

Broward County Public Schools

City/Pembroke Pines Charter Middle School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	12
III. Planning for Improvement	17
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

City/Pembroke Pines Charter Middle School

18500 PEMBROKE RD, Pembroke Pines, FL 33029

pinescharter.net

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes (F.S.), requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a new, amended, or continuation SIP for each school in the district which has a school grade of D or F; has a significant gap in achievement on statewide, standardized assessments administered pursuant to s. 1008.22 by one or more student subgroups, as defined in the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), 20 U.S.C. s. 6311(b)(2)(C)(v)(II); has not significantly increased the percentage of students passing statewide, standardized assessments; has not significantly increased the percentage of students demonstrating Learning Gains, as defined in s. 1008.34, and as calculated under s. 1008.34(3)(b), who passed statewide, standardized assessments; has been identified as requiring instructional supports under the Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE) program established in s. 1008.365; or has significantly lower graduation rates for a subgroup when compared to the state's graduation rate. Rule 6A-1.098813, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.), requires district school boards to approve a SIP for each Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) school in the district rated as Unsatisfactory.

Below are the criteria for identification of traditional public and public charter schools pursuant to the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) State plan:

Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)

A school not identified for CSI or TSI, but has one or more subgroups with a Federal Index below 41%.

Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)

A school not identified as CSI that has at least one consistently underperforming subgroup with a Federal Index below 32% for three consecutive years.

Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)

A school can be identified as CSI in any of the following four ways:

1. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%;
2. Have a graduation rate at or below 67%;
3. Have a school grade of D or F; or
4. Have a Federal Index below 41% in the same subgroup(s) for 6 consecutive years.

ESEA sections 1111(d) requires that each school identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI develop a support and improvement plan created in partnership with stakeholders (including principals and other school leaders, teachers and parent), is informed by all indicators in the State's accountability system, includes evidence-based interventions, is based on a school-level needs assessment, and identifies resource inequities to be addressed through implementation of the plan. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as TSI, ATSI and non-Title I CSI must be approved and monitored by the school district. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as Title I, CSI must be approved by the school district and

Department. The Department must monitor and periodically review implementation of each CSI plan after approval.

The Department's SIP template in the Florida Continuous Improvement Management System (CIMS), <https://www.floridacims.org>, meets all state and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all ESSA components for a support and improvement plan required for traditional public and public charter schools identified as CSI, TSI and ATSI, and eligible schools applying for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) funds.

Districts may allow schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions to develop a SIP using the template in CIMS.

The responses to the corresponding sections in the Department's SIP template may address the requirements for: 1) Title I schools operating a schoolwide program (SWD), pursuant to ESSA, as amended, Section 1114(b); and 2) charter schools that receive a school grade of D or F or three consecutive grades below C, pursuant to Rule 6A-1.099827, F.A.C. The chart below lists the applicable requirements.

SIP Sections	Title I Schoolwide Program	Charter Schools
I-A: School Mission/Vision		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(1)
I-B-C: School Leadership, Stakeholder Involvement & SIP Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(2-3)	
I-E: Early Warning System	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-A-C: Data Review		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-F: Progress Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(3)	
III-A: Data Analysis/Reflection	ESSA 1114(b)(6)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(4)
III-B: Area(s) of Focus	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(i-iii)	
III-C: Other SI Priorities		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(5-9)
VI: Title I Requirements	ESSA 1114(b)(2, 4-5), (7)(A)(iii)(I-V)-(B) ESSA 1116(b-g)	

Note: Charter schools that are also Title I must comply with the requirements in both columns.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Department encourages schools to use the SIP as a “living document” by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

I. School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

It is our mission to prepare students to succeed in a global society by providing a personalized and rigorous curriculum through excellence in teaching.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Empowering Students for the Possibilities of Tomorrow!

