Plato Academy Largo Charter School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Plato Academy Largo Charter School

7100 142ND AVE N, Largo, FL 33771

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
Donnelly, Stephen	Principal	Manage school activities and staff, including teachers and support personnel Establish and oversee class schedules Develop, implement, and maintain curriculum standards Counsel and discipline students Observe teachers and evaluate their performance Meet with parents and teachers to discuss students' progress and behavior Assess and prepare reports on test scores and other student achievement data Organize professional development programs and workshops for staff Manage the school's budget, order school supplies, and schedule maintenance Establish and coordinate security procedures for students, staff, and visitors

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.

School Advisory Council meetings

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))

School based leadership team meetings (SBLT) are where monitoring of the SIP plan will be done. During meetings academic data is discussed in detail and the team problem solves around root causes as well strategy implementation to support the students increase in academics.

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	43%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	55%
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: C 2019-20: C 2018-19: C 2017-18: B

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	18	9	13	12	14	7	9	14	11	107
One or more suspensions	0	1	1	1	1	0	0	3	1	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	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	11	9	7	8	8	12	7	14	13	89
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	6	8	4	4	3	16	5	15	12	73
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	7	10	8	7	9	11	52
	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	1	2	9	15	3	3	3	3	39

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	1	1	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	6
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	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Total
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	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Total
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*	43	55	53	54	55	55	62		
ELA Learning Gains				54			59		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				46			53		
Math Achievement*	47	61	55	53	34	42	54		
Math Learning Gains				50			47		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				44			44		
Science Achievement*	42	52	52	52	57	54	40		
Social Studies Achievement*	64	69	68	64	57	59	64		
Middle School Acceleration	59	69	70	58	44	51	65		
Graduation Rate		44	74		49	50			
College and Career Acceleration		17	53		65	70			
ELP Progress	67	56	55	37	69	70	55		

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	52
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	4
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	361
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	51
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	4
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	512
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	100
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	36	Yes	2	
AMI				
ASN	59			
BLK	35	Yes	4	
HSP	35	Yes	1	
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	53			

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	43			

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	31	Yes	1	1
ELL	35	Yes	1	
AMI				
ASN	60			
BLK	36	Yes	3	
HSP	46			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	57			
FRL	38	Yes	1	

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	43			47			42	64	59			67
SWD	30			41							2	
ELL	21			21							3	67
AMI												
ASN	53			65							2	
BLK	32			37							2	
HSP	32			32			25				4	50
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	47			51			54	62	53		6	
FRL	33			40			29	47	60		7	71

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	54	54	46	53	50	44	52	64	58			37
SWD	18	50	50	28	30	23	18					
ELL	35	38		31	40		29					37
AMI												
ASN	53	50		80	58							
BLK	29	50		28	38							
HSP	50	47	44	42	43	47	50					43
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	59	58	48	60	54	37	55	65	73			
FRL	39	40	41	38	34	35	32	52				33

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	62	59	53	54	47	44	40	64	65			55
SWD	29			35								
ELL	45	63	58	39	42							55
AMI												
ASN	60			73								
BLK	35	30		24	30							
HSP	57	67	50	50	44	43	25	55				47
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	66	58	60	60	52	58	48	71	61			
FRL	45	53	38	42	45	35	40	54				53

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	40%	57%	-17%	54%	-14%
07	2023 - Spring	36%	48%	-12%	47%	-11%
08	2023 - Spring	38%	47%	-9%	47%	-9%
04	2023 - Spring	45%	58%	-13%	58%	-13%
06	2023 - Spring	59%	47%	12%	47%	12%
03	2023 - Spring	38%	53%	-15%	50%	-12%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	65%	58%	7%	54%	11%
07	2023 - Spring	24%	36%	-12%	48%	-24%
03	2023 - Spring	41%	62%	-21%	59%	-18%
04	2023 - Spring	68%	66%	2%	61%	7%
08	2023 - Spring	50%	61%	-11%	55%	-5%
05	2023 - Spring	44%	61%	-17%	55%	-11%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	46%	47%	-1%	44%	2%
05	2023 - Spring	37%	60%	-23%	51%	-14%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	70%	53%	17%	50%	20%

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

CIVICS						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	58%	68%	-10%	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.

