

Pinellas County Schools

Athenian Academy School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	10
III. Planning for Improvement	15
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	24
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	24
VI. Title I Requirements	26
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	27

Athenian Academy

2289 N. HERCULES AVE, Clearwater, FL 33763

<http://www.athenianacademy.org/>

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.

Our mission is to change lives and challenge minds by creating global citizens through unique world language instructions.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The school's vision is to fulfill the mission through the educational development of global minded, multilingual citizens using world language instruction as a vehicle toward academic achievement and excellence in all curriculum areas.

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
Roper, June	Principal	Develops, implement, and evaluates school philosophy, goals and objectives reflecting district and state goals Develops, implements and evaluates School Improvement Plan (SIP) and School-wide Discipline Plan Develops and maintains a positive school/community climate and a safe, secure, and healthy environment Plans, implements, and evaluates the school instructional program based on student needs and within state guidelines Determines staffing needs including selection, supervision, staff development and evaluation of all school personnel Actively monitors and implements best practices and professional development for improved Student Achievement Oversees the school daily operations Facilitates PD Oversees MTSS, ESE,PTA and Family engagement, Teacher evaluations and walk throughs, Facilitates the School Leadership Team and the Instructional leadership team

Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Development

Describe the process for involving stakeholders (including the school leadership team, teachers and school staff, parents, students (mandatory for secondary schools) and families, and business or community leaders) and how their input was used in the SIP development process. (ESSA 1114(b)(2))

Note: If a School Advisory Council is used to fulfill these requirements, it must include all required stakeholders.

The school leadership team engaged in a data review to develop school improvement goals. Our SIP goals will be shared with all stakeholders and the school will solicit input on the goals set forth for the School Improvement Plan.

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))

Instructional Leadership – Our SBLT will review data monthly (assessments, iReady and walk throughs). The MTSS coach and team leads will facilitate subject-area planning. During classroom walkthroughs, the principal and AP will measure target/task alignment using the Charter research-based classroom walkthrough tool.

Teachers meet in a Professional Learning Community (PLC) at least once per month with the MTSS coach to review student work in order to determine to what degree students are making progress with benchmarks because of the use of complex tasks. Additionally, teachers will plan remediation by evaluating student data from various subject area programs and classroom assessment to determine student individual needs to improve learning gains. Administrators will monitor PLC's to ensure student data is driving instructional practices in all subject areas.

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	45%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	59%
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) 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	1	0	7	13	5	12	8	7	12	65	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	6	3	11	
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	2	5	0	0	0	7	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	1	11	0	0	0	12	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	27	13	17	24	21	102	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	34	15	15	24	19	107	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	1	1	4	4	3	0	1	1	0	15	

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	5	2	5	21	29	0	0	0	62	

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	2	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	5	
Students retained two or more times	0	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*	46	55	53	47	55	55	45		
ELA Learning Gains				49			49		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				41			50		
Math Achievement*	37	61	55	43	34	42	42		
Math Learning Gains				53			54		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				48			56		
Science Achievement*	50	52	52	45	57	54	21		
Social Studies Achievement*	66	69	68	65	57	59	31		
Middle School Acceleration	38	69	70	43	44	51	63		
Graduation Rate		44	74		49	50			
College and Career Acceleration		17	53		65	70			
ELP Progress	55	56	55	64	69	70	41		

** 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	48
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	4
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	337
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	50
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	498
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	17	Yes	4	1
ELL	45			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	28	Yes	2	2
HSP	48			
MUL	32	Yes	1	
PAC				
WHT	49			

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	40	Yes	2	

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	35	Yes	3	
ELL	44			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	31	Yes	1	1
HSP	55			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	53			
FRL	40	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	46			37			50	66	38			55
SWD	13			21							2	
ELL	36			43							3	55
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	19			15			50				3	
HSP	47			35			39	71			4	
MUL	45			18							2	

