

Pinellas County Schools

Pinellas Preparatory 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	11
III. Planning for Improvement	16
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	23
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	24
VI. Title I Requirements	26
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	27

Pinellas Preparatory Academy

2300 BELCHER RD S, Largo, FL 33771

<http://www.pinellasprep.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.

Mission: Pinellas Preparatory Academy (PPA) is more than just a school. Our PPA community is made up of students, faculty, staff, families, and other stakeholders. We support and nurture all areas of children's development and learning with a focus on social emotional, cognitive skills, academic development, global citizenship, physical health, and humanities. We take learning outside of our textbooks. Our students connect lessons to the community and contribute to the solution of real-world issues through cross curricular hands-on experiences. We are committed to providing an environment where students are physically and emotionally safe to ensure they reach their highest potential. Our rigorous and innovative curriculum provides our students with the tools necessary to succeed outside the walls of PPA.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Vision: The PPA community promotes academic excellence, whole-child education, and fosters innovation in a safe environment.

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
Vollmer, Kristin	Principal	<p>This position serves as the educational leader of Pinellas Preparatory Academy and Pinellas Primary Academy (Pinellas Preparatory Academy, Inc). The Principal performs responsible administrative and supervisory work in the area of instruction, academic personnel, curriculum, safety, and purchasing. Position is responsible for the educational and academic success of both schools which are co-located.</p> <p>Principal is responsible for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensures that all aspects of the charter in regards to academics are successful • Responsible for the academic and emotional success of students • Assists in recruitment and retention of academic staff • Responsible for the recruitment and retention of students • Oversees the annual lottery • Conducts an annual perspective family open house • Conducts an annual open house near the beginning of each school year • Attends monthly Board of Directors meetings • Attends and is a voting member of the Parent Teacher Enrichment Group (PTEG) • Organizes and implements school-based fundraisers • Conducts school wide character assemblies • Supervises, evaluates, and coordinates team meetings with all academic staff • Develops and maintains a positive school/community climate and a safe and healthy environment (i.e. works with SRO and Safety Director, conducts drills, works on school culture...) • Plans, implements, and evaluates the school instructional program based on student needs and within state guidelines • Maintains records and necessary educational reports for efficient operation (i.e. bullying reports, threat assessments, teacher observations and evaluations...) • Works with Dean/Behavioral Specialist to ensure student behaviors are addressed and behavior modification is in place • Plans, implements, and evaluates a new teacher program • Communicates with students, parents, staff to ensure all questions and concerns are addressed • Oversees and is responsible for the ESE, ELL, RtI (MTSS) and Section 504 programs • Chairs all academic staff committees • Plans, implements, and evaluates all professional development for academic staff • Attends district level meetings

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
------	----------------	---------------------------------

- Attends and demonstrates support for school-sponsored events of reasonable number including but not limited to school dances, 8th grade culminating events, school-wide banquets, and PTEG events.

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.

A broad group of stakeholders was developed including school leadership team, teachers, staff, parents etc. Data was gathered and presented to meeting participants on how the school is doing and what needs to improve. Discussion was held regarding the data about how students are doing in school, how they behave, and what teachers think. They also discuss feedback from parents, the community and what they want to change and improve. We listed then important things that need to get better.

Next, we made specific goals and plans to fix those important things making sure these plans are clear and can be measured. Developing action steps to showing exactly what needs to happen, who's responsible, when it should be done, and what resources are needed.

SIP Monitoring

Describe how the SIP will be regularly monitored for effective implementation and impact on increasing the achievement of students in meeting the State's academic standards, particularly for those students with the greatest achievement gap. Describe how the school will revise the plan, as necessary, to ensure continuous improvement. (ESSA 1114(b)(3))

The School Improvement Plan (SIP) will be monitored through monthly data meetings led by the Principal with grade level teams, the LEA and MTSS director, where they'll review student performance data, especially focusing on achievement gaps. If the plan isn't working as intended, it will be revised with input from teachers, parents, and community leaders, setting new achievable goals and adapting strategies. Clear communication will be maintained with stakeholders throughout this process, ensuring continuous improvement and better student achievement, particularly for those facing the greatest achievement gaps.