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
Castellano, Michael	Principal	<p>The PPCMS leadership team consisting of administration, guidance, and curriculum provides direction, instructions, and guidance to teachers and staff. The team meets regularly to develop strategies to reach goals, identify professional development needs, meet with teachers to discuss areas of concern, and provide guidance and results-oriented solutions. The leadership team spends time working on matters of long-term importance, including common policies, common direction, and organizational development and improvement initiatives that lead to school improvement and student academic achievement. Michael Castellano, and Sean Chance are the principals of Pembroke Pines Charter Middle School for the West Campus and Central Campus respectively.</p>
		<p>They meet regularly with the assistant principals, curriculum specialists, guidance counselors, teachers, and staff to discuss curriculum and instruction, day-to-day operations, safety protocols, and policies to improve the school. The principals review student and teacher data, perform walk-throughs and observations, conduct meetings with stakeholders, and communicate with the Parent Advisory Board, City of Pembroke Pines personnel, and the City Commission, which serves as the school's governing board.</p>
		<p>The principals frequently meet with parent groups and attend school and community functions. They communicate with stakeholders via global email notices, faculty meetings, parent nights, workshops, parent link, and morning announcements which provide information on school activities and functions. There are also forums, websites, and newsletters that are available to the public. Additionally, the principals are responsible for the allocation and disbursement of budgetary finances to ensure all students receive an equitable education and that a clean, safe, and orderly environment is accessible to all stakeholders.</p>
		<p>Alan Pfau and Dr. Maria Garcia are the assistant principals of the West Campus and Central Campus respectively. The assistant principals meet regularly with teachers, staff and students to discuss the day-to-day operations, school safety procedures, student data, and curriculum and instruction. They serve as the school liaison for the Parent Teacher Association and provide support in all fundraising activities. The assistant principals are the main contact for disciplinary issues in the school and also perform walk-throughs and observations. In addition, assistant principals meet with staff and parents about individual student academic and/or behavioral needs.</p>
		<p>Diedre Blackburn and Jill Bear are the school counselors for the West Campus and Central Campus respectively. Each counselor meets with teachers, staff, and students in the areas of academic performance and personal social issues. They work with small groups of students, individual students, and classes to implement a comprehensive annual guidance plan. The counselors oversee the Character Education program, Anti-bullying program, and the Life Skills and Wellness curriculum. In addition, they serve as Testing Coordinator, Interventionist Team Leader, Section 504 Liaison, Child Abuse Designee, and Homeless Education Liaison for their respective campuses. To ensure system</p>

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		<p>alignment they also oversee the data management system that monitors students' progress in the MTSS/RTI process. Our counselors coordinate the new FLDOE FAST Math and Reading administrations for progress monitoring.</p> <p>Cynthia Adorno and Veronica Lesmes are the curriculum specialists for the Central Campus and West Campus respectively. The curriculum specialists disaggregate and analyze the school's data and use the information to select instructional approaches, identify research-based materials, and spearhead school-wide initiatives. Along with all stakeholders, they develop a school improvement plan. They conduct professional development trainings for teachers and conference with teachers to provide instructional feedback when needed. The curriculum specialists serve as the accreditation team for the system; meet regularly to align the system's policies, procedures, and curriculum; and design and deliver parent workshops focusing on increasing student achievement. As the in-service facilitators, the curriculum specialists meet with Professional Learning Community (PLC) coordinators on a regular basis in order to facilitate ongoing professional development for all teachers. In addition, the curriculum specialists mentor beginning teachers, model effective lessons in the classrooms, assist in parent conferences, and facilitate data chats. They are also the school liaisons for all online platforms such as FOCUS, i-Ready, Ed Learning, Canvas, Planbook, Savvas, Read 180, and HMH.</p> <p>Melonie Jimenez and Maria Marquez are the ESE Specialists for the Central Campus and West Campus respectively. The Director for Exceptional Student Education assists the Executive Director, Exceptional Student Education with overall department operations. The Director has primary responsibility for the administration and supervision of the ESE program for their assigned campuses. In addition, the Director shares leadership in the planning, organizing, coordinating and evaluating of all ESE programs.</p> <p>Cynthia Adorno and Samantha Grandson are the ESOL Contacts for the Central Campus and West Campus respectively. The ESOL Contacts monitor and conduct ELL student assessment and placement procedures. The ESOL coordinator insures that ELLs are initially identified based on their responses to the Home Language Survey and that subsequently their English language proficiency is properly assessed to determine qualification for the ESOL program. ESOL records must be submitted upon enrollment. ELLs are provided with equal access to all courses. Teachers use ESOL strategies to make courses and instruction comprehensible. All courses are delivered in English. Appropriate accommodations are provided to ELLs based on their ESOL Level.</p>

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.

An integral continuous improvement process that is focused on learners' experiences and needs is the School Improvement Plan (SIP). Annually, the leadership team collaborates with instructional support teams to guide campus School Improvement Plans (SIP). School Improvement Plans are intended to be a primary artifact to review data, set goals, create an action plan, and monitor progress. This living document guides the leadership team in decision making and in supporting improvement system wide as evidenced in our annual SIP submissions.

