptly revise or replace them. This agile approach prevents the continuation of ineffective practices.

Professional Development: Our plan includes provisions for ongoing professional development for teachers and staff. This ensures that they have the tools and knowledge needed to effectively implement strategies and support students.

Communication: Regular communication with all stakeholders will keep them informed about the plan's progress and any adjustments made. Transparency fosters a sense of shared ownership in the school's improvement journey.

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	30%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	43%
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) Asian Students (ASN) Black/African American Students (BLK)* 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: B 2019-20: A

	2018-19: A
	2017-18: A
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

Using 2022-23 data, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	2	0	2	2	4	4	5	4	23
One or more suspensions	0	2	0	0	1	0	0	3	2	8
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	1	1
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	4	5	5	11	9	34
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	2	8	11	12	11	44
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	5	3	7	7	8	30

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	4	3	5	13	20	22	26	93

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	2	0	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	
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	8	
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	8	
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*	57	55	53	60	55	55	61		
ELA Learning Gains				55			51		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				29			36		
Math Achievement*	52	61	55	57	34	42	57		
Math Learning Gains				60			41		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				62			38		
Science Achievement*	48	52	52	49	57	54	56		
Social Studies Achievement*	73	69	68	85	57	59	62		
Middle School Acceleration	50	69	70	58	44	51	72		
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	57
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	340
Total Components for the Federal Index	6
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	57
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	515
Total Components for the Federal Index	9
Percent Tested	98
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	29	Yes	2	1
ELL	50			
AMI				
ASN	90			
BLK	44			
HSP	44			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	60			

2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
FRL	50			

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	39	Yes	1	
ELL	43			
AMI				
ASN	87			
BLK	39	Yes	1	
HSP	39	Yes	1	
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	61			
FRL	47			

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	57			52			48	73	50			
SWD	33			24							2	
ELL	60			40							2	
AMI												
ASN	93			86							2	
BLK	35			53							2	
HSP	48			36			36	55			4	
MUL												

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2021-22	C & C Accel 2021-22	ELP Progress
PAC												
WHT	57			54			50	88	50		6	
FRL	48			44			38	64	50		6	

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	60	55	29	57	60	62	49	85	58			
SWD	29	30	18	33	58	64						
ELL	31	55		42	45							
AMI												
ASN	83			91								
BLK	29	15		41	69							
HSP	45	37		39	35		40					
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	63	58	27	59	64	69	54	93	58			
FRL	45	40	15	36	52	62	42	83	50			

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	61	51	36	57	41	38	56	62	72			
SWD	39	38		17	31							
ELL	30											
AMI												
ASN	85			77								
BLK	20			20								
HSP	60	55		43	55							
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	61	50	42	61	38	35	59	69	75			
FRL	51	53	53	45	48	50	50	50	73			

Grade Level Data Review– State Assessments (pre-populated)
The data are raw data and include ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data. <u>The percentages shown here represent ALL students who received a score of 3 or higher on the statewide assessments</u>.

An asterisk (*) in any cell indicates the data has been suppressed due to fewer than 10 students tested, or all tested students scoring the same.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	60%	57%	3%	54%	6%
07	2023 - Spring	48%	48%	0%	47%	1%
08	2023 - Spring	60%	47%	13%	47%	13%
04	2023 - Spring	60%	58%	2%	58%	2%
06	2023 - Spring	55%	47%	8%	47%	8%
03	2023 - Spring	58%	53%	5%	50%	8%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	46%	58%	-12%	54%	-8%
07	2023 - Spring	50%	36%	14%	48%	2%
03	2023 - Spring	64%	62%	2%	59%	5%
04	2023 - Spring	64%	66%	-2%	61%	3%
08	2023 - Spring	59%	61%	-2%	55%	4%
05	2023 - Spring	56%	61%	-5%	55%	1%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	50%	47%	3%	44%	6%
05	2023 - Spring	48%	60%	-12%	51%	-3%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	63%	53%	10%	50%	13%

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.