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	48			41			55	62	36		6	
FRL	32			30			44	62	43		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	47	49	41	43	53	48	45	65	43			64
SWD	19	42	42	19	48	42						
ELL	31	25		38	63							64
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	29	36	14	15	43	50						
HSP	49	51	50	52	59	57	48	73				
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	48	55	52	46	52	42	49	67	64			
FRL	35	36	24	36	48	42	34	65				

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	45	49	50	42	54	56	21	31	63			41
SWD	4	32	36	14	38	45	18					
ELL	26	53		33	65							41
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	29	26		21	47	55						
HSP	47	57		48	56		17	15				33
MUL	54			43								
PAC												
WHT	45	50	53	40	57	64	29	44				
FRL	42	49	40	38	54	50	24	27	64			18

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	62%	57%	5%	54%	8%
07	2023 - Spring	33%	48%	-15%	47%	-14%
08	2023 - Spring	43%	47%	-4%	47%	-4%
04	2023 - Spring	34%	58%	-24%	58%	-24%
06	2023 - Spring	54%	47%	7%	47%	7%
03	2023 - Spring	42%	53%	-11%	50%	-8%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	44%	58%	-14%	54%	-10%
07	2023 - Spring	40%	36%	4%	48%	-8%
03	2023 - Spring	33%	62%	-29%	59%	-26%
04	2023 - Spring	25%	66%	-41%	61%	-36%
08	2023 - Spring	20%	61%	-41%	55%	-35%
05	2023 - Spring	64%	61%	3%	55%	9%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	38%	47%	-9%	44%	-6%
05	2023 - Spring	57%	60%	-3%	51%	6%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	38%	53%	-15%	50%	-12%

CIVICS						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	68%	68%	0%	66%	2%

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 data component was in Math proficiency at 40% for the 22-23 SY. This is down 2% from the previous year. These scores fall below the district and state average. Attendance and teacher vacancies in middle school could have been a contributing factor to the low performance.

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 was also in math, down by 2% from the previous year. The goal for math was to have 44% of students proficient by EOY 2023. These scores fall below the district and state average. Attendance and teacher vacancies in middle school could have been a contributing factor to the low performance.

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 greatest gap when compared to the state average was also in math 3rd-8th grade. Where 5th grade scored higher than the district and state, the remaining grade levels were below or well below the state averages. Attendance and teacher vacancies in middle school could have been a contributing factor to the low performance.

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

Science was the component that showed the greatest improvement, although we did not meet our goal of 55% proficiency in that area. Departmentalizing 5th grade so that each major subject area could be attended to with more robust lessons was a new action that was taken. The 5th grade and middle school science teachers provide hands on learning and experiments to enhance the lessons, and Generations Genius a supplemental science program was introduced.

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

The major area of concern for Athenian Academy is our attendance with 65 students missing 10% or more days of the school year.

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

Subgroup proficiency for SWD - 35%
Subgroup proficiency for BLK - 31%
Subgroup proficiency for FRL - 40%
Attendance - 65 students absent 10 or more days.

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.

FSA data shows that students with disabilities are performing significantly below their nondisabled peers, with only 19% proficiency in ELA and 19% in Math. In 2022 the SWD subgroup did not meet the ESSA requirements, with a 35 Federal Index Score which should be above 41.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Increase the ELA proficiency of students with disabilities by at 6% from 19% to 25% based on FAST data gathered from PM1 to PM3.
Increase the Math proficiency of students with disabilities by at 6% from 19% to 25% based on FAST data gathered from PM1 to PM3.

Monitoring:

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

Progress monitoring will occur regularly for our SWD population by reviewing i-Ready diagnostic data, FAST data, and specifically targeted intervention data. Walk-throughs will be completed by administrators at which time they will collect data on the implementation of scaffolding, tiered groups and differentiation.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

June Roper (c.roperj@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.)

