

Table of Contents

- SIP Authority 1
- I. School Information 3
 - A. School Mission and Vision 3
 - B. School Leadership Team 3
 - C. Stakeholder Involvement and Monitoring 8
 - D. Demographic Data 10
 - E. Early Warning Systems 11
- II. Needs Assessment/Data Review 14
 - A. ESSA School, District, State Comparison 15
 - B. ESSA School-Level Data Review 16
 - C. ESSA Subgroup Data Review 17
 - D. Accountability Components by Subgroup 20
 - E. Grade Level Data Review 23
- III. Planning for Improvement 24
- IV. Positive Culture and Environment 29
- V. Title I Requirements (optional) 31
- VI. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review 33
- VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus 34

School Board Approval

A "Record School Board Approval Date" tracking event has not been added this plan. Add this tracking event with the board approval date in the notes field to update this section.

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)
<p>A school can be identified as CSI in any of the following four ways:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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 parents), 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://cims2.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)	
I.E: Early Warning System	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II.A-E: Data Review		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
III.A: Data Analysis/Reflection	ESSA 1114(b)(6)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(4)
III.B, IV: Area(s) of Focus	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(i-iii)	
V: 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. The printed version in CIMS represents the SIP as of the "Printed" date listed in the footer.

I. School Information

A. School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement

To provide a personalized learning experience that prepares all students to become global citizens.

Provide the school's vision statement

To create a collaborative learning community that cultivates Character and provides a challenging Curriculum.

Purpose: Empowering Students for the Possibilities of Tomorrow!

B. School Leadership Team

School Leadership Team

For each member of the school leadership team, enter the employee name, and identify the position title and job duties/responsibilities as they relate to SIP implementation for each member of the school leadership team.

Leadership Team Member #1

Employee's Name

Dr. Lisa Maraj

Position Title

Principal

Job Duties and Responsibilities

Dr. Lisa Maraj is the Principal of the Pembroke Pines-Florida State University Charter Elementary School. She often meets with the assistant principal, curriculum specialist, guidance counselor, teachers, and staff to discuss instruction, day-to-day operations, safety, and information to improve the school. She reviews student and teacher data, performs walk-throughs and observations, conducts meetings with stakeholders, and communicates with the advisory board, City of Pembroke Pines personnel, administration from the Pembroke Pines Charter Schools, Florida State University personnel, and the governing board. She frequently meets with parent groups. She attends school and community functions on a regular basis. She communicates with parents by sending out global email notices that inform parents of school activities. She additionally sends out a "Principal's Report" with pertinent information for the staff. She is also responsible for writing the K-12 Comprehensive Reading Plan. She approves the expenses needed to purchase curricular materials.

Leadership Team Member #2

Employee's Name

Dr. Kimberly Pizzo

Position Title

Assistant Principal

Job Duties and Responsibilities

Dr. Kimberly Pizzo is the Assistant Principal and also serves as the District Safety Specialist. In this role, she often meets with the leadership team, teachers, staff, and students to discuss the day-to-day operations, safety, the schedule for activities, data, and instruction. She is the main contact for disciplinary issues in the school. As the school administrator, she performs walkthroughs and observations, communicates with parent groups, and coordinates school events and functions. She collaborates with curriculum, guidance, support, and instructional and support personnel to identify areas of student needs and barriers. As a member of this curriculum team, she consults and collaborates to identify interventions and supports as part of educational plans to address these needs and remove barriers so that the students are able to achieve their full academic, behavioral, and social-emotional potential.

Leadership Team Member #3

Employee's Name

Judith Founds

Position Title

Curriculum Specialist

Job Duties and Responsibilities

Judith Founds is the Curriculum Specialist responsible for aligning policies and procedures across multi-campuses. She oversees the data management system that houses State and local tests and assessments, tracks students' progress in MTSS/Rtl, and provides reports for school administrators. She develops, plans, and coordinates the professional development activities for teachers, staff, and other key stakeholders. She assists in monitoring the School Improvement Plan to track progress toward meeting the target goals set for the school year. In addition, she coordinates the implementation of the instructional and curriculum integration of technology and organizes team leader's meetings to ensure collaborative processes in all aspects of curriculum, instruction, and assessment.