ELA achievement for SWD showed the lowest performance. This is due to the transition of ESE teachers in the middle of the year.

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

ELA achievement for SWD showed the greatest decline from the prior year. This is due to the transition of ESE teachers in the middle 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.

state average data not available

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

Science achievement showed the most improvement. New science curriculum was implemented.

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

Attendance
students with substantial reading deficiencies

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

Decrease number of students absent 10% or more days.
increase ELA Achievement for SWD
increase ELA achievement for ELL students

Increase ELA achievement for BLK students

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.

Standards-based data (FSA) from the 21/22 school year shows students performing at 54% proficiency in ELA. There is a gap in the implementation of rigorous instructional strategies aligned to the Florida Standards. Our current ELA level of performance among students with disabilities is 18% proficiency. The problem/gap is occurring because students are lacking foundational skills required by the demands of the standards/benchmarks.

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

The percentage of SWD achieving ELA proficiency will increase from 18% to 41%, as measured by the Florida Assessment of Student Thinking (FAST).

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

Walk-throughs, Lesson Plans, Curriculum Assessments, Running Records, Formative Assessments, Fall/Winter Diagnostic Assessment

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Stephen Donnelly (c.donnellys@pcsb.org)

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

1.Develop a deep understanding of the B.E.S.T. Standards/NGSSS as a non-negotiable for improving student outcomes.
2. Utilize curricular materials to create a common foundations of standards-aligned rigorous expectations for all students.
3. Monitor whole-group and small-group instruction to ensure instruction is rigorous and implemented according to evidence-based practices.
4. Provide targeted professional development and coaching to teachers and leaders on effective academic strategies.
5. Ensure SWD participate in after school tutoring by extending personal invitations.
6. Celebrate students' growth by goal setting and tracking academic progress to encourage continuous academic growth.

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

If we effectively implement high-yield strategies which support standards-based lesson planning and rigorous instruction, coupled with differentiated instruction, and ongoing professional development for teachers, then the
percentage of students with disabilities achieving proficiency in ELA will increase from 18% to 41%.

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

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

1. Provide all SWD with consistent opportunities to engage in complex, grade-level content and activities related to the rigor of the standard.

2. Ensure instructional supports are in place for SWD's during core instruction and independent work time.

3. Implement the instructional practice where students are doing the cognitive work of the lesson (teacher poses higher-order thinking questions along with teacher scaffold to support so students are doing more talking, coupled with high-quality feedback, and thus immediate opportunity to turn key that feedback.

4. Regular data chats to identify students not meeting the benchmark to adjust the intervention / accommodation being provided.

Person Responsible: Stephen Donnelly (c.donnellys@pcsb.org)

By When: This will happen by PM3, May 2024.

#2. 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.

Scholar attendance was selected due to data pulled during the 2022-23 school year, showing 30% of our students were absent 10% or more days of the instructional school year. In turn only 70% of students were present at least 90% of the instructional year.

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

90% of students will be in attendance 90% of the instructional school year.

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

SBLT will meet weekly to discuss attendance and utilize the problem-solving worksheet for grade level attendance. The Guidance Counselor will conduct home visits and parent conferences with families who have chronic absences and/or tardies.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Stephen Donnelly (c.donnellys@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.)

Create a three-tiered approach that starts with foundational support for the whole school. These foundational supports are followed by prevention-oriented supports (Tier1), more personalized outreach (Tier 2), and intensive intervention (Tier 3).

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

Missing more than 10% of school in one school year puts the scholar at risk for retention. Strengthening the Tiered process will build stronger relationships between the schools and families while helping to identify barriers that are attributed to chronic absences.

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.

• Strengthen the implementation of Tier 1, Tier 2, and Tier 3 attendance interventions to address and support the needs of our scholars.
• School-Based Leadership Team will review and problem-solve around attendance data on a weekly basis.
• Guidance Counselor will continue providing parents with district populated letters informing parent/guardian(s) of their child's attendance as well as hold parent conferences, conduct home visits, and/or

refer families with chronic attendance issues to the State Attorney's Office.
• Continue offering services from community resources to address and/or eliminate attendance barriers.

Person Responsible: Stephen Donnelly (c.donnellys@pcsb.org)

By When: May 2024

#3. 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.