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	39%

2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	27%
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) Multiracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: A 2019-20: A 2018-19: A 2017-18: A
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

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

Indicator	Grade Level										Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Absent 10% or more days	6	7	12	6	10	7	13	13	11	85	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	1	2	2	4	2	11	
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	2	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	2	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	8	12	6	11	14	8	59	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	10	8	26	7	9	9	69	
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		

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	1	2	3	1	8

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students identified retained:

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

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

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

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

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

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Students with two or more indicators		

The number of students identified retained:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The number of students identified retained:

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

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review

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

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

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

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	64	55	53	62	55	55	66		
ELA Learning Gains				57			56		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				47			33		
Math Achievement*	64	61	55	62	34	42	64		
Math Learning Gains				64			56		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				49			41		

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
Science Achievement*	52	52	52	45	57	54	54		
Social Studies Achievement*	86	69	68	91	57	59	89		
Middle School Acceleration	59	69	70	83	44	51	67		
Graduation Rate		44	74		49	50			
College and Career Acceleration		17	53		65	70			
ELP Progress	50	56	55	35	69	70			

* In cases where a school does not test 95% of students in a subject, the achievement component will be different in the Federal Percent of Points Index (FPPI) than in school grades calculation.

See [Florida School Grades, School Improvement Ratings and DJJ Accountability Ratings](#).

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	62
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	436
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	60
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	595
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	32	Yes	2	
ELL	45			
AMI				
ASN	63			
BLK	32	Yes	1	
HSP	50			
MUL	75			
PAC				
WHT	68			
FRL	52			

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	44			
AMI				
ASN	72			
BLK	47			
HSP	50			
MUL	65			
PAC				
WHT	64			
FRL	63			

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	64			64			52	86	59			50
SWD	36			36			25				3	
ELL	32			54							3	50
AMI												
ASN	68			77			67				4	
BLK	36			28							2	
HSP	53			59			29	82			6	18
MUL	83			67							2	
PAC												
WHT	66			66			57	85	66		6	
FRL	54			52			47	81	42		7	38

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	62	57	47	62	64	49	45	91	83			35
SWD	33	34	15	31	45	36	23					
ELL	27	44	50	45	61							35
AMI												
ASN	72	57		80	75		75					
BLK	50	58		38	42							
HSP	53	47	39	55	60	53	23	80				40
MUL	75	58		69	58							
PAC												
WHT	63	60	51	61	64	48	47	94	85			
FRL	59	60	62	55	68	51	39	89	81			

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	66	56	33	64	56	41	54	89	67			
SWD	41	42	33	46	39	44	50					
ELL	37	36	31	46	45		23					

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
AMI												
ASN	80	56		80	67		38					
BLK	60	83		47	58							
HSP	56	49	28	49	49	44	45		80			
MUL	85	73		69	55							
PAC												
WHT	67	55	33	66	56	40	58	85	66			
FRL	58	49	34	54	55	43	43	82	67			

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	67%	57%	10%	54%	13%
07	2023 - Spring	66%	48%	18%	47%	19%
08	2023 - Spring	70%	47%	23%	47%	23%
04	2023 - Spring	67%	58%	9%	58%	9%
06	2023 - Spring	53%	47%	6%	47%	6%
03	2023 - Spring	59%	53%	6%	50%	9%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	68%	58%	10%	54%	14%
07	2023 - Spring	66%	36%	30%	48%	18%
03	2023 - Spring	66%	62%	4%	59%	7%
04	2023 - Spring	76%	66%	10%	61%	15%
08	2023 - Spring	76%	61%	15%	55%	21%
05	2023 - Spring	31%	61%	-30%	55%	-24%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	62%	47%	15%	44%	18%
05	2023 - Spring	44%	60%	-16%	51%	-7%

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

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

CIVICS						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	85%	68%	17%	66%	19%

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.

