

The School District of Palm Beach County

Franklin Academy Palm Beach Gardens 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	16
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	23
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	0
VI. Title I Requirements	0
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

Franklin Academy Palm Beach Gardens

5651 HOOD RD, Palm Beach Gardens, FL 33418

<http://pbg.franklin-academy.org/>

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Palm Beach County School Board on 12/9/2023.

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.

Utilizing an intercultural-mindedness model and a standards-based curriculum, the mission of Franklin Academy is to create compassionate, engaged, life-long learners by promoting a culture of collaboration and high expectations that emphasizes character development through active service in the local, national and international community, while adhering to the principle that all children can learn.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Utilizing an intercultural mindedness model and a standards-based curriculum, the mission of Franklin Academy is to create compassionate, engaged, life-long learners by promoting a culture of collaboration and high expectations that emphasize character development through active service in the local, national and international community, while adhering to the principle that all children can learn.

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
Torres, Deborah	Principal	The Principal will monitor and work with all staff listed above to ensure implementation with MTSS and SIP support. The Principal oversees the execution and monitoring of all strategies and action steps towards continuous improvement process at the school. The Principal will guide and facilitate instruction with the use of best practices and recommended resources/materials. It is the principal's responsibility to deepen the understanding of standards and engage faculty, students, parents, and the community members to understand the standards and the vision of academic success aligned to college and career readiness. In addition, the principal hires and retains highly qualified employees, uses data to inform decisions and instruction, professional learning, performance, and student learning. The principal quickly and proactively addresses problems in instruction and student learning. Finally, as principal, Ms. Torres must reflect on competing priorities and focus attention on those that will have the greatest leverage in improving instruction and learning.
Varela, Michelle	Assistant Principal	As assistant Principal, Mrs. Varela supports professional learning and collaboration amongst teachers and resource staff and facilitates and leads professional learning focused on content, instruction, and pedagogical content knowledge. She must demonstrate through daily decisions and actions that the school's priority is academic success for every student. The Assistant Principal assists with eliminating barriers and distractions that interfere with effective teaching and learning. Supports the principal in building a culture of pride, trust, and respect. Monitors the implementation of cultural competence, equity, and access within the instructional practices at the school center. She also monitors and improves instruction by visiting classrooms to support and monitor instruction.

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.

All stakeholders were involved in adding input to the development of the SIP. The data was looked over and in a roundtable discussion and a needs assessment was conducted. The focus of the conversation was identifying the why SWD and African Americans were below performance level, identified the potential causes, and possible actionable goals to accomplish by the end of the school year.

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))

After each state assessment progress monitoring period, the breakdown of the student data is done to monitor for progress. Interim assessment tools are used for progress monitoring prior to state assessment benchmarks. These progress monitoring checks are essential to ensure that the action

steps detailed in the SIP are working effectively towards student achievement gains. Based on the results of these ongoing checks, the team will decide if necessary changes must be made prior to state assessment benchmarks. A key element to achieve success involves conducting data chats and curriculum meetings where our general education teachers and ESE facilitators collaborate to discuss student-specific data. These meetings result in the creation of tailored action plans that best address the individual needs of each student. Formal data chats will happen after each progress monitoring assessment, facilitating an ongoing, detailed review of student progress. Additionally, informal data chats will be conducted during team leader meetings to ensure continuous monitoring of student advancement. By taking these comprehensive measures, we aim to significantly improve the academic status of our SWD subgroup and our African American subgroup and ensure that all students achieve their full potential. The goal is to ensure that positive progress is evident.

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	70%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	53%
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: C 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	18	21	32	15	12	17	2	3	4	124
One or more suspensions	12	12	7	7	8	14	22	17	14	113
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	52	31	22	105
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	30	4	27	61
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	25	18	20	40	24	28	155
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	22	22	25	34	20	28	151
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	1	5	6	5	18	20	40	24	28	147

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	1	0	7	9	6	6	11	7	10	57

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	6	3	0	5	0	0	0	1	0	15
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1

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	18	21	32	15	12	17	2	3	4	124
One or more suspensions	12	12	7	7	8	14	22	17	14	113
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	52	31	22	105
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	30	4	27	61
Level 1 on statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	25	18	20	40	24	28	155
Level 1 on statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	22	22	25	34	20	28	151
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	1	0	7	9	6	6	11	7	10	57