Leadership Team Member #4

Employee's Name

Maria Marquez

Position Title

ESE Director

Job Duties and Responsibilities

Maria Marquez is the ESE Specialist for the FSU Broward campus and West Campus K-8 Center. She is responsible for providing support to schools to ensure that students with disabilities demonstrate increased participation and performance in the standard or access curriculum, statewide assessments, and accountability systems. She coordinates required ESE meetings, revises and updates schedules, and monitors the progress of IEP goals. She assists ESE support staff in developing IEPs goals for students identified with having disabilities. She meets regularly with the ESE Department to ensure all services and program delivery are done with fidelity.

Leadership Team Member #5**Employee's Name**

Karine Miranda

Position Title

School Counselor

Job Duties and Responsibilities

Karine Miranda is the school counselor. She meets often with the leadership team, teachers, staff, and students. She works with small groups of students, individual students, and classes. She assists teachers in helping students who are learning proper behaviors and oversees the Character Education program, Anti-bullying program, and development of social skills. She promotes positive interactions with stakeholders and serves as a liaison between agencies, parents, associations, and other organizations. In addition, Ms. Miranda is the school's testing coordinator. She conducts many meetings to make sure that the students are receiving the support needed to excel. She also works with students on behavioral goals as a response to intervention.

Leadership Team Member #6**Employee's Name**

Diane Morrison

Position Title

Student Support Services Coordinator

Job Duties and Responsibilities

Diane Morrison is the Student Services Coordinator for the FSU Broward campus and West Campus K-5 Center. She assists both campuses with carrying out the school's academic and behavior programs. She provides proactive leadership to

engage all stakeholders in the delivery of programs and services to support the students' academic achievement and personal and social development. The Student Services Coordinator works cooperatively with the principal, counselor, nurse, staff, students, and parents toward a positive school climate. She coordinates with the school and the ESE and School Counseling Departments, attends meetings, and monitors the progress of the students' MTSS/RtI goals. She assists teachers and the support staff in developing MTSS/RtI goals for students and monitoring progress. She meets regularly with the teachers and support staff to ensure all services and program delivery are done with fidelity. She develops and implements professional/staff development experiences as well as opportunities for all instructional and support staff. She is part of the Response to Intervention Team and participates in many meetings to make sure that the students are receiving the support needed to excel.

Leadership Team Member #7

Employee's Name

Rabia Yousuf

Position Title

Reading Specialist

Job Duties and Responsibilities

Rabia Yousuf is the school's reading specialist. She meets often with the leadership team, teachers, staff, and students. She works with small groups of students, individual students, and classes. She assists teachers during their reading block using the push-in model. She also works with students in a small group setting on reading goals as a response to intervention. In addition, Mrs. Rabia Yousuf is the textbook coordinator and the in-service facilitator. Mrs. Yousuf and the Curriculum Specialist develop and implement in-service professional practices, professional/staff development experiences, and opportunities for all instructional and support staff. She is part of the Response to Intervention Team and participates in many meetings to ensure the students receive the support needed to excel in reading.

Leadership Team Member #8

Employee's Name

Tanya Roman

Position Title

Math Coach

Job Duties and Responsibilities

Tanya Roman is the Math Coach for the school. She meets often with the leadership team, teachers, staff, and students. She works with small groups of students, individual students, and classes. She

assists teachers during their reading block and math block using the push-in model. She also works with students in a small group setting on reading goals as a response to intervention.

C. Stakeholder Involvement and Monitoring

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. (*ESEA 1114(b)(2)*)

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

Developing the school improvement plan (SIP) is a collaborative process. It involves the school administrators, curriculum specialists, the Literacy Leadership Team (LLT) members, and key stakeholders from the school leaders, teachers, families, and community partners. Their valuable input is sought in creating goals that align with the school's vision, mission, and purpose statements, ensuring the SIP meets all requirements. It reflects the collective effort of the entire school community.

The school leadership team reviews and analyzes the school's academic data, stakeholder surveys, and meeting notes to identify areas of strengths and areas that need improvement. Planned meetings are held with teacher leaders to formulate strategies and action steps to improve on areas that affect learning conditions and sustain our positive school culture.

Parents and students play a crucial role in the development of our SIP. Through parent-teacher meetings, surveys, and other informational sessions, their valuable input is used to ensure their suggestions and concerns are heard and addressed in the planning process. This active involvement empowers them to contribute to the school's improvement. Advisory board members review the draft proposal and provide feedback and guidance to ensure action steps and goals are obtainable in the timeline. Lastly, the community leaders and business partners lend their expert and financial support to ensure the effective implementation of the school improvement plan.