In our recent data analysis, it became evident that our students with disabilities subgroup faced a considerable challenge regarding academic achievement, particularly in the areas of 5th-grade math and science. Our data revealed that only 31% of students with disabilities met the proficiency standards for math, and a slightly improved but still concerning 44% 5th grade students met the standards for science. Several factors contributed to last year's low performance, and these trends are a cause for concern.

Firstly, the COVID-19 pandemic forced us to adapt quickly to remote and hybrid learning environments. This transition was especially challenging for our students with disabilities who often rely on specialized support services and face to face interaction resulting in an initial decline in performance.

Moreover, as we transitioned back to full-time, in-person learning, our students had to readjust to traditional classrooms. This change may have caused anxiety, adjustment difficulties, and a need for additional support, all of which impacted their academic performance.

Excessive absences were also a contributing factor. It's likely that students with disabilities faced unique challenges that led to more frequent absences. These absences disrupted their learning continuity, further affecting their achievement.

Additionally, the introduction of new academic standards and curricula played a role. As educational standards evolved, our students had to adapt to different expectations and content areas. The transition to new standards can be particularly challenging for students with disabilities, requiring them to learn new skills or adjust their learning strategies, which can take time and additional support.

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

In analyzing our school's recent data, the most significant decline from the previous year became apparent in the realm of mathematics, particularly among our 5th-grade students, and in English Language Arts (ELA) within the lowest quartile of our students. This decline in academic performance is concerning, and upon closer examination, several factors emerged as contributors to this decline.

First and foremost, the absence of small group teaching had a notable impact. In previous years, we had implemented small group instruction to cater to the diverse learning needs of our students. This approach allowed teachers to provide more personalized support and address individual learning gaps effectively. However, due to various constraints such as the need for physical distancing during the pandemic, we had to temporarily suspend small group instruction. This had an adverse effect on our students, particularly in mathematics, where many benefit from the additional guidance and reinforcement that small group settings offer. The absence of this tailored support likely contributed to the decline in math performance.

Additionally, another factor that played a role in the decline was the change in math teachers. When students transition to a new teacher, especially in a subject as skill-dependent as mathematics, it can lead to disruptions in their learning continuity. Different teaching styles, expectations, and classroom environments can be challenging for students to adapt to, which might result in temporary setbacks in their academic progress. The shift in math teachers likely had a cumulative effect on our 5th-grade students' math performance.

In ELA, the data showed a decline specifically within the lowest quartile of students. This decline can be attributed to several factors, one of which is the broader educational impact of the pandemic. Students faced disruptions in their regular school routines, transitions between remote and in-person learning, and varying levels of access to resources. These factors affected not only the lowest quartile but also the overall performance in ELA.

Furthermore, in ELA, personalized and differentiated instruction is crucial, especially for students struggling to meet grade-level expectations. The shift away from small group instruction and personalized support affected these students more significantly, resulting in a decline in their ELA performance.

To address these challenges and reverse the decline in math and ELA, we need to implement a targeted and comprehensive approach. This includes reinstating small group teaching as soon as feasible, providing additional support to the lowest quartile of students in ELA, and carefully managing transitions between teachers to minimize disruptions. We must also continue to adapt to changing circumstances, taking into account the individual needs of our students and providing the necessary resources and support to help them regain their academic footing. By recognizing these contributing factors and taking proactive measures, we aim to ensure that our students receive the quality education they deserve, with a focus on improving their performance in math and ELA.

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.

When we examined our recent data, the most glaring gap in comparison to the state average was evident in 5th-grade math and science. This disparity in academic performance is a cause for concern, and it became apparent that several factors have contributed to this gap. One notable factor is the change in teachers. The transition from one teacher to another can be a significant adjustment for students, especially in subjects like math and science, where instructional continuity is crucial. Different teaching styles, classroom dynamics, and expectations can disrupt the learning process and affect students' confidence and progress. This shift in teachers has likely played a role in the performance gap we observed.