Standards-based data (FSA) from the 21/22 school year shows students performing at 54% proficiency in ELA. There is a gap in the implementation of rigorous instructional strategies aligned to the Florida Standards. Our current ELA level of performance among ELL students is 35% proficiency. The problem/gap is occurring because students are lacking the vocabulary required by the demands of the standards/benchmarks.

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

The percentage of ELL students achieving ELA proficiency will increase from 35% to 50%, as measured by the Florida Assessment of Student Thinking (FAST).

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

Walk-throughs, Lesson Plans, Curriculum Assessments, Running Records, Formative Assessments, Fall/Winter Diagnostic Assessment

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Stephen Donnelly (c.donnellys@pcsb.org)

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

1. Establish and implement processes that create a system of support for ELLs.
2. Establish meaningful communication with families and a parent involvement plan that is carried out in the home language and is sustained over time for the ELL families.
3. Monitor whole-group and small-group instruction to ensure instruction is differentiated to include strategies to support ELL's.
4. Provide a bilingual assistant in the classroom during reading instruction to support language translation.
5. Ensure ELL students participate in after school tutoring by extending personal invitations.
6. Celebrate students' growth by goal setting and tracking academic progress to encourage continuous academic growth.

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

ELL's are better able to perform and participate when they have in the moment language support.

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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

1. Create a plan for each student coded LY and LF to receive appropriate testing accommodations at the start of the school year.
2. Create a plan for monitoring the students performance to ensure academic success
3. Monitor fidelity of implementation of the ELL Grading Policy schoolwide by utilizing the grading reports and following up with individual teachers for each course failure for LY and LF students
4. Create a schedule for the Bilingual Assistant to directly support standards-based instruction for ELLs (provide support and PD and establish clear expectations with accountability)
5. Engage is regular data chats with ELL students

Person Responsible: Stephen Donnelly (c.donnellys@pcsb.org)

By When: May 2024

#4. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Black/African-American

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

Standards-based data (FSA) from the 21/22 school year shows students performing at 54% proficiency in ELA. There is a gap in the implementation of rigorous instructional strategies aligned to the Florida Standards. Our current ELA level of performance among black students is 36% proficiency. The problem/gap is occurring because students are lacking foundational skills required by the demands of the standards/benchmarks.

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

The percentage of Black students achieving ELA proficiency will increase from 36% to 51%, as measured by the Florida Assessment of Student Thinking (FAST).

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

Walk-throughs, Lesson Plans, Curriculum Assessments, Running Records, Formative Assessments, Fall/Winter Diagnostic Assessment

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Stephen Donnelly (c.donnellys@pcsb.org)

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

1.Develop a deep understanding of the B.E.S.T. Standards/NGSSS as a non-negotiable for improving student outcomes.
2. Utilize curricular materials to create a common foundations of standards-aligned rigorous expectations for all students.
3. Monitor whole-group and small-group instruction to ensure instruction is rigorous and implemented according to evidence-based practices.
4. Provide targeted professional development and coaching to teachers and leaders on effective academic strategies.
5. Ensure Black Students participate in after school tutoring by extending personal invitations.
6. Celebrate students' growth by goal setting and tracking academic progress to encourage continuous academic growth.

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

If we effectively implement high-yield strategies which support standards-based lesson planning and rigorous instruction, coupled with differentiated instruction, and ongoing professional development for teachers, then the
percentage of black students achieving proficiency in ELA will increase from 35% to 51%.

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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

1. Provide all Black students with consistent opportunities to engage in complex, grade-level content and activities related to the rigor of the standard.
2. Implement the instructional practice where students are doing the cognitive work of the lesson (teacher poses higher-order thinking questions along with teacher scaffold to support so students are doing more talking, coupled with high-quality feedback, and thus immediate opportunity to turn key that feedback.
4. Regular data chats to identify students not meeting the benchmark to adjust the intervention / accommodation being provided.

Person Responsible: Stephen Donnelly (c.donnellys@pcsb.org)

By When: May 2024

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).

We have purchased supplemental curriculum (Heggerty, IXL, Spire, Learning A-Z, etc) to support school improvement.
We hired a 2nd reading intervention teacher to support students in Tier 3 and provide small group instruction.

Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE)

Area of Focus Description and Rationale
Include a description of your Area of Focus (Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA) for each grade below, how it affects student learning in literacy, and a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed. Data that should be used to determine the critical need should include, at a minimum:

- The percentage of students below Level 3 on the 2022 statewide, standardized ELA assessment. Identification criteria must include each grade that has 50 percent or more students scoring below level 3 in grades 3-5 on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.

- The percentage of students in kindergarten through grade 3, based on 2021-2022 end of year screening and progress monitoring data, who are not on track to score Level 3 or above on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.

- Other forms of data that should be considered: formative, progress monitoring and diagnostic assessment data.

Grades K-2: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

In ELA, we noticed that students in grades PK-2 have gaps in the foundational literacy areas (phonemic awareness, phonics, and high frequency words), which impedes their ability to access complex texts and engage in complex tasks in grades 3-5.

We plan to

- implement HMH phonics curriculum with fidelity
- support and strengthen staff ability to utilize data to plan for differentiation, intervention, and scaffold core instruction to increase student achievement.
- ensure that teachers plan for regular assessment opportunities (both formally and informally) and utilize data to modify and adjust instruction.

Grades 3-5: Instructional Practice specifically related to Reading/ELA

In ELA, there are significant gaps in foundational literacy skills (phonics and fluency) which impacts students comprehension when reading text independently. Students specifically struggle with informational texts.

We plan to
- dedicate an extra 30 minutes daily to reading intervention where students will recieve targeted instruction via online program and/or in teacher led small group
- MTSS team will also support small group instruction for students inTier 2 and/or Tier 3.
- expose students to more informational text during Tier 1 instruction where teacher can provide step by step guidance with chunking and annotating text as they read so they can increase overall comprehension.

Measurable Outcomes

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each grade below. This should be a data-based, objective outcome. Include prior year data and a measurable outcome for each of the following:

- ◦ Each grade K -3, using the coordinated screening and progress monitoring system, where 50 percent or more of the students are not on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment;

- ◦ Each grade 3-5 where 50 percent or more of its students scored below a Level 3 on the most recent statewide, standardized ELA assessment; and

- ◦ Grade 6 measurable outcomes may be included, as applicable.

Grades K-2 Measurable Outcomes

Each grade K -3, using the coordinated screening and progress monitoring system, where 50 percent or more of the students are not on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment;

K-2 reading profiency will increase from 59% to 74% as measured by the STAR Renaissance Assessment.

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

Each grade 3-5 where 50 percent or more of its students scored below a Level 3 on the most recent statewide, standardized ELA assessment;

3-5 reading proficiency will increase from 43% to 58% as measured by the STAR Renaissance Assessment.

Monitoring

Monitoring
Describe how the school's Area(s) of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcomes. Include a description of how ongoing monitoring will impact student achievement outcomes.

Data will be monitored through SBLT meetings, walk-throughs, and data chats with teachers during PLC's.

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome
Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Donnelly, Stephen, c.donnellys@pcsb.org

Evidence-based Practices/Programs

Description:
Describe the evidence-based practices/programs being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each grade and describe how the identified practices/programs will be monitored. The term "evidence-based" means demonstrating a statistically significant effect on improving student outcomes or other relevant outcomes as provided in 20 U.S.C. §7801(21)(A)(i). Florida's definition limits evidence-based practices/programs to only those with strong, moderate or promising levels of evidence.

- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs meet Florida's definition of evidence-based (strong, moderate or promising)?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align with the district's K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align to the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards?

We will utilize the iReady intervention program along with teacher led small group instruction in guided reading provided by the teacher and/or reading MTSS teacher.

Rationale:
Explain the rationale for selecting practices/programs. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting the practices/programs.

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs address the identified need?
- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

According to FAST data there is over 40% of scholars in K-5 that are not proficient in ELA. These practices are researched based and proven to increase proficiency.

Action Steps to Implement
List the action steps that will be taken to address the school's Area(s) of Focus. To address the area of focus, identify 2 to 3 action steps and explain in detail for each of the categories below:

- Literacy Leadership
- Literacy Coaching
- Assessment
- Professional Learning

Action Step	Person Responsible for Monitoring
Provide a structure for weekly planning/PLCs where teachers regularly engage in data/student work analysis as well as intellectually prepare and rehearse key parts of upcoming lessons. Professional Development on how to use data to drive instruction.	Donnelly, Stephen, c.donnellys@pcsb.org