SIP Monitoring

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

The goals outlined in the SIP are monitored periodically throughout the school year. The SIP also aligns with some of the goals in our K - 12 Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan and our school-based MTSS/RtI Plan, with similar goals designed to increase student achievement and close

learning gaps. A meeting is held mid-year with the LLT members to review progress on meeting the goals and to address any new concerns. In addition, Progress Monitoring Data chat meetings are held to analyze student performance data, identify improvement areas, and monitor progress on identified learning gaps.

Classroom walkthroughs and iObservation tools are used to monitor learning conditions and provide needed support to teachers and/or students as part of our monitoring system. Ongoing survey feedback and informal stakeholder meetings provide different perspectives on how the school meets its goals.

These steps ensure continuous flow, with a strong emphasis on collaboration, accountability, and improvement. Data-driven decision-making meetings with the school-based leadership team involve analyzing data to identify areas for improvement. This process includes changes to practices or policies impacting the teaching and learning environment and strategies, interventions, or resources used to support student achievement. The curriculum specialist is responsible for sharing the proposed revisions with all stakeholders to get feedback and input and ensure the revised plan meets its goal of improving students' academic outcomes.

D. Demographic Data

2024-25 STATUS (PER MSID FILE)	ACTIVE
SCHOOL TYPE AND GRADES SERVED (PER MSID FILE)	ELEMENTARY KG-5
PRIMARY SERVICE TYPE (PER MSID FILE)	K-12 GENERAL EDUCATION
2023-24 TITLE I SCHOOL STATUS	NO
2023-24 MINORITY RATE	78.6%
2023-24 ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED (FRL) RATE	40.5%
CHARTER SCHOOL	YES
RAISE SCHOOL	NO
2023-24 ESSA IDENTIFICATION *UPDATED AS OF 7/25/2024	N/A
ELIGIBLE FOR UNIFIED SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT GRANT (UNISIG)	
2023-24 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 <i>*2022-23 SCHOOL GRADES WILL SERVE AS AN INFORMATIONAL BASELINE.</i>	2023-24: A 2022-23: A* 2021-22: A 2020-21: 2019-20: A

E. Early Warning Systems

1. Grades K-8

Current Year 2024-25

Using 2023-24 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 school days	0	13	16	13	11	27				80
One or more suspensions	0	0	2	1	2	4				9
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0				0
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0				0
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	4	5	5	4	9				27
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	5	5	9	2	9				30
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.053, F.A.C. (only applies to grades K-3)	1	2	8	7						18
Number of students with a substantial mathematics defined by Rule 6A-6.0533, F.A.C. (only applies to grades K-4)	0	2	6	2						10

Current Year 2024-25

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	2	6	2	1	10				21

Current Year 2024-25

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

INDICATOR	GRADE LEVEL									TOTAL
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained students: current year					3	1				4
Students retained two or more times					2					2

Prior Year (2023-24) As Last Reported (pre-populated)

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
One or more suspensions										0
Course failure in ELA										0
Course failure in Math										0
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment										0
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment										0
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.053, F.A.C. (only applies to grades K-3)										0

Prior Year (2023-24) As Last Reported (pre-populated)

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

Prior Year (2023-24) As Last Reported (pre-populated)

The number of students retained:

INDICATOR	GRADE LEVEL									TOTAL
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained students: current year										0
Students retained two or more times										0

2. Grades 9-12 (optional)

This section intentionally left blank because it addresses grades not taught at this school or the school opted not to include data for these grades.

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review (ESEA Section 1114(b)(6))

A. ESSA School, District, State Comparison

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.

Data for 2023-24 had not been fully loaded to CIMIS at time of printing.

ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENT	2024			2023			2022**		
	SCHOOL	DISTRICT†	STATE†	SCHOOL	DISTRICT†	STATE†	SCHOOL	DISTRICT†	STATE†
ELA Achievement *	81	81	57	73	73	53	83	83	56
ELA Grade 3 Achievement **	84	84	58	70	70	53			
ELA Learning Gains	69	69	60				79		
ELA Learning Gains Lowest 25%	50	50	57				63		
Math Achievement *	82	82	62	78	78	59	76	64	50
Math Learning Gains	68	68	62				76		
Math Learning Gains Lowest 25%	38	38	52				51		
Science Achievement *	70	70	57	59	59	54	60	76	59
Social Studies Achievement *								76	64
Graduation Rate								60	50
Middle School Acceleration								51	52
College and Career Readiness									80
ELP Progress	64	64	61	60	61	59	65		

*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.