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	6	3	0	5	0	0	0	1	0	15
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1

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*	50	49	53	54	52	55	56		
ELA Learning Gains				53			58		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				42			52		
Math Achievement*	49	51	55	44	45	42	46		
Math Learning Gains				48			39		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				48			34		
Science Achievement*	41	46	52	38	48	54	40		
Social Studies Achievement*	73	63	68	56	57	59	65		
Middle School Acceleration	76	68	70	62	51	51	57		
Graduation Rate		73	74		38	50			
College and Career Acceleration		39	53		62	70			
ELP Progress	55	53	55	76	64	70	77		

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

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

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	57
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	399
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	52

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index

OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	521
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	98
Graduation Rate	

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)**2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY**

ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	27	Yes	2	2
ELL	45			
AMI				
ASN	76			
BLK	53			
HSP	60			
MUL	52			
PAC				
WHT	61			
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	26	Yes	1	1
ELL	45			
AMI				
ASN	70			
BLK	39	Yes	1	
HSP	54			

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY

ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
MUL	53			
PAC				
WHT	56			
FRL	44			

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	50			49			41	73	76			55
SWD	24			22			17	36			5	
ELL	42			46			18	64			5	55
AMI												
ASN	71			81							2	
BLK	42			36			25	67	90		6	
HSP	54			51			44	71	72		7	56
MUL	52			52							2	
PAC												
WHT	53			56			53	76	82		6	
FRL	45			41			33	69	77		7	50

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS

Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21	ELP Progress
All Students	54	53	42	44	48	48	38	56	62			76
SWD	17	31	26	20	37	33	12	31				
ELL	42	53	47	40	48	38	18					76
AMI												
ASN	88	57		76	57							

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21	ELP Progress
BLK	39	44	43	26	41	44	21	39	53			
HSP	56	61	41	50	50	46	31	66	65			77
MUL	62	55		50	44							
PAC												
WHT	63	55	48	51	52	54	51	66	62			
FRL	46	48	43	34	43	50	39	43	54			

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	56	58	52	46	39	34	40	65	57			77
SWD	27	44	50	17	33	40	15					
ELL	45	57	64	43	36		37	64				77
AMI												
ASN	83	62		89	54							
BLK	41	52	62	25	30	33	23	58	31			
HSP	48	50	45	44	29	22	37	52	52			88
MUL	59	50		50	42							
PAC												
WHT	71	66	54	57	50	42	49	72	68			
FRL	46	48	46	33	32	29	29	54	38			58

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	55%	56%	-1%	54%	1%
07	2023 - Spring	50%	48%	2%	47%	3%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	52%	47%	5%	47%	5%
04	2023 - Spring	59%	58%	1%	58%	1%
06	2023 - Spring	40%	45%	-5%	47%	-7%
03	2023 - Spring	54%	48%	6%	50%	4%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	43%	54%	-11%	54%	-11%
07	2023 - Spring	51%	36%	15%	48%	3%
03	2023 - Spring	57%	57%	0%	59%	-2%
04	2023 - Spring	59%	52%	7%	61%	-2%
08	2023 - Spring	37%	65%	-28%	55%	-18%
05	2023 - Spring	48%	56%	-8%	55%	-7%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	16%	46%	-30%	44%	-28%
05	2023 - Spring	35%	51%	-16%	51%	-16%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	61%	48%	13%	50%	11%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	61%	50%	11%	48%	13%

BIOLOGY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	94%	63%	31%	63%	31%

CIVICS						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	73%	65%	8%	66%	7%

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.

Franklin Academy demonstrated the lowest performance on overall 21-22 FSA ELA student achievement in the SWD subgroup with 26% and African American subgroup with 39% proficient, compared to our general education population who scored a 52% achievement. Historically, during the 20-21 FSA ELA Spring assessment, the SWD subgroup achievement was 32% and the African American subgroup was 39% proficient. Two years prior, during the 19-20 school year, we did not have any statewide achievement data for comparison purposes.

A contributing factor to students' performance was the initial first full year of students returning back on campus from virtual learning post pandemic, students coming in below grade level, and lack of data driven instruction to support student achievement and growth. Another contributing factor was students were on a 7 period schedule, students had a restrained time to get acquainted in class and focus.

A trend that was identified was the drop in achievement for the SWD subgroup of 6 percentage point, while our African American subgroup remained low with no movement at 39% proficient.