Another contributing factor is the change in curriculum. Alterations in the curriculum can create challenges for both students and teachers. When students are asked to adapt to new content or teaching methods, it can take time for them to become comfortable and proficient. The adjustment period may lead to lower test scores and performance, which could contribute to the observed gap.

Furthermore, one trend that stood out was the lack of strong Science Project-Based Learning (PBL) experiences in the earlier grades (K-4). Science education builds upon foundational concepts, and when students do not have robust PBL opportunities in their early years, it can hinder their ability to engage with more advanced concepts in 5th-grade science. This gap in early science education can result in a lack of foundational knowledge and skills, which may contribute to lower performance in 5th-grade science.

To address this performance gap, it is imperative that we take a multi-faceted approach. This includes providing additional support to students during transitions between teachers, ensuring that educators have the necessary resources and training to effectively implement new curricula, and bolstering science education in the lower grades with engaging PBL experiences. By recognizing these contributing factors and taking proactive measures, we aim to bridge the gap and provide our students with a strong foundation in math and science, setting them up for future success.

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

While it's true that 5th-grade math has been a challenging area for us, the overall growth in math was evident across the board. Recognizing our struggles, we took several new actions to address the decline and build a stronger foundation in mathematics throughout our school.

One of the key actions we undertook was the creation of a continuum of learning in math. This continuum provides a seamless progression of math concepts and skills from grade to grade, ensuring that students are well-prepared for the challenges they will face in 5th-grade math and beyond. By aligning our math curriculum across all grade levels, we aimed to fill any gaps in students' understanding and provide them with a more solid mathematical foundation.

Vertical planning with our staff was another critical step we took to improve math education. This involved collaborative discussions and planning sessions among teachers from different grade levels. By working together, teachers were able to identify essential math skills and concepts that needed reinforcement in the earlier grades to better prepare students for 5th-grade math. This vertical alignment allowed us to identify potential trouble spots in students' mathematical development and address them proactively.

Additionally, we put a strong emphasis on professional development for our math educators. We provided them with training and resources to enhance their teaching techniques, adapt to changing curriculum standards, and employ effective instructional strategies. By investing in our teachers'

professional growth, we aimed to equip them with the tools and knowledge needed to support students' math education more effectively.

Furthermore, we focused on data-driven decision-making. We regularly analyzed student performance data to identify areas where additional support was needed. This data-driven approach allowed us to tailor interventions and support for individual students and groups struggling in math, ultimately contributing to the overall improvement in math performance.

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

Upon reflection of the Early Warning System (EWS) data from Part I, two potential areas of concern have come to the forefront: absences and the presence of Level 1 students. Firstly, absences stand out as a significant concern, as they can have a profound impact on students' academic progress and overall success. High levels of absenteeism can disrupt the continuity of learning, leading to gaps in knowledge and skills. It is imperative that we delve deeper into understanding the reasons behind these absences, whether they are health-related, socio-economic, or other factors, to develop targeted interventions and support mechanisms to reduce absenteeism.

Secondly, the presence of Level 1 students is also a matter of concern. Level 1 typically indicates that students are performing below grade level. This poses a substantial challenge as it may signify gaps in foundational knowledge or learning difficulties. It is crucial that we implement strategies to address the specific needs of Level 1 students, including targeted interventions, individualized support, and differentiated instruction to help them catch up to grade-level expectations. By addressing these areas of concern proactively, we can work towards creating a more inclusive and supportive learning environment that ensures all students have the opportunity to succeed.

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

- 1- Students with disabilities success
- 2 - 5th grade math and science
- 3- attendance

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 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.