**Grade 3 ELA Achievement was added beginning with the 2023 calculation.

† District and State data presented here are for schools of the same type: elementary, middle, high school, or combination.

B. ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2023-24 ESSA FPPI	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL FPPI – All Students	67%
OVERALL FPPI Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the FPPI	606
Total Components for the FPPI	9
Percent Tested	100%
Graduation Rate	

ESSA OVERALL FPPI HISTORY						
2023-24	2022-23	2021-22	2020-21	2019-20*	2018-19	2017-18
67%	68%	69%	52%		69%	67%

* Pursuant to Florida Department of Education Emergency Order No. 2020-EO-1 (PDF), spring K-12 statewide assessment test administrations for the 2019-20 school year were canceled and accountability measures reliant on such data were not calculated for the 2019-20 school year. In April 2020, the U.S. Department of Education provided all states a waiver to keep the same school identifications for 2019-20 as determined in 2018-19 due to the COVID-19 pandemic.

C. ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

2023-24 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%
Students With Disabilities	49%	No		
English Language Learners	63%	No		
Asian Students	88%	No		
Black/African American Students	66%	No		
Hispanic Students	68%	No		
Multiracial Students	80%	No		
White Students	71%	No		
Economically Disadvantaged Students	61%	No		

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%
Students With Disabilities	35%	Yes	1	
English Language Learners	60%	No		
Asian Students	77%	No		
Black/African American Students	65%	No		
Hispanic Students	67%	No		
Multiracial Students	83%	No		
White Students	75%	No		
Economically Disadvantaged Students	62%	No		

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%
Students With Disabilities	48%	No		
English Language Learners	61%	No		
Native American Students				
Asian Students	89%	No		
Black/African American Students	61%	No		
Hispanic Students	70%	No		
Multiracial Students	82%	No		
Pacific Islander Students				
White Students	79%	No		
Economically Disadvantaged Students	67%	No		

D. 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)

2023-24 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS													
	ELA ACH.	GRADE 3 ELA ACH.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	MATH ACH.	MATH LG	MATH LG L25%	SCI ACH.	SS ACH.	MS ACCEL.	GRAD RATE 2022-23	C&C ACCEL 2022-23	ELP PROGRESS
All Students	81%	84%	69%	50%	82%	68%	38%	70%					64%
Students With Disabilities	49%	59%	50%	35%	53%	50%	33%	59%					
English Language Learners	66%	64%	63%		72%	50%							64%
Asian Students	93%		73%		93%	91%							
Black/African American Students	77%	75%	72%	55%	76%	67%	45%	58%					
Hispanic Students	82%	87%	70%	48%	83%	68%	29%	71%					71%
Multiracial Students	86%		73%		86%	73%							
White Students	80%	85%	60%	45%	83%	66%		76%					
Economically Disadvantaged Students	72%	73%	65%	44%	75%	62%	26%	61%					69%

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS

	ELA ACH.	GRADE 3 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	73%	70%			78%			59%					60%
Students With Disabilities	36%	35%			44%			24%					
English Language Learners	60%	50%			68%								61%
Asian Students	71%				82%								
Black/African American Students	68%	68%			75%			50%					
Hispanic Students	76%	60%			77%			64%					57%
Multiracial Students	83%				83%								
White Students	73%	83%			82%			62%					
Economically Disadvantaged Students	67%	62%			70%			48%					

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS													
	ELA ACH.	GRADE 3 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	83%		79%	63%	76%	76%	51%	60%					65%
Students With Disabilities	57%		60%	48%	39%	54%	39%	38%					
English Language Learners	52%		67%	60%	57%	67%							65%
Native American Students													
Asian Students	92%		90%		92%	80%							
Black/African American Students	75%		73%	56%	68%	69%	42%	46%					
Hispanic Students	85%		80%	62%	76%	74%	54%	63%					69%
Multiracial Students	88%		86%		76%	79%							
Pacific Islander Students													
White Students	87%		81%	60%	85%	86%		74%					
Economically Disadvantaged Students	76%		74%	63%	66%	72%	59%	51%					75%

E. 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.

2023-24 SPRING						
SUBJECT	GRADE	SCHOOL	DISTRICT	SCHOOL - DISTRICT	STATE	SCHOOL - STATE
Ela	3	84%	83%	1%	55%	29%
Ela	4	76%	73%	3%	53%	23%
Ela	5	82%	82%	0%	55%	27%
Math	3	87%	86%	1%	60%	27%
Math	4	79%	83%	-4%	58%	21%
Math	5	80%	76%	4%	56%	24%
Science	5	70%	73%	-3%	53%	17%

III. Planning for Improvement

A. Data Analysis/Reflection (ESEA Section 1114(b)(6))

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources.