The lowest-performing data component was the English Language Arts (ELA) Low 25% Learning Gains, indicating challenges in helping a specific subgroup of students make significant progress in ELA skills. Several contributing factors were identified for the low performance observed last year:

Newly Enrolled Students: The presence of newly enrolled students might have affected the baseline performance data. These students could be adjusting to a new curriculum, teaching style, or educational environment, which could have impacted their learning gains.

ELA Gaps in Grades K-8: The data indicates that there were gaps in ELA performance across multiple grade levels (K-8). This suggests that the issue may not be isolated to a specific grade level but might stem from foundational ELA skills not being adequately developed in earlier years.

Inconsistent Data Utilization: The inconsistency in using data to inform instruction could have hindered effective differentiation and scaffolding for student achievement. Without a data-driven approach, it becomes challenging to identify struggling students and tailor instruction to their needs.

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

The data component that displayed the most significant decline from the previous year was science achievement. Several factors contributed to this decline:

Lack of Science Vocabulary in Primary Grades: The absence of a strong foundation in science vocabulary during the primary grades can impact students' ability to comprehend and engage effectively with science content as they progress to higher grade levels.

Lack of Intentional Instruction in Primary Grades: Insufficient intentional instruction in science during the primary grades can lead to an incomplete understanding of foundational scientific concepts. This gap may hinder students' ability to grasp more advanced science topics in later years.

Lack of Dedicated Science Lab: The absence of a dedicated science lab at the school could limit hands-on and practical experiences for students. Science education heavily relies on experiential learning, and the absence of proper lab facilities might impede students' ability to engage with the subject.

Transient Teacher Population in Middle School: A transient teacher population in the middle school

grade level could disrupt the continuity of instruction. Frequent teacher turnover may lead to inconsistency in teaching methodologies, curricula coverage, and overall student engagement.

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.

The data component with the most significant gap when compared to the state average was ELA Low 25% Learning Gains. Several factors contributed to this gap:

Inconsistent Tier 2 and Tier 3 Instruction: Inconsistency in providing tier 2 (targeted small group instruction) and tier 3 (intensive individualized instruction) interventions for students falling behind in ELA may have hindered their progress. Uneven access to additional support can lead to a wider performance gap.

Impact of Covid-19 Shutdown: The prolonged Covid-19 shutdown in student's foundational years likely exacerbated existing gaps. Remote learning challenges, limited in-person instruction, and disruptions to the regular academic calendar might have disproportionately affected students' ELA progress, further contributing to the performance gap.

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

The data component that demonstrated the most improvement was Math Low 25% Learning Gains. The school's efforts in this area led to notable progress. Several new actions were taken to achieve this improvement:

Tier 2 Math Groups: The implementation of tier 2 math groups allowed for targeted support to students in the lower 25% in math. These small-group interventions cater to individual learning needs, offering focused instruction to bridge learning gaps.

Differentiation Planning: Consistently planning for math differentiation enabled teachers to tailor instruction to varying skill levels and learning styles within the classroom. This personalized approach helps students grasp concepts more effectively.

Accelerated Math Curriculum: Utilizing an accelerated math curriculum introduced students to more advanced mathematical concepts and rigorous problem-solving. This curriculum challenges students to think critically and engage with math at a higher level.

Preparation for Rigorous Thinking: The school focused on preparing students for rigorous mathematical thinking. This emphasis encourages students to approach math problems with analytical and creative thinking, fostering a deeper understanding of mathematical concepts.

Professional Development (PD) on Florida BEST Math Standards: Teachers attended extensive PD sessions to enhance their understanding and teaching of the Florida BEST Math standards. The commitment to improving teaching methodologies aligns instruction with state standards.

In-Person Conferences and County Trainings: Teachers attended both in-person 3-day conferences and county-level trainings, accumulating a total of 12 hours of training per attendee. This comprehensive training approach equipped teachers with the latest teaching techniques and strategies.