School Improvement Plans (SIP) are shared with all stakeholders; teachers, parents, students, and staff. In order to promote more engagement in the SIP plan creation, school leaders have expanded ways to reach the target audience. Through student surveys, PTSA, and School Advisory board feedback, the leadership team amends the SIP as needed to reflect improvement initiatives across the campus. SIP plans are presented annually to the School Advisory Boards for public Q and A and final approval. Plans and School Advisory notes are found on the school website.

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 PPCS 5081 SIP will be regularly monitored for effective implementation and impact on increasing the achievement of students in meeting the State's academic standards. Systemically, the School Advisory Board , approves SIP plans annually after the system administrators have provided input and feedback to campus leadership teams. The 15 member Charter Elementary / Middle School Advisory Board meets monthly to review school procedures and policies and make recommendations that will advance, encourage, and enhance the education of the City's charter elementary and middle school students. Guidance, ESE, Curriculum, Department Chairs and site based administrators provide input and participate in ongoing progress monitoring of school wide and ESSA subgroup ESE goals. PLC goals are created based upon schoolwide student achievement. Each department monitors progress toward their schoolwide literacy and content area PLC goals.

Midyear iReady reading and math diagnostics and FAST 2 reading and math progress monitoring contribute to ongoing instructional planning and adjustments to timelines and action steps included in the SIP may be made at this time. Additionally midyear Civics and 8th grade Science diagnostic scores (BSA) provide progress monitoring data for these tested areas and guide content area teachers in adjusting instruction and areas of focus. All tested area content teachers and ESE support facilitators participate in formal data chats three times a year with administration, guidance, and curriculum. ESE Support Facilitators monitor SWD student achievement based on IEP indicators. Throughout the year, ESE students are evaluated for their present level of performance (PLP) in order to evaluate progress towards personalized goals and to support providing or diminishing classroom accommodations as indicated for each SWD. Administrators conduct evaluative classroom observations that will provide additional data points to support SIP implementation in the classroom. Teacher feedback and deliberate planning in support with ESE facilitators provides ongoing monitoring for SWD students with the greatest achievement gaps . Continuous improvement is the annual goal across the system.

Demographic Data

2023-24 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Middle School 6-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	89%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	38%
Charter School	Yes
RAISE School	No
2021-22 ESSA Identification	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	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	0	0	0	0	0	0	59	67	87	213	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	3	5	13	
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	14	9	26	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	17	16	44	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	35	29	12	76	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	21	11	52	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	29	10	23	62	

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	0	0	0	13	9	22

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	3	0	3
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
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	4	7	15	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	10	9	25	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	0	4	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	26	39	76	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	45	35	46	126	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	40	59	115	

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	8	18	22	48

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	1	2	0	3
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	2

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 days	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	4	7	15	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	10	9	25	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	0	4	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	26	39	76	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	45	35	46	126	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	40	59	115	

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	8	18	22	48	

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	1	2	0	3
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	2

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	2022			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	78	54	50	84	57	54
ELA Learning Gains	66	54	48	71	57	54
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	49	44	38	65	48	47
Math Achievement*	75	52	54	84	60	58
Math Learning Gains	75	63	58	66	58	57
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	70	58	55	61	49	51

Accountability Component	2022			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
Science Achievement*	67	49	49	85	49	51
Social Studies Achievement*	90	71	71	89	71	72
Middle School Acceleration	77			78		
Graduation Rate						
College and Career Acceleration						
ELP Progress				60		

* 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	72
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	647
Total Components for the Federal Index	9
Percent Tested	98
Graduation Rate	

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

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	40	Yes	1	
ELL	59			
AMI				
ASN	87			

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%
BLK	68			
HSP	71			
MUL	78			
PAC				
WHT	75			
FRL	64			

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)

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	78	66	49	75	75	70	67	90	77			
SWD	28	32	30	30	58	53	22	48	59			
ELL	65	61	42	59	69	53	41	76	67			
AMI												
ASN	91	79	62	95	88		90	98	92			
BLK	74	65	52	67	71	69	55	91	66			
HSP	76	65	47	73	74	67	67	88	78			
MUL	86	68		83	80	73	69	92	72			
PAC												
WHT	79	63	49	79	77	84	77	88	78			
FRL	68	61	42	64	72	69	56	83	65			

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS

Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20	ELP Progress
All Students	77	62	45	68	40	36	69	83	69			
SWD	24	32	24	31	31	27	23	47	53			
ELL	68	64	44	67	46	43		70	83			

