

Pinellas County Schools

# Plato Academy Pinellas Park Charter School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

---

## Table of Contents

---

<b>SIP Authority and Purpose</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>I. School Information</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>II. Needs Assessment/Data Review</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>III. Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review</b>	<b>21</b>
<b>V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>VI. Title I Requirements</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus</b>	<b>0</b>

# Plato Academy Pinellas Park Charter School

9200 49TH ST, Pinellas Park, FL 33782

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
Ariano, Michele	Principal	

**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.

At Plato Academy Pinellas Park, our SBLT were instrumental in the to completion and development the SIP for the 2023-2024. Our members were, teachers, school leaders, and school staff.

The SBLT team met in person and virtual to ensure that we were able to gather the necessary feedback and input. These meeting fostered an open platform for ideas and collaborative thinking.

The meetings were targeted to data analysis and problem solving.

**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 will monitor the SIP with a systematic approach/process for evaluation and improvements.

The process for monitor the SIP

1. Collect Data
2. Analysis the data collected related to benchmarks
3. Review of the data by the SBLT and/or SAC committee
4. Engage stakeholders for feedback and input
5. Plan for revision and continuous improvement

**Demographic Data**

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

<b>2023-24 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Combination School KG-8
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2022-23 Title I School Status</b>	No
<b>2022-23 Minority Rate</b>	44%
<b>2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b>	51%
<b>Charter School</b>	Yes
<b>RAISE School</b>	No
<b>ESSA Identification</b> *updated as of 3/11/2024	ATSI
<b>Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)</b>	No
<b>2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD)* English Language Learners (ELL) Asian Students (ASN) Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
<b>School Grades History</b> *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: C 2019-20: B 2018-19: B 2017-18: D
<b>School Improvement Rating History</b>	
<b>DJJ Accountability Rating History</b>	

**Early Warning Systems**

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	14	9	10	4	5	8	6	3	59
One or more suspensions	0	0	6	3	3	2	4	13	16	47
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	5	9
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	16	14	14	14	22	80
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	8	12	13	13	15	61
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	38	39	35	30	35	177

**Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that have two or more early warning indicators:**

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	1	18	20	18	27	84

**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	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	4
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

**Prior Year (2022-23) As Initially Reported (pre-populated)**

**The number of students by grade level that exhibited each early warning indicator:**

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

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

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Students with two or more indicators		

**The number of students identified retained:**



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

**Prior Year (2022-23) Updated (pre-populated)**

Section 3 includes data tables that are pre-populated based off information submitted in prior year's SIP.

**The number of students by grade level that exhibited each early warning indicator:**

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more school days	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

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

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

**The number of students identified retained:**

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

**II. Needs Assessment/Data Review**

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

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

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

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	48	55	53	55	55	55	57		
ELA Learning Gains				49			56		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				39			42		
Math Achievement*	59	61	55	57	34	42	59		
Math Learning Gains				48			47		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				43			43		
Science Achievement*	53	52	52	45	57	54			
Social Studies Achievement*	67	69	68	76	57	59	62		
Middle School Acceleration	62	69	70	60	44	51	60		
Graduation Rate		44	74		49	50			
College and Career Acceleration		17	53		65	70			
ELP Progress		56	55		69	70	73		

\* 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	55
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	330
Total Components for the Federal Index	6
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	52

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	472
Total Components for the Federal Index	9
Percent Tested	96
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	24	Yes	2	1
ELL	39	Yes	1	
AMI				
ASN	73			
BLK	43			
HSP	48			
MUL	55			
PAC				
WHT	56			
FRL	46			

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	36	Yes	1	
ELL	44			
AMI				
ASN	63			
BLK	41			
HSP	49			

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
MUL	52			
PAC				
WHT	52			
FRL	43			

**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	48			59			53	67	62			
SWD	24			33			18				4	
ELL	32			46							2	
AMI												
ASN	69			78			71				3	
BLK	37			48							2	
HSP	44			54			41	53			4	
MUL	48			62							2	
PAC												
WHT	47			58			56	66	69		6	
FRL	40			47			46	63	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	55	49	39	57	48	43	45	76	60			
SWD	37	43	23	38	42	38	30					
ELL	45	50		47	35							
AMI												
ASN	67	54		71	57		61		70			

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21	ELP Progress
BLK	38	45	40	42	48		33					
HSP	57	44	36	55	47	27	52	70				
MUL	61	64		53	31							
PAC												
WHT	54	48	38	56	48	47	39	80	59			
FRL	48	44	31	44	39	36	32	63	53			

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	57	56	42	59	47	43		62	60			73
SWD	32	10		33	17							
ELL	52	50		67	50							73
AMI												
ASN	67	75		74	63			75				
BLK	48	43	50	45	27							
HSP	57	49	43	50	43	53		57	46			
MUL	45	55		50	55							
PAC												
WHT	57	57	41	62	48	48		59	57			
FRL	49	51	41	51	43	40		61	60			