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

The data provided highlights concerning trends in ELA and Science achievement, as well as attendance:

ELA Achievement: The ELA lowest 25th percentile achievement has shown a steady decline over the years. In 2019, it was at 63%, but it dropped to 36% in 2021 and further decreased to 29% in 2022. This consistent decline suggests that there might be persistent challenges affecting students' ELA performance that require immediate attention and targeted interventions.

Science Achievement: Similarly, Science achievement has exhibited a declining trend. The achievement rate was at 72% in 2019, which dropped to 56% in 2021 and further decreased to 49% in 2022. This declining performance raises concerns about the effectiveness of science instruction and the need for strategies to address learning gaps.

Attendance: The data shows that 23 students out of a total of 364 students missed 10% or more days of school. Consistently missing school days can have a detrimental impact on students' academic progress and engagement. This attendance concern highlights the need to address the factors contributing to absenteeism and implement interventions to improve attendance rates.

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

Based on the data and identified needs, the highest priorities for school improvement in the upcoming school year are as follows:

1. Attendance: Addressing attendance concerns should be a top priority to ensure students are consistently present and engaged in their learning.

2. Tier 2 Instruction in ELA: Focusing on tier 2 interventions in ELA can provide targeted support to students who are struggling, helping them improve their reading and language skills.

3. Tier 3 Instruction in ELA: Implementing effective tier 3 interventions in ELA will cater to students needing intensive individualized support, closing the achievement gap.

4. Increasing Intentional Science Instruction in K-8: Enhancing science instruction across K-8 with a focus on science vocabulary can lead to better comprehension and engagement in science topics.

5. Explicit Instruction in Informational Text Components: Providing explicit instruction in the components of informational text is essential for improving reading comprehension skills, which are foundational for success across subjects.

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

#1. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Teacher Retention and Recruitment

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

Rationale: The prioritization of a positive culture and environment arises from a data-driven assessment of teacher retention rates between 2022-2023, revealing a 73% retention rate. While this rate is notable, understanding the causes behind non-retention is pivotal for enhancing overall teacher retention.

Examining the reasons provided for non-retention unveils significant challenges, including teachers relocating due to escalated county living costs and transferring between Plato campuses to mitigate rising gas expenses. These explanations highlight potential underlying concerns impacting the workplace atmosphere and teacher experience. Concentrating on cultivating a positive culture and environment becomes imperative to ameliorate these issues and bolster teacher satisfaction.

Moreover, a conducive culture and environment significantly influence teacher well-being, contentment, and subsequently, student achievements. Teachers who feel valued, supported, and engaged are more inclined to remain committed to the institution, effectively contributing to the learning milieu, and fostering favorable student outcomes.

This strategic emphasis aligns seamlessly with the school's objective of retaining a minimum of 80% of teachers. Through initiatives like enhanced support systems, behavioral guidance, academic mentorship, professional growth opportunities, and mental health provisions, the institution aspires to enrich the overall work experience for educators. By doing so, the school aims to counteract the external factors that contribute to non-retention, ultimately elevating teacher retention rates.

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

The specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve is to have a teacher retention rate of at least 80% through the implementation of increased and ongoing support measures, including behavioral support, academic coaching, professional development, and mental health support.

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

The Positive Culture and Environment Area of Focus will be monitored by tracking specific indicators for behavioral support and academic coaching.

For behavioral support, monitoring will include recording the number of classroom disruptions, referrals, and implemented Tier 2 behavior plans. These metrics will provide insights into the effectiveness of interventions and the overall reduction of disruptive behavior.

Regarding academic coaching, monitoring will involve district and state progress assessments, evaluating students' performance over time. Additionally, individual student growth data will be tracked to measure their progress during coaching sessions.

Regular data collection and analysis of these indicators will guide adjustments to support strategies. Qualitative feedback from stakeholders will complement the quantitative metrics, offering a comprehensive view of the impact of the initiatives on fostering a positive culture and improving academic outcomes.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Nichole Jones (c.jonesn@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.)