Our chosen area of focus is the cultivation of a positive school culture and environment, with a specific emphasis on addressing attendance issues among students with disabilities. This focus area was identified as a crucial need through a thorough review of data, which highlighted a persistent concern: attendance rates among students with disabilities consistently lag behind those of their peers. This discrepancy poses a significant barrier to their educational success. Research underscores the pivotal role of a positive school culture and environment in improving attendance and engagement, which, in turn, positively impacts academic outcomes. By prioritizing the development of a nurturing, inclusive, and supportive school culture, we aim to create an environment where all students, including those with disabilities, feel valued, engaged, and motivated to attend school regularly, ultimately enhancing their overall learning experience and educational outcomes.

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 for the focus area of cultivating a positive culture and improving attendance among students with disabilities is to increase the average daily attendance (ADA) rate for students with disabilities by at least 5% over the course of the academic year. This outcome will be assessed by comparing the ADA rate at the beginning of the school year to the rate at the end of the year. The objective is to ensure that students with disabilities attend school more consistently, contributing to their engagement and participation in the learning process, as well as their overall academic success.

Monitoring:

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

Monitoring this Area of Focus involves several key strategies. Student Success Team (SST) meetings will be held regularly to assess attendance and engagement progress. Data analysis will track attendance trends and intervention effectiveness. Teachers will maintain open communication with students, parents, and guardians regarding attendance and engagement. This multifaceted approach ensures that attendance and engagement among students with disabilities are closely monitored, allowing for timely interventions and adjustments to achieve the desired outcome of increased attendance and a more positive school environment.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Kristin Vollmer (c.vollmerk@pcsb.org)

Evidence-based Intervention:

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

The evidence-based intervention being implemented for our Area of Focus, which is cultivating a positive school culture and improving attendance among students with disabilities, includes Student Success Team (SST) Meetings. SST meetings are well-documented as an effective strategy in improving student attendance and engagement.

During SST meetings, attendance data, student performance, and attendance-related concerns are thoroughly reviewed. This process allows for data-driven decision-making, as the team assesses attendance trends and identifies any patterns or specific issues contributing to low attendance among students with disabilities.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The collaborative nature of SST meetings is a key component of their effectiveness. The team, comprising teachers, special education staff, counselors, and parents/guardians, collectively develops and adjusts individualized attendance improvement plans for students with disabilities. These plans are evidence-based and tailored to address each student's unique needs and challenges.

By engaging in regular SST meetings, the school leverages evidence-based practices to monitor and improve attendance, ultimately contributing to a more positive school culture and enhanced student engagement among students with disabilities. The data-driven and collaborative approach ensures that interventions are targeted and effective in achieving the desired outcomes.

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.

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed.

One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Our area of focus centers on the subgroup of students with disabilities, which emerged as a crucial need from the data reviewed. The data component that showed the lowest performance, with only 31% of students with disabilities meeting proficiency standards, underlines the urgency of this focus. It became evident that this subgroup faces unique challenges in achieving academic success, consistently lagging behind their peers. This performance gap, highlighted by the data, raises concerns about their educational outcomes and opportunities. Our rationale behind this choice is twofold: firstly, it stems from a commitment to providing equitable educational experiences for all students, regardless of their abilities or disabilities. Secondly, it is driven by a recognition of our responsibility as educators to address disparities and ensure that each student reaches their full potential. By focusing our efforts on supporting students with disabilities, we aim to close the achievement gap, provide tailored interventions, and create a more inclusive learning environment where every student, including those in the subgroup with disabilities, has a chance to thrive.

Measurable Outcome:

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

The specific measurable outcome that our school plans to achieve for the subgroup of students with disabilities is to increase their proficiency in core subjects, particularly in math and ELA, by at least 15 percentage points over the course of the academic year.