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

The greatest decline seen was our white subgroup, which decreased from a 58.1% proficient in 21-22 to 49.8% proficient in 22-23 on the Spring statewide ELA/Reading assessment.

Contributing factors related to this decline was 90% of our students were virtual and participated in an instructional model during COVID or did not participate in State Assessments. Additional contributing factors were new teachers to the profession with limited knowledge on implementing accommodations through the tier 1 instruction.

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 greatest gap compared to the state on the statewide Spring ELA/Reading assessment was the ELA Lowest 25% performance during the 22-23 school year with a 42% compared to the state at 46%.

The contributing factors were an influx of new teachers to the profession with limited knowledge on implementing tier 1 instruction.

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

The data component for the SWD subgroup that showed the most improvement during the statewide Spring FAST assessment during the 22-23 school year was the Math Achievement level from 17% the prior year (21-22) to 20% (22-23).

A contributing factor was Franklin Academy students were on campus for instruction, allowing teachers and support facilitators to provide appropriate services to students and accommodations in person. ESE team members were able to make changes to IEPs from temporary distance learning plans to original plans to adding services and accommodations.

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

After reviewing the EWS data, a potential area of concern in proficiency levels in Math.

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

1. Supporting our students with disabilities
2. Tier 1 Differentiated instruction
3. Implement MTSS Process with fidelity.

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.

Franklin Academy PBG Campus demonstrated the lowest performance on overall 2021-2022 ELA student achievement in the SWD subgroup with 17%, compared to our general education population who scored a 54%. Math student achievement in the SWD subgroup with 20%, compared to our general education population who scored a 44%. The greatest decline from the previous year was our ELA Achievement for SWD subgroup that decreased from a 27% to 17%. Students with disabilities continue to perform below 41% index level for the last year.

Our focus this year will be improving academic achievement for our Students With Disabilities subgroup. Our instructional priorities for SWD subgroup include weekly meetings within the ESE department, reviewing IEP's during PLC, check accommodation logs to ensure fidelity.

Measurable Outcome:

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

By the end of the PM3 2024, 50% of students with disabilities within ELA achievement will make growth according to the state assessment on the FAST ELA assessment compared to previous PM3.

Monitoring:

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

The ESE team will participate in bi-weekly curriculum meetings with grade level and department team meetings. During these meetings, current data for all students will be examined and monitored for progress. The ESE team will have their own department meeting to check in on individual student progress. The ESE team will participate in ongoing data chats with grade level and departments to ensure students at risk are being supported.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Deborah Torres (deborah.torres@pbcharterschools.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 have the opportunity to receive remediation through Progress Learning Software- an instructional software aligned to standard based lessons, assessments and practice skills. Students will be provided with small group instruction to close the achievement gap within tier 1 instruction with our HMH ELA resources. Ongoing data chats will be implemented based on progress monitoring data checks. ESE students will be provided with a Learning Strategies class added to their schedule. Learning Strategies class consists of students will be working on independent functioning skills that will support core classes.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The chosen intervention will help provide remediation in a small group setting to assist with tier 1 instruction and be able to meet the needs of our students with disabilities. Data chats are an integral part of monitoring for student growth and ensuring that the support provided is effective. Placing our ESE Students in a learning strategy class will increase the effectiveness of their independent functioning skills to support academic growth.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

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

1. Remediation through Progress Learning
2. Differentiated Small Group Instructions
3. Data Chats
4. Implementation of Learning Strategies class in current schedule

Person Responsible: Deborah Torres (deborah.torres@pbcharterschools.org)

By When: Beginning of November 2023

#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.

Franklin Academy PBG Campus demonstrated the low performance on overall 2021-2022 ELA student achievement in the BLK subgroup with 99%, compared to our general education population who scored a 52%. Math student achievement in the BLK subgroup with 25%, compared to our general education population who scored a 46%.. Black students continue to perform below 41% index level for the last year.

Our focus this year will be improving academic achievement for our black students subgroup. African American subgroup performed below 41% index level. Our instructional priorities include small group differentiated instruction, instructional software that is meeting students at their level and creating a pathway for remediation.

Measurable Outcome:

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

By the end of the PM3, 50% of students in the African American subgroup within ELA achievement will make one achievement level gain on the FAST ELA assessment.