Students with disabilities will be provided with a combination of direct instruction and small group strategy instruction to maximize achievement. Classroom teachers, MTSS coach and ESE teachers will work collaboratively during PLC's to determine specific differentiated needs and instructional curriculum for all SWD's. SWD's that continue to perform below grade level, will participate in tutoring, cooperative/ collaborative learning and small groups.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Instructional time is best used when it is filled with student-to-student interactions and discussions taking place about the lessons. Students will continue to excel when they have the opportunity to use academic language through speaking, listening, reading, and writing.

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.

Classroom teachers and ESE teachers will collaborate during common planning when available and PLC meetings to plan instruction and differentiate supports for students with disabilities.

Person Responsible: June Roper (c.roperj@pcsb.org)

By When: May 2024

Provide additional academic supports before, after and during school that focus on targeted instructional gaps and needs. Teachers can utilize the school MTSS coach and ESE teachers to demonstrate live lessons with their students to promote a greater understanding by the teacher

Person Responsible: June Roper (c.roperj@pcsb.org)

By When: May 2024

#2. 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.

The underperforming subgroup, Black/African American students, received a 31 Federal Index Score which falls below the 41 that is necessary to meet state performance levels and help students thrive.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Increase the ELA proficiency of Black/African American students by 6% from 29 to 35 based on FAST data from PM 1 to PM 3

Increase the Math proficiency of Black/African American students by 8% from 15 to 23 based on FAST data from PM 1 to PM 3

Monitoring:

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

Progress monitoring will occur regularly for our BLK/African American population by reviewing i-Ready diagnostic data, FAST data, and specifically targeted intervention data. Walk-throughs will be completed by administrators at which time they will collect data on the implementation of scaffolding, tiered groups and differentiation.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

June Roper (c.roperj@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.)

Differentiated instruction and small groups will be used to meet the needs of the underperforming subgroup.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Differentiated instruction is a research based and current evidence supports addressing student differences through meeting a variety of learning modalities and multiple intelligence according to the article, "differentiated Instruction: A Research Basis."

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.

Provide additional academic supports before, after and during school that focus on targeted instructional gaps and needs. Teachers can utilize the school MTSS coach to demonstrate live lessons with their students to promote a greater understanding by the teacher.

Person Responsible: June Roper (c.roperj@pcsb.org)

By When: May 2024

#3. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Economically Disadvantaged**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.

FSA data shows that economically disadvantaged students received a Federal Index Score of 35% proficiency in ELA and 36% in Math. In 2022 this subgroup did not meet the ESSA requirements, which should be above 41.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Increase the ELA proficiency of Economically disadvantaged students by 6% from 35 to 41 based on FAST data from PM 1 to PM 3

Increase the Math proficiency of Economically disadvantaged students by 5% from 36 to 41 based on FAST data from PM 1 to PM 3

Monitoring:

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

Progress monitoring will occur regularly for our Economically disadvantaged population by reviewing i-Ready diagnostic data, FAST data, and specifically targeted intervention data. Walk-throughs will be completed by administrators at which time they will collect data on the implementation of scaffolding, tiered groups and differentiation.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

[no one identified]

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.)

Economically disadvantage students will be provided with a combination of direct instruction and small group strategy instruction to maximize achievement. Classroom teachers and MTSS coach will work collaboratively during PLC's to determine specific differentiated needs for all economically disadvantaged students. Economically disadvantaged students that continue to perform below grade level, will participate in tutoring, cooperative/collaborative learning and small groups.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Instructional time is best used when it is filled with student-to-student interactions and discussions taking place about the lessons. Students will continue to excel when they have the opportunity to use academic language through speaking, listening, reading, and writing.

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.

Classroom teachers and MTSS coach will collaborate during common planning when available and PLC meetings to plan instruction and differentiate supports for our economically disadvantaged students.

Person Responsible: June Roper (c.roperj@pcsb.org)

By When: May 2024

#4. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Early Warning System**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

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

Student attendance has significantly impacted their overall performance. Attendance has been affected by fear of illness since school closures in 2020 and lack of commitment to education by parents.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Student daily attendance will increase from 90% to 93%.