**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	43%	57%	-14%	54%	-11%
07	2023 - Spring	40%	48%	-8%	47%	-7%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	49%	47%	2%	47%	2%
04	2023 - Spring	64%	58%	6%	58%	6%
06	2023 - Spring	48%	47%	1%	47%	1%
03	2023 - Spring	43%	53%	-10%	50%	-7%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	38%	58%	-20%	54%	-16%
07	2023 - Spring	34%	36%	-2%	48%	-14%
03	2023 - Spring	75%	62%	13%	59%	16%
04	2023 - Spring	67%	66%	1%	61%	6%
08	2023 - Spring	60%	61%	-1%	55%	5%
05	2023 - Spring	68%	61%	7%	55%	13%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	52%	47%	5%	44%	8%
05	2023 - Spring	57%	60%	-3%	51%	6%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	62%	53%	9%	50%	12%

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

CIVICS						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	65%	68%	-3%	66%	-1%

### 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 with the greatest decline from the prior year was ELA. Please see above.

**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 groups 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 showed the most improvement was Science. Actions taken that resulted in an increase of student performance was the purchase of (but not limited to) science curriculum and resources such as Generation Genius, IXL Science, Elevate Savvas. In addition, teachers also increased the use and application of science vocabulary.

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

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

**ELA Achievement:** The ELA lowest 25th percentile achievement has shown a steady decline over the years. This consistent decline suggests that there might be persistent challenges affecting students' ELA performance that require immediate attention and targeted interventions.

**Attendance:** The data shows that 59 students out of a total of 541 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: Data has revealed that Plato Academy Pinellas Park has had a decrease in teacher retention from 88% in 2021-2022 to 80% during the 2022-2023 school year. Understanding the causes behind a lack of retention is pivotal for enhancing overall teacher retention.

After evaluation of the reasons for low teacher, significant challenges that were determined including (but not limited to): teachers relocating due to living costs and/or transferring between Plato campuses to off set rising gas expenses. These explanations the need establish a positive workplace atmosphere and teacher experience.

A positive school climate and culture is created when Teachers who feel valued, supported, and engaged are more inclined to remain committed to our school; therefore, having a positive impact student learning gains outcomes.

The strategic plan with goals that we have created aligns with the school's mission and vision, and meets the objective of retaining a minimum of 85% of teachers. By implementing school-wide initiatives like enhanced support systems, behavioral guidance, academic mentorship, professional growth opportunities, and mental health provisions, Plato Academy Pinellas Park's goal is to 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 85% 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.

By monitoring the number of classroom disruptions, referrals, and implemented Tier 2 behavior plans, we will be able to determine the overall effectiveness of the behavioral supports put in to place.

Regular monitoring of district and state progress assessments, evaluating students' performance over time. will assist in determining the progress academic coaching

Lastly, regular data collection and analysis from all stakeholders on school wide initiatives of will able us to male adjustments to support strategies to yield a positive outcome related school culture and academic outcomes.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Michele Ariano (c.arianom@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 a school wide Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports (PBIS) strategies along with using 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 and by using a tiered system targets support for individual needs in academics and behavior. Targeted interventions assist struggling students, while enrichment supports those performing well.

Integrating both evidence-based methods helps to create 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), and a tiered support system, stems from their proven effectiveness in maintaining a supportive learning atmosphere.

PBIS offers established methods to instill positive behavior, reinforcing consistent expectations and proactive measures.

Implementing a tiered system, personalized for academic and behavioral needs, acknowledges student diversity and optimizes support. Uses the tiered system promotes emotional growth, positive behavior, and targeted 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 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.

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.

**Person Responsible:** Michele Ariano (c.arianom@pcsb.org)

**By When:**

*No description entered*

**Person Responsible:** [no one identified]

**By When:**

Maintain a 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:** Michele Ariano (c.arianom@pcsb.org)

**By When:**

Regular Data Collection

Monitor classroom disruptions and referrals.  
Document student behavioral growth and/or academic growth and response to interventions.

**Person Responsible:** Michele Ariano (c.arianom@pcsb.org)

**By When:**

6. Classroom Management and Coaching:

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

**Person Responsible:** Michele Ariano (c.arianom@pcsb.org)

**By When:**

Behavior Data Collection

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

**Person Responsible:** Michele Ariano (c.arianom@pcsb.org)

**By When:**

**#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 critically identified from the declining trend in ELA achievement over the past four years. The consistent decline in student performance signifies that targeted intervention are needed to bridge the learning gap and increase 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 (...%) to (...% ) 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:**

Michele Ariano (c.arianom@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 targeted 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 evidence base 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.

Data Analysis and Student Identification:

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

**Person Responsible:** Michele Ariano (c.arianom@pcsb.org)

**By When:**

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:** Michele Ariano (c.arianom@pcsb.org)

**By When:**

Differentiated Instruction:

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

**Person Responsible:** Michele Ariano (c.arianom@pcsb.org)

**By When:**

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:** Michele Ariano (c.arianom@pcsb.org)

**By When:**

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:** Michele Ariano (c.arianom@pcsb.org)

**By When:**

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:** Michele Ariano (c.arianom@pcsb.org)

**By When:**

### 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.