The evidence-based intervention for the Positive Culture and Environment Area of Focus includes the adoption of Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports (PBIS) strategies, alongside the implementation of the Zones of Regulation curriculum. Additionally, a tiered system will be applied to address both academic and behavioral aspects.

PBIS strategies establish clear behavior expectations, offering consistent reinforcement and proactive measures to address challenges. The Zones of Regulation curriculum enhances emotional understanding and self-regulation. This approach fosters a supportive environment for students to manage emotions effectively.

Utilizing a tiered system tailors support for individual needs in academics and behavior. Targeted interventions assist struggling students, while enrichment opportunities cater to those performing well. Integrating these evidence-based methods cultivates a positive culture, promoting emotional well-being, behavior, and academic growth across the school community.

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

The chosen intervention strategy, combining Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports (PBIS), the Zones of Regulation curriculum, and a tiered support system, stems from their proven effectiveness in nurturing a comprehensive and supportive learning atmosphere.

PBIS offers established methods to instill positive behavior, reinforcing consistent expectations and proactive measures. The Zones of Regulation curriculum addresses emotional well-being, equipping students to understand and manage their feelings adeptly, fostering improved behavior and interactions.

Implementing a tiered system, personalized for academic and behavioral needs, acknowledges student diversity and optimizes support. The integration of these evidence-based approaches aligns seamlessly with the goal of cultivating a positive culture and environment. By promoting emotional growth, positive behavior, and tailored support, the school aspires to enhance overall student engagement, academic progression, and teacher retention.

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.

1. Develop a school wide PBIS Plan:

Collaborate with staff to define clear behavior expectations.
Design a system for reinforcing positive behavior.
Create a framework for addressing behavioral challenges proactively.
Hold Bi-Weekly MTSS Behavior Meetings to teach behavior expectations.

Person Responsible: Amber Sipe (c.sipea@pcsb.org)

By When: By the end of the first quarter

2. Integrate Zones of Regulation:

Train teachers on the Zones of Regulation curriculum.
Implement the curriculum in classroom activities and discussions.
Provide resources for students to practice emotional regulation.

Person Responsible: Marie Christopher (c.christopherc@pcsb.org)

By When: By the end of the first semester

3. Maintain Tiered System:

Identify academic and behavioral benchmarks for each tier.
Develop targeted interventions for struggling students.
Design enrichment activities for students performing well.

Person Responsible: Marie Christopher (c.christopherc@pcsb.org)

By When: By the end of the first quarter

4. Regular Data Collection:

Monitor classroom disruptions and referrals.
Track student progress in emotional regulation using Zones of Regulation framework.
Document academic growth and response to interventions.

Person Responsible: Nichole Jones (c.jonesn@pcsb.org)

By When: By end of third quarter

5. Ongoing Training and Support:

Conduct professional development workshops on PBIS strategies.
Provide staff training using culturally Responsive Strategies.
Offer quarterly PD based on school culture and discipline data.

Person Responsible: Dawn Parker (c.parkerd@pcsb.org)

By When: By end of third quarter

6. Classroom Management and Coaching:

Conduct weekly classroom management walkthroughs.
Provide feedback and coaching cycles to teachers.
Identify scholars with 2 or more behavior referrals for targeted support.

Person Responsible: Amber Sipe (c.sipea@pcsb.org)

By When: On going

7. Proactive Behavior Strategies:

Implement proactive behavior strategies that address scholars' needs.
Adjust strategies based on ongoing data analysis.

Person Responsible: Amber Sipe (c.sipea@pcsb.org)

By When: By end of first quarter

8. Behavior Data Communication:

Communicate behavior data through monthly visual displays and other media.
Ensure transparency and shared understanding of progress.