Monitoring:

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

The Child Study team will review attendance bi-weekly during our meetings to determine if steps need to be taken by the school to engage parents in further understanding of the importance of attendance.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

[no one identified]

Evidence-based Intervention:

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

Family engagement, family resources and School Counselor outreach.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Continued family engagement has a direct, positive effect on children's achievement according to the article, "Fifteen Effective Strategies for Improving Student Attendance and Truancy Prevention."

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

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

The school counselor will aide in the process of enhance regular student attendance through phone calls and letters, and will communicate with families to support positive interventions and engagement from families.

Person Responsible: June Roper (c.roperj@pcsb.org)

By When: May 2024

Students will be recognized at quarterly assemblies for perfect attendance.

Person Responsible: June Roper (c.roperj@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).

A team of Stakeholders within Athenian Academy reviewed the academic, behavioral, and attendance data from both 2022 end of year and 2023 end of year. Stakeholders determined the area of concern for the current school year as well as trends supported by data in 3 subgroup areas. The team will continue to monitor for learning gains in the three areas of need throughout the school and modify support as the need is identified.

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

N/A

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

N/A

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

N/A

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

N/A

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.

N/A

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Rafalski, Shana, rafalskis@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?

N/A

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?

N/A

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
-------------	-----------------------------------

N/A

Title I Requirements

Schoolwide Program Plan (SWP) Requirements

This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A SWP and opts to use the SIP to satisfy the requirements of the SWP plan, as outlined in the ESSA, Public Law No. 114-95, § 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

Provide the methods for dissemination of this SIP, UniSIG budget and SWP to stakeholders (e.g., students, families, school staff and leadership and local businesses and organizations). Please articulate a plan or protocol for how this SIP and progress will be shared and disseminated and to the extent practicable, provided in a language a parent can understand. (ESSA 1114(b)(4))

List the school's webpage* where the SIP is made publicly available.

N/A

Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission, support the needs of students and keep parents informed of their child's progress.

List the school's webpage* where the school's Family Engagement Plan is made publicly available. (ESSA 1116(b-g))

N/A

Describe how the school plans to strengthen the academic program in the school, increase the amount and quality of learning time and help provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum. Include the Area of Focus if addressed in Part III of the SIP. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)ii)

N/A

If appropriate and applicable, describe how this plan is developed in coordination and integration with other Federal, State, and local services, resources and programs, such as programs supported under ESSA, violence prevention programs, nutrition programs, housing programs, Head Start programs, adult education programs, career and technical education programs, and schools implementing CSI or TSI activities under section 1111(d). (ESSA 1114(b)(5))

N/A

Optional Component(s) of the Schoolwide Program Plan

Include descriptions for any additional strategies that will be incorporated into the plan.

Describe how the school ensures counseling, school-based mental health services, specialized support services, mentoring services, and other strategies to improve students’ skills outside the academic subject areas. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(I))

N/A

Describe the preparation for and awareness of postsecondary opportunities and the workforce, which may include career and technical education programs and broadening secondary school students’ access to coursework to earn postsecondary credit while still in high school. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(II))

N/A

Describe the implementation of a schoolwide tiered model to prevent and address problem behavior, and early intervening services, coordinated with similar activities and services carried out under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. 20 U.S.C. 1400 et seq. and ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(III).

N/A

Describe the professional learning and other activities for teachers, paraprofessionals, and other school personnel to improve instruction and use of data from academic assessments, and to recruit and retain effective teachers, particularly in high need subjects. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(IV))

N/A

Describe the strategies the school employs to assist preschool children in the transition from early childhood education programs to local elementary school programs. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(V))

N/A

Budget to Support Areas of Focus

Part VII: Budget to Support Areas of Focus

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

1	III.B.	Area of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities	\$0.00
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Black/African-American	\$0.00
3	III.B.	Area of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Economically Disadvantaged	\$0.00
4	III.B.	Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Early Warning System	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00

Budget Approval

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

No