Monitoring:

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

This objective will be measured through regular assessments and standardized tests, with the baseline being the initial 31% proficiency level. Our aim is to raise this proficiency level to a minimum of 46% by the end of the academic year, as a data-based indicator of improved academic performance and closing the achievement gap for students with disabilities in these subjects.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Kristin Vollmer (c.vollmerk@pcsb.org)

Evidence-based Intervention:

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

The evidence-based intervention being implemented for our area of focus, which is students with disabilities, involves additional small group instruction within the classroom during specific 30-minute Multi-Tiered System of Supports (MTSS) blocks, in addition to their existing Exceptional Student Education (ESE) services and targeted reading and math instruction.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

This intervention is grounded in research showing the effectiveness of small group instruction, particularly for students with disabilities. These sessions offer personalized, targeted support, aligning with individual learning needs. During the 30-minute MTSS block, students engage in focused activities addressing their academic challenges. It's evidence-based, adapting teaching methods to match abilities and learning styles. Integrating these small group sessions with ESE services and targeted reading instruction creates a comprehensive support system. This combination ensures consistent, specialized assistance where needed, ultimately boosting academic performance and closing the achievement gap. Data-driven

assessment and progress monitoring are vital, allowing educators to adapt instruction and achieve measurable proficiency improvements for students with disabilities.

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.

Identify Targeted Students: The school's Student Support Team will identify students with disabilities who would benefit from additional small group instruction based on their academic needs and assessments. (Person Responsible: Student Support Team)

Person Responsible: Kristin Vollmer (c.vollmerk@pcsb.org)

By When: Oct. 31, 2023

Professional Development: Ongoing professional development will be provided to instructors to enhance their skills in delivering effective small group instruction. (Person Responsible: Professional Development Coordinator)

Person Responsible: Kristin Vollmer (c.vollmerk@pcsb.org)

By When: Beginning 10/11/2023

Regular Progress Monitoring: Ongoing data collection and analysis will be conducted to monitor students' progress within the small group sessions, allowing for timely adjustments to instruction. (Person Responsible: ESE specialist and Classroom Teachers)

Person Responsible: Kristin Vollmer (c.vollmerk@pcsb.org)

By When: Ongoing until end of year.

CSI, TSI and ATSI Resource Review

Describe the process to review school improvement funding allocations and ensure resources are allocated based on needs. This section must be completed if the school is identified as ATSI, TSI or CSI in addition to completing an Area(s) of Focus identifying interventions and activities within the SIP (ESSA 1111(d)(1)(B)(4) and (d)(2)(C).

In our school, the process of reviewing and allocating school improvement funding is a meticulous endeavor guided by a steadfast commitment to meeting the unique needs of our students. It all starts with an in-depth analysis of student performance data, where we examine everything from standardized test scores to attendance records. This data-driven approach allows us to pinpoint areas where our students may be falling behind or where achievement gaps persist.

Once we've identified these critical needs, we set clear and achievable goals. We prioritize these goals based on their potential impact on student outcomes and the resources available to us. It's crucial to have a well-defined roadmap before delving into the allocation process.

Resource inventory is the next step. We take stock of all available resources, from funds to personnel, technology, and instructional materials. We also consider existing programs and initiatives that may align with our identified needs. This step provides us with a comprehensive view of what we have to work with.

Our budget development phase is rigorous and transparent. We create a detailed budget that outlines precisely how funds will be allocated to support our goals and priorities. We involve a diverse range of stakeholders, including school leadership, teachers, parents, and community members, in this process. Their input ensures that our budget reflects the needs and aspirations of our entire school community.

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.

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: Positive Culture and Environment: Early Warning System				\$0.00
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities				\$65,034.50
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2023-24
	5100	520	7171 - Pinellas Preparatory Academy	General Fund		\$5,000.00
	Notes: Touch Math curriculum					
	5100	520	7171 - Pinellas Preparatory Academy	General Fund		\$480.00
	Notes: Reading accommodation curriculum- Talking hands					
	5100	130	7171 - Pinellas Preparatory Academy	General Fund		\$59,554.50
	Notes: ESE Teacher					
Total:						\$65,034.50

Budget Approval

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

No