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	94	81	70	91	55		91	100	89			
BLK	70	58	44	58	38	41	61	74	66			
HSP	75	61	42	64	37	30	65	81	67			
MUL	79	67		65	44	40	62	92	50			
PAC												
WHT	83	59	42	76	39	38	80	90	70			
FRL	65	57	39	56	37	35	54	73	59			

2018-19 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 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18	ELP Progress
All Students	84	71	65	84	66	61	85	89	78			60
SWD	45	60	55	49	55	48	50	75	45			
ELL	68	73	70	73	65	60		73				60
AMI												
ASN	96	78	77	96	74	67	100	95	93			
BLK	77	69	63	75	64	56	77	83	76			
HSP	86	72	67	86	66	62	86	91	75			
MUL	90	79		86	64		80		91			
PAC												
WHT	83	68	61	87	66	67	84	92	74			
FRL	80	70	63	80	63	60	84	89	73			

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
07	2023 - Spring	78%	49%	29%	47%	31%
08	2023 - Spring	73%	49%	24%	47%	26%
06	2023 - Spring	74%	50%	24%	47%	27%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	83%	54%	29%	54%	29%
07	2023 - Spring	80%	51%	29%	48%	32%
08	2023 - Spring	74%	46%	28%	55%	19%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	53%	38%	15%	44%	9%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	95%	48%	47%	50%	45%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	94%	46%	48%	48%	46%

BIOLOGY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	99%	63%	36%	63%	36%

CIVICS						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	89%	64%	25%	66%	23%

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.

According to the 2022 FSA results, the student achievement data in grade 7 FSA Reading was the lowest with 74% of students proficient. Although this was the lowest scoring reading group, it has increased from 72% in 2021. Students with disabilities have experienced a three-year decline in math and ELA achievement following the pandemic. Additionally, Florida has adopted new math and ELA standards and implemented new state testing requirements for students K-12. The school has also adopted a new ELA series HMH Into Lit. This robust curriculum provides online and paper based resources. Additional progress monitoring features are available within the teacher dashboard for classroom common assessments. Tutorials are also embedded within the platform to support learners who may struggle.

The use of these materials and continued professional development on using the reports and resources will support our goals to bring up the reading gains for students in 6th, 7th, and 8th grade.

There are varied contributing factors that may have impacted this area of lowered performance. The global pandemic began to disrupt normal operations at the end of the 19-20 school year and well into the 20-21 school year. PPCS Middle School experienced higher than average student and staff attendance issues that school year due to Covid protocols that were still in place. There was also a significant number of staff changes that occurred after the 21-22 school year. The changes in school operations that were due to pandemic related issues impacted the day-to-day staffing and operational procedures of the school. Frequent "quarantine" absences, more reliance on substitute teachers, and hybrid learning all disrupted normal school operations and may impacted the learning environment for students. While many of these variables have self-resolved as we have moved past that time period in education, the learning gaps and educational habits formed by adolescents during the pandemic have been challenging to overcome. Fortunately, a return to normal operations, a redirection in academic and behavioral expectations, and significant intervention of resources and staff have begun to show promise in rebounding student achievement scores in reading, particularly for the lowest 25% of grades 6-8 students.

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

According to the 2022 FSA results, the student achievement data in 8th grade science has shown the greatest decline when compared to the previous tested school year. According to the 21-22 FLDOE 8th grade science data, 59% of students were proficient as compared to the 22-23 8th grade science data which indicates only 53% of students were proficient. The decline may attributed in part to pandemic related issues experienced by educational institutions during this time period.

Approximately 27% of eligible 8th grade students elect to take Biology I Honors in 8th grade in order to accelerate and meet this graduation requirement early. The diminishment in the quantity of students in this cohort impacts the overall student science achievement. The students that elect to take Biology I Honors in 8th grade are the highest achieving students in the grade, as evidenced in the 22-23 Biology EOC 100% passing rate. However, the removal of these students from the grade 8 sciences classes does impact the pace, depth, and tone of the 8th grade classroom instruction as well as the overall science scores.

Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends.