Person Responsible: Nichole Jones (c.jonesn@pcsb.org)

By When: By end of first semester

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

The identified area of focus is to improve the lowest 25% ELA gains among students. This need was crucially identified from the declining trend in ELA achievement over the past four years. The consistent drop in performance highlights a persistent challenge that requires targeted intervention to bridge the learning gap and uplift student achievement.

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

The school aims to increase the lowest 25% ELA gains from the current rate of 29% to 40% by the end of the school year.

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

Progress toward the desired outcome will be monitored through regular data collection and analysis of ELA assessment results. Quarterly assessments will provide insights into student performance, allowing timely adjustments to the intervention strategies if necessary.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Nichole Jones (c.jonesn@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.)

The evidence-based intervention being implemented is targeted and scaffolded instruction for ELA. This intervention includes differentiated teaching strategies, one-on-one tutoring, and small group instruction tailored to the specific needs of students in the lowest 25% ELA gains.

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

This specific intervention was chosen due to its proven effectiveness in addressing learning gaps and promoting skill development. The approach directly targets the needs of struggling students, offering individualized support and personalized strategies to improve their ELA skills.

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.

1. Data Analysis and Student Identification:

Analyze FAST and i-Ready ELA assessment data to identify students in the lowest 25%.

Person Responsible: Nichole Jones (c.jonesn@pcsb.org)

By When: End of September

2. Individualized Learning Plans:

Create individualized learning plans for each identified student based on FAST and i-Ready data.
Collaborate with teachers to tailor interventions using i-Ready resources.

Person Responsible: Marie Christopher (c.christopherc@pcsb.org)

By When: Within two weeks of data analysis.

3. Targeted Tier 2 Instruction:

Implement targeted Tier 2 interventions for ELA using i-Ready insights.
Provide small group instruction focusing on specific skill gaps identified in i-Ready reports.

Person Responsible: Marie Christopher (c.christopherc@pcsb.org)

By When: Throughout the school year, starting after learning plans are developed.

4. Frequent Progress Monitoring:

Regularly assess students' progress using i-Ready growth assessments.
Utilize i-Ready data to adjust instruction and interventions as needed.

Person Responsible: Marie Christopher (c.christopherc@pcsb.org)

By When: Ongoing throughout the school year, aligned with FAST and i-Ready assessment schedule.

5. Differentiated Instruction:

Utilize i-Ready data to inform differentiated teaching strategies within classroom instruction.
Tailor instruction based on i-Ready diagnostic results and personalized pathways.

Person Responsible: Nichole Jones (c.jonesn@pcsb.org)

By When: Ongoing throughout the school year.

6. Regular Communication with Families:

Share i-Ready assessment results with families to communicate students' progress and intervention strategies.
Collaborate with parents to support learning at home using i-Ready resources.

Person Responsible: Nichole Jones (c.jonesn@pcsb.org)

By When: Initiate communication in the first month and maintain regular updates.

7. Ongoing Professional Development:

Provide teachers with i-Ready-specific professional development on utilizing data for effective intervention.
Equip teachers with i-Ready tools to differentiate instruction and address skill gaps.

Person Responsible: Nichole Jones (c.jonesn@pcsb.org)

By When: Scheduled i-Ready PD sessions throughout the school year.

8. Review and Adjust Strategies:

Use i-Ready progress reports to periodically review the effectiveness of interventions.
Adjust strategies based on FAST PM data and i-Ready data and student progress.

Person Responsible: Nichole Jones (c.jonesn@pcsb.org)

By When: Scheduled review meetings aligned with FAST & i-Ready assessment cycles.

9. Collaborative Team Meetings:

Hold regular collaborative meetings using i-Ready data to discuss students' progress and intervention outcomes.
Adjust strategies collectively based on i-Ready insights.

Person Responsible: Nichole Jones (c.jonesn@pcsb.org)

By When: Weekly during PLCs

10. Celebrate Progress and Growth:

Recognize and celebrate students' achievements and growth using i-Ready data.
Highlight improvement in i-Ready scores to motivate students.