Most Improvement

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

There was a strategic effort to ensure the 90-minute literacy block is aligned with the Science of Reading (SoR). Across the grade levels, the ELA component increased significantly. The third- and fifth-grade students performed exceptionally well, with 84% of third graders scoring at a level 3 or higher, a 15 percentage point increase from the previous school year. The fifth grade students had a 5% percentage point increase from last year, with 82% scoring at a level 3 or above. The increase was from the highly effective teaching practices focusing on explicit, systematic, and differentiated instruction and tutoring support for students in the lowest quartile.

Lowest Performance

Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year's low performance and discuss any trends.

The math data for students in the bottom 25th percentile was among our lowest measures. Only 38 percent of those students made learning gains in math. In the previous school year, many of our improvement goals were focused on helping students become proficient in reading and writing. The school's math data has always been one of our strengths, and many practices continued from the previous year. In ELA, 50% of the students in the lowest 25th percent made learning gains. These scores were significantly lower than the district and the state. There are many contributing factors based on the sub-group data. The SWD did not perform well in either subject area.

Greatest Decline

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

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

The fourth-grade ELA data showed the most significant decline from the prior year. In the previous year, 82% of the students scored at or above level 3, but the Spring 2024 data showed that only 76% scored at or above level 3 in ELA. After reviewing neighboring schools' data, it is observed that many of the fourth graders did not perform as well as the third and fifth graders. The content tested may be at a higher level of complexity than expected, or the stamina required for reading the passages may

have been the cause.

Greatest Gap

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.

PPCES-FSU is a high-performing school, and the school-to-state comparison gap is over 20 percentage points in all categories, with the exception of science. The fifth-grade students did remarkably well this school year, with 70% scoring a level 3 or higher in science. The score is 3 percentage points lower than our district's, closing the 13% gap last year. The Spring 2024 data is 17 percentage points higher than the state average, increasing from last year's 8% gap.

EWS Areas of Concern

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

The Early Warning Systems (EWS) indicator shows an increase in students with 10% or more school day absences. The total number is 80, with fifth grade accounting for the highest number of 27. This is a significant increase overall. In 2022-23, the data reflected 61 in grades 1 - 4. After reviewing past data, it is evident that the attendance issue is trending upward.

What is new this year is that the EWS will now recognize the number of Level 1s in grades K-2 on the statewide ELA and Math assessments. These numbers add to the noticeable increase from the previous years. Another new indicator is the number of students with a substantial mathematical defined by Rule 6A-6.0533, F.A.C, which only applies to grades K-4). The data will be monitored closely as they may be attributed to the increase in level 1s on the statewide Math assessment.

Highest Priorities

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

1. Increase the percentage of students in the lowest quartile achieving learning gains in ELA and Mathematics by at least 3 percentage points.
2. Increase the percentage of 4th grade students achieving on or above grade-level performance on state assessments in Mathematics by at least 2 percentage points.
3. Decrease the percentage of students with 10% or more unexcused absences by 10 percentage points.
4. 100% of instructional staff will attend professional learning opportunities in mathematics.

B. Area(s) of Focus (Instructional Practices)

(Identified key Area of Focus that addresses the school's highest priority based on any/all relevant data sources)

Area of Focus #1

Address the school's highest priorities based on any/all relevant data sources.

ESSA Subgroups specifically relating to Students With Disabilities (SWD)

Area of Focus Description and Rationale

Include a description of your Area of Focus, how it affects student learning, and a rationale explaining how it was identified as a crucial need from the prior year data reviewed.

The Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) requires that states and school districts track and report student performance by subgroup. These subgroups include Students with Disabilities, English Language Learners, Asian Students, Black/African American Students, Hispanic Students, Multiracial Students, White Students, and Economically Disadvantaged Students. Analyzing the reporting data helps schools understand how well students are performing in the school.