The data component that has the greatest gap when compared to the state average is grades 6-8 ELA Achievement. The State of Florida is 50% proficient and PPCS Middle is 78% proficient. The gap in achievement can be attributed to various reasons. The demographics and student population for PPCS Middle typically trends higher in student achievement than their peers in Broward County Schools. This can be evidenced in the longitudinal trend data demonstrating aptitude in vocabulary, literary, and informational text. Participation in varied enrichment clubs and projects continue to strengthen reading skills both in and out of the classroom. PPCS Middle School has participated and earned local and state accolades in the following areas; speech and debate, Model UN, Literary Fair, Science Fair, and History Fair. Students also have opportunities to get free after school tutoring in reading, provided by highly qualified school instructional staff. The curriculum for these tutoring sessions are from state approved resources and designed to support lower scoring domains for grades 6-8 students.

Additionally, our highly qualified ELA and reading teachers continue to engage in high yield instructional strategies. The majority of current ELA/Reading teachers are reading endorsed and continue to participate in professional development to strengthen instructional approaches and progress monitoring. Others in the department are working towards Reading Endorsement. Small groups, tutoring camps, enrichment projects, and targeted skill building and instructional scaffolding with coaches all contribute to the success of our learners.

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

The data component that has the most improvement based on our historical data is grades 6-8 math learning gains and math lowest 25 percentile. For example, according to the 2023 Spring FAST Math exam grade 6, 85% of students were proficient as compared to only 54% at the state level. In addition, the 2023 Spring FAST Math exam grade 7 indicates that 80% of students were proficient as compared to only 48% at the state level. Grade 8 Spring 2023 Math scores were 74% proficient while the state was only 55% proficient at this level. PPCS Middle School consistently outperformed the FLDOE math averages in grades 6-8 for the 22-23 school year.

There were some new actions taken for the 22-23 school year in math that may have contributed to the increased performance in math. New for the 22-23 school year was additional training in the BEST Math standards along with a new, robust adoption of the Savvas Envision math curriculum that includes enrichment and remediation components. Continued professional development that focuses on classroom implementation, strategic planning and instructional support, along with common assessments for progress monitoring was a contributing factor to this achievement. Additionally, the role of the math coach was expanded to provide fulltime, push in, small group instruction with targeted foundational math skill support helped lower performing students to achieve higher in math than previous years. All level 1 and 2 math students were invited for an optional 9 week math skill afterschool camp session that followed an instructional focus calendar that was created based upon the needs indicated in our schoolwide iReady and FAST progress monitoring assessments.

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

According to the Early Warning System (EWS), 16% of middle school students grades 6-8 are level 1 readers. This means they are reading at a grade level that is two years or more below the current grade level of the students. Additionally, many in this group (13%) are identified as having substantial reading deficiencies. Students who consistently score below grade often have foundational reading skill deficiencies and typically have greater difficulties in all content areas as compared to their grade level peers. One way PPCS 5081 is attempting to remedy this is to better support the content area teachers in providing reading strategies and comprehension support for this population. An emphasis on the

research-based, high-impact instructional strategies embodied in the Just Read FLDOE professional development campaign has begun at the school site. Key staff members attended the Science of Reading trainings and have returned to the campus ready to implement these strategies in the content areas. Science and Social Studies Professional Learning Community (PLC) members are participating in a monthly research-based reading strategy demonstration with modeling and peer feedback in order to enhance the instructional skillset for these content areas in order to increase overall student achievement in not only social studies and science but reading overall.

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

Our greatest priority need in addressing student achievement for the 23-24 school year is a focus on the subgroup SWD across all content areas. Pre-Covid SWD scores (2018-19) were significantly higher in all tested areas as compared to the SWD student achievement scores reflected in the 2021-22 report. For example, 45% of the 18-19 SWD grades 6-8 cohort were proficient in reading skills but only 28% of the grades 6-8 SWD group was proficient according to the 21-22 FSA results. Reading achievement is a primary area of need in the 23-24 school year in reference to all students ,but particularly for SWD population. Additionally, Science achievement scores dropped in the ESSA SWD Group for the same time period, 50% proficient in 18-19 to 22% proficient in 21-22. As a whole, the SWD group has fallen below the ESSA Federal Index of 41%. Upon review of the 2022 data for this group scored 28% in ELA Achievement, 30% in Math Achievement, and 22% in Science Achievement. This data has guided the leadership team to identify SWD reading, math, and science proficiency as the greatest priority needs of the 23-24 school year. The team will use Into Lit as the core reading/ language arts curriculum, Read 180 as the intensive reading curriculum, and iReady and FAST are used for progress monitoring. Savvas EnVision is the core math curriculum and iReady and FAST are used for progress monitoring. Ed Learning is the core science curriculum with cumulative textbook diagnostics and the BSA used for progress monitoring. Data chats reflect the need to transition from Tier 1 to Tier 2 RTI support as indicated my the individual needs of the students.