Person Responsible: Nichole Jones (c.jonesn@pcsb.org)

By When: Ongoing throughout the school year, with specific i-Ready achievement acknowledgments.

#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.

The identified area of focus is to increase science proficiency among 5th and 8th-grade students by 15%, as measured by standardized science assessments. This need was identified as a crucial objective from the data that highlighted a decline in science achievement over the years. The declining trend underscores the urgency to strengthen science instruction, particularly in grades K-8, to ensure that students develop a strong foundation in science concepts and skills.

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

The measurable outcome the school plans to achieve is a 15% increase in science proficiency among 5th and 8th-grade students, as determined by the results of standardized science assessments administered at the end of the academic year.

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

To monitor progress toward the desired outcome, regular assessment data analysis will be conducted. The school will track students' performance on standardized science assessments throughout the year and compare the results to the baseline data. This ongoing monitoring will enable timely adjustments and interventions if progress is not aligning with the targeted increase.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Nichole Jones (c.jonesn@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.)

The evidence-based intervention being implemented for this area of focus involves intentional science instruction across grades K-8 with a specific emphasis on enhancing science vocabulary. Resources such as Pearson Elevate Science, Nearpod, and Generation Genius will be used to provide interactive and differentiated science content.

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

This intervention strategy was selected based on its alignment with research-proven methods for improving student achievement in science. Research shows that interactive and differentiated instruction, along with a focus on vocabulary, enhances students' understanding and retention of science concepts. The chosen resources are reputable and have demonstrated effectiveness in fostering science comprehension and engagement.

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.

1. Resource Integration and Teacher Training:

Integrate Pearson Elevate Science, Nearpod, and Generation Genius into K-8 science curriculum.
Provide professional development workshops for teachers on effective resource utilization.
Identify key science terms and concepts for emphasis.

Person Responsible: Nichole Jones (c.jonesn@pcsb.org)

By When: Integration and Curriculum Preparation: Start of the school year. Professional Development Workshops: First month of the school year. Vocabulary Emphasis Planning: Second month of the school year.

2. Instructional Implementation:

Teachers use integrated resources in daily science instruction.
Administer regular formative assessments to gauge student understanding.
Utilize assessment data to adjust instruction.

Person Responsible: Nichole Jones (c.jonesn@pcsb.org)

By When: Ongoing throughout the school year.

3. Data Analysis and Progress Review:

Collect and analyze assessment data to track student progress.
Conduct regular meetings to review results and intervention effectiveness.
Adjust strategies based on data analysis.

Person Responsible: Nichole Jones (c.jonesn@pcsb.org)

By When: Assessment Data Collection and Analysis: Quarterly assessment cycles. Progress Review Meetings: End of each assessment cycle.

4. Parent Engagement and Celebration:

Share student progress reports and strategies with parents.
Provide guidance for supporting science learning at home.
Recognize and celebrate student achievements.

Person Responsible: Nichole Jones (c.jonesn@pcsb.org)

By When: Ongoing throughout the school 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).

The process of allocating school improvement funding based on needs involves these steps:

Data Analysis: Gather academic, attendance, and behavior data, plus input from stakeholders to identify key challenges.
Prioritize Needs: Determine priority areas for improvement based on data analysis.
Set Goals: Define specific goals and objectives for each priority area.

Assess Resources: Review available funding and resources for allocation.
Align Resources: Match resources to priority needs to maximize impact.
Develop Action Plans: Create detailed plans with activities, timelines, and responsibilities.
Stakeholder Input: Engage teachers, parents, students, and the community for input.
Review and Approval: Present plans to decision-makers for review and approval.
Implementation: Execute plans, monitor progress, and adjust as needed.
Evaluate Effectiveness: Continuously assess resource impact and adjust strategies.
Transparency: Communicate progress through regular updates to stakeholders.

This systematic approach ensures that available resources are strategically invested to address identified needs, enhance the learning environment, and promote student success.