In reviewing the subgroup data, the students in the lowest quartile with an Individualized Education Plan (IEP) did not make satisfactory learning gains in ELA and math. Students can demonstrate Learning Gains for FAST ELA and Mathematics in the following ways. 1. All eligible Students who have current and prior year scores improve from the prior year by at least one level. 2. All eligible students who scored at Levels 1 or 2 in the prior year who advance from one subcategory within Achievement Level 1 or 2 in the prior year to a higher subcategory in the current year.

The SWD significantly increased in the 2023-24 school year, with 49% of students scoring at a level 3 or above, an 11 percentage point increase from the previous year, when only 36% scored at/or above a level 3. Subsequently, in math, the SWD increased from 44% of students scoring at or above level 3 last year to 53% of students scoring at/or above level 3. This is marking the second year of the administration of the FAST assessments, and the SWD continues to shine, with 50% of SWD students having achieved learning gains in ELA and math.

The SWD students in the lowest quartile did not make as much progress as hoped. The percentage of students achieving Learning Gains was in the mid-30s, and the scores were lower than those of the district and the other campuses. As a result, one of the highest priorities will be to find resolutions to this situation. Many effective practices, including mentoring and tutoring services, are in place to support SWD.

Measurable Outcome

Include prior year data and state the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each relevant grade level. This should be a data-based, objective outcome.

By May 2025, students with disabilities (SWD) in the lowest quartile will achieve Learning Gains in the FAST Mathematics Progress Monitoring 3 assessment, increasing from 33% to 40%, as evidenced by the Florida Assessment of Student Thinking (FAST).

Monitoring

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome. Include a description of how ongoing monitoring will impact student achievement outcomes.

The school-based leadership team will monitor tier 1 mathematics instruction through informal walkthroughs to ensure explicit, systematic, and differentiated instruction occurs to support students with an educational plan. The math coach will meet periodically with teachers in grades 3 - 5 to ensure the appropriate pacing of math concepts and skills is taught quarterly, and multisensory strategies are part of the learning routine. Classroom tier 1 subgroup data will be reviewed in the monthly grade-level meetings.

The progress monitoring data will be reviewed frequently for students receiving tier 2 and tier 3 math instructions. Reflex math program report data will be pulled regularly to review students' progress and provide immediate feedback to the learner. Data will also be collected in the RtI Monthly meetings to determine if more frequent interventions or support are needed for the student.

The ongoing progress monitoring of the student's data and IEP goals will impact the amount of support the student receives. The timely decision and evidence-based approach will motivate students, build confidence, and achieve positive outcomes.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome

Judith Founds, Curriculum Specialist

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention (practices/programs) being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each relevant grade level, explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy, and describe how the identified interventions will be monitored for this Area of Focus (ESEA Section 8101(21)(B)).

Description of Intervention #1:

enVisionMATH is a core curriculum for students in kindergarten through grade 6. The program seeks to help students develop an understanding of math concepts through problem-based instruction, small-group interaction, and visual learning with a focus on reasoning and modeling. Differentiated instruction and ongoing assessment are used to meet the needs of students at all ability levels.

Rationale:

enVision Math K-5 – (Does not yet meet strong, moderate, or promising levels of evidence for grades

K-5; however, the following IES Practice Guide Recommendations support the program: Assisting Students Struggling with Mathematics: Response to Intervention (RtI) for Elementary and Middle Schools - Recommendation 3: instruction during the intervention should be explicit and systematic (Strong Evidence) - Recommendation 4: Interventions should include instruction on solving word problems that is based on common underlying structures (Strong Evidence).

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention:

Tier 3 – Promising Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement:

List the action steps that will be taken to address this Area of Focus or implement this intervention. Identify 2-3 action steps and the person responsible for each step.

Action Step #1

1. Fidelity of Intervention

Person Monitoring:

Diane Morrison

By When/Frequency:

Monthly

Describe the Action to Be Taken and how the school will monitor the impact of this action step:

The school-based leader will monitor the effectiveness of the Tier 2 and Tier 3 interventions to ensure they are implemented with fidelity. RtI/MTSS meetings will be held monthly to review and discuss the implementation of evidence-based strategies and progress monitoring data. The FAST Progress Monitoring data and district benchmark data will be used to monitor the impact of the MTSS protocol on student achievement outcomes.