Monitoring:

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

The teams will participate in curriculum meetings with grade level and department team meetings during PLC's every 7 days. During these meetings, current data for all students will be examined and monitored for progress. The leadership/administration team will have their own department meeting to check in on individual student progress.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Deborah Torres (deborah.torres@pbcharterschools.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 African American subgroup will have the opportunity to receive remediation through Progress Learning

Software- an instructional software aligned to standard based lessons, assessments and practice skills. Students will be provided with small group instruction to close the achievement gap within tier 1 instruction with our HMM ELA resources. Ongoing data chats will be implemented based on progress monitoring data checks. Strategies class consists of students will be working on independent functioning skills that will support core classes.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The chosen intervention will help provide remediation in a small group setting to assist with tier 1 instruction and be able to meet the needs of our African American subgroup. Data chats are an integral part of monitoring for student growth and ensuring that the support provided is effective.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

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

1. Remediation through Progress Learning
2. Differentiated Small Group Instructions
3. Data Chats

Person Responsible: Deborah Torres (deborah.torres@pbcharterschools.org)

By When: Beginning of November 2023

#3. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Teacher Retention and Recruitment**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

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

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

Overall retention and recruitment of highly qualified educators. If we focus on retaining and recruiting highly qualified teachers to increase learning gains in school-wide ELA and Math, then we will increase student achievement for all students, but especially for our low performing subgroups. The teacher retention rate from 22-23 school year to 23-24 school year was 78%. Some of the teachers who left to the district was a result of higher compensation.

This area of focus aligns directly with our District Strategic Plan. Our instructional priority for this area of focus will include Professional Development provided, team meetings, data review and the use of the newly hired Mentor teacher position who is a support person for all new teachers.

Measurable Outcome:

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

By the end of FY24 school year, Franklin Academy will retain 80% of the current teaching staff.

Monitoring:

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

Teachers will participate in weekly check in surveys. This data will allow support and resources to be put in place weekly. The teachers will be provided with monthly morale calendars to increase the community atmosphere. Professional development will be assigned to teachers based on walk-through and informal observations.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Deborah Torres (deborah.torres@pbcharterschools.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.)

All teachers will participate in professional development trainings monthly. Teachers will participate in committee meetings that are based on the schools need and culture.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The chosen intervention will help teachers identify areas of growth and to collaborate with other teachers.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

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

1. Weekly Check in surveys
2. Monthly Morale calendars
3. Professional Development trainings based on survey, walk-throughs and informal observations.

Person Responsible: Deborah Torres (deborah.torres@pbcharterschools.org)

By When: Beginning of November 2023

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).

SDPBC requires schools to complete a Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) aligned to the district's 5-Year Strategic Plan in the Continuous Improvement Management System (CIMS) portal. Since our schools was identified as Additional Targeted Support & Improvement (ATSI), we are provided personalized, one-on-one or small group support to assist the principal and leadership teams in developing comprehensive plans of action steps in the SIP for improving student achievement. These sessions ensure SIP and Strategic Plan alignment, provide an overview of the requirements of the School Board and school improvement updates. The training is mandatory for all principals. Principals select members of their SIP leadership teams to attend a session with them. Working in collaboration with the school leadership team, Performance Accountability/School Improvement, School Transformation and Federal/State Programs, the District ensures that the SIP and other grant funded plans or allocations are in alignment with the District's Five-Year Strategic Plan and complementary in the funded strategies and supports for each school's continuous improvement. All plans are carefully reviewed and approved by the School Board and the Office of School Improvement.

Resources and allocations are focused on:

1. Resource teachers (ESOL and ESE) support during small group instruction.
2. Teachers and support staff will attend ongoing professional development to engage deep, focused, collaborative planning to support and strengthen data analysis and small group planning and implementation.
3. Professional Learning Community (PLC)/Professional Development will ensure teachers collaboratively unite to focus on best practices and methodologies.
4. Multi-Tiered System of Supports (MTSS) framework to ensure students are provided with the specific instruction, resources, time, and intensity needed for success.
5. Curriculum Resources: Curriculum resources to enhance ELA, Science, Civics & Math skills and support student mastery of the Florida B.E.S.T. standards, will support literacy across the content areas, will support social emotion growth through the resources found in the Skills for Learning & Life (SLL) Resource Center to promote character education.
6. We have partnerships with multiple community and business partners. Together the schools, partner organizations, and businesses provide additional high-quality resources and services to students and families and comprehensively focus on health and wellness, as well as academic achievement.