Action Step #2

2. Data Chats

Person Monitoring:

Judith Founds, Curriculum Specialist

By When/Frequency:

Quarterly

Describe the Action to Be Taken and how the school will monitor the impact of this action step:

The school-based leader will have monthly data chats to review and discuss Tier 1 data to ensure curriculum, instruction, and assessment alignment. The data chat will also aid in monitoring students' progress in receiving supplemental instruction and intensive intervention, including the effects of motivational strategies. The Data Chat minutes will be used to monitor the impact of support teachers and learners are receiving and whether the learning gaps are closing.

Action Step #3

Coaching/Mentoring

Person Monitoring:

Dr. Lisa Maraj, Principal

By When/Frequency:

Quarterly

Describe the Action to Be Taken and how the school will monitor the impact of this action step:

The administrator will perform walkthroughs, meet with the Math Coach, and review math progress monitoring data in the Leadership Team Meetings. The FAST Progress Monitoring Data and iObservation data will track progress to identify what goals were successful and what other actions

need to be taken.

IV. Positive Culture and Environment

Area of Focus #1

Positive Behavior and Intervention System (PBIS)

Area of Focus Description and Rationale

Include a description of your Area of Focus for each relevant grade level, how it affects student learning, and a rationale explaining how it was identified as a crucial need from the prior year data reviewed.

Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports (PBIS), aptly named R.O.A.R.S., stands for responsibility, organization, acceptance, respect, and safety. It is the PPCES-FSU framework for sustaining a positive culture and supportive learning environment for our diverse population. The 2023-24 data showed increased suspension, attendance, and students with substantial reading deficits. The data analysis warrants a look at our P.B.I.S. to see how to reduce inappropriate behaviors, strengthen resiliency, and build character and confidence to increase academic achievement goals.

Measurable Outcome

Include prior year data and state the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each relevant grade level. This should be a data-based, objective outcome.

By May 2025, the number of students with a substantial reading deficiency will decrease from 18 to 15, as evidenced by the FAST Progress Monitoring Assessment.

Monitoring

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome. Include a description of how ongoing monitoring will impact student achievement outcomes.

The Literacy Leadership Team will monitor multiple data points, including the FOCUS portal for student engagement and the Coaching/Mentorship program, to ensure teachers are trained to provide social-emotional support to increase students' academic achievement.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome

Dr. Kimberly Pizzo, Assistant Principal

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention (practices/programs) being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes, explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy, and describe how the identified interventions will be monitored for this Area of Focus (ESEA Section 8101(21)(B)).

Description of Intervention #1:

The Early Warning Systems (EWS) is a systematic approach used by school staff to identify students at risk of not graduating on time, assign students to interventions, and monitor their progress. The indicators used to identify at-risk students are engagement (attendance), behavior (suspension), and course performance (grades and credits).

Rationale:

The EWS model is designed to help schools efficiently use data to identify the at-risk population and provide targeted support. Thus, it strengthens student persistence and progress in school and ultimately improves academic performance.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention:

Tier 1 – Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement:

Action Step #1

1. Recognition Program

Person Monitoring:

Dr. Kimberly Pizzo, Assistant Principal

By When/Frequency:

Monthly

Describe the Action to Be Taken and how the school will monitor the impact of this action step:

Students and staff can earn a Jag Gram certificate award from any employee recognizing one or more of the 11 resiliency characteristics from the Florida Department of Education throughout the school day. The principal acknowledges the Jag Gram award recipients and enters them into a drawing to receive a gift from the PTA. The leadership team will meet monthly to discuss the program's impact from meetings or feedback from key stakeholders. The objective is to improve or revise awards or incentive programs and assess its impact on improving the school climate and culture.

Action Step #2

2. Reading Incentive Plan

Person Monitoring:

Judith Founds, Curriculum Specialist

By When/Frequency:

Quarterly

Describe the Action to Be Taken and how the school will monitor the impact of this action step:

PPCES-FSU is implementing a schoolwide incentive program to improve academic performance, on-task behavior, and social-emotional skills for students who are not yet proficient readers. The external reward system targeting reading will help build self-esteem and self-confidence and encourage learners to use strategies to improve their reading skills. Interventionists will meet with students on targeted goals selected by students. Students will receive points/badges on task completion, Lexia unit usage and increases, and accelerated reader books read for the week. The school-based leadership team will review the implementation of the Reading Incentive Plan, which focuses on improving academics and building the self-esteem and confidence of students with substantial reading deficiencies. The Lexia, AR, and Star assessments will be reviewed to determine the plan's impact on struggling readers.