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 Other**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.

Fostering positive relationships is a foundational belief for PPCSS. Stakeholder surveys indicate that nearly 75% of students agree that they have a personal relationship with at least one staff member at their campus. This sentiment is also reflected in the Staff and Parent Surveys where 88% of staff and 86% of parents reported that students are known by staff members on campus. An area of need identified by the PPCS Equity Team is broader access for all in terms of system communication. In order to better reach and engage all stakeholders, annual surveys will be available in 3 languages; English, Spanish, and Creole.

All students participate in 30 minutes a day of instruction in Life Skills and Wellness (LSW) . The curriculum used for this component is ReThink- a state approved LSW resource with age appropriate lessons on varied social topics. For the Students With Disabilities (SWD) subgroup, the structure and support is even further delineated. ESE Support Facilitators provide push in support for all of their student's core content area classes. Additionally small, targeted, math and reading support is coordinated for our ESE students based upon their IEP goals. Gen Ed and Special Education teachers are members of the IEP evaluation team and provide data and feedback for goal setting and progress monitoring as well as attend ESE parent conferences and IEP annual meetings. Support Facilitators have their caseload of ESE students rostered together in a non-academic class in our SIS Focus for ease of monitoring, communication, access to student data.

Equity for all stakeholders and targeted support for our lowest performing 21-22 subgroup (SWD) is a campus goal for PPCS. The systemic approach to stakeholder involvement, clear communication, and equity across campuses has been identified as one of the many ways PPCS fosters a positive environment.

Measurable Outcome:

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

By April 2024, at least 80% of PPCS Middle School communication to parents will be available in 3 languages ; English, Spanish, and Creole.

This SMART goal is a collaborative objective of the School Improvement Team as identified by the PPCS Equity Plan.

Monitoring:

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

According to the PPCS Equity Plan, the system equity liaisons will monitor the weekly ratio of multi language emails to total emails sent.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Michael Castellano (mcastellano@pinescharter.net)

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 this Area of Focus is being more deliberate with parents/guardians as partners in communication for all students, including SWDs. This is a PPCS goal identified in the City of Pembroke Pines Communication Plan.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The rationale for selecting this the strategy/intervention (parents/guardians as partners in communication for all students, including SWDs) is that it is in alignment with our system-wide Communication Plan. A predominate challenge, according to 21-22 stakeholders survey feedback, has been clear, consistent communication across the system. This important for all students and families but the SWD population, research indicates that providing multiple opportunities and platforms for communication and information to be shared is a primary step in effectively communicating the academic progress, needs, and goals for our SWD families.

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.

All stakeholders will have opportunities to participate in school process creation and contribute to the school community by attending various outreach events. The PPCS Office of Innovative Learning (OIL) offers monthly Jaguar Parent Workshops and a goal is to expand this series by offering the workshops in multiple languages. Additionally, campus events are open to stakeholders such as multicultural events, Open House, award ceremonies, campus clean up, field trips, and more. By expanding the opportunities available for school site interaction and communicating these events on multiple platforms in varied native languages, all stakeholders will continue to experience equitable opportunities for school engagement and will continue fostering positive relationships for all stakeholders.

Person Responsible: Michael Castellano (mcastellano@pinescharter.net)

By When: By April 2024, at least 80% of PPCS Middle School communication to parents will be available in 3 languages ; English, Spanish, and Creole.

#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.

According to the FLDOE 2022 end of year assessment data for PPCS Middle 5081, the greatest priority need in addressing student achievement for the 23-24 school year is a focus on the subgroup SWD. This group of students has fallen below the ESSA Federal Index of 41%. Upon review of the 2022 data for this group scored 28% in ELA Achievement, 30% in Math Achievement, and 22% in Science Achievement.

To ensure a positive culture and environment, ESE teachers are invited to data chats and PLCs to discuss student achievement. Teachers, in turn, are invited to IEP meetings to create a collaborative goal for the students. All ESE Support Facilitators are SWD certified as well as reading endorsed.

Measurable Outcome:

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

By May of 2024, 31% or higher of the subgroup SWD will score proficiency in ELA achievement, 33% or higher of the subgroup SWD will score proficiency in Math achievement, and 25% or higher of the subgroup SWD will score proficiency in Science achievement as measured by the FAST PM 3 and the FSSA Science test.

Monitoring:

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

The subgroup SWD will be monitored throughout the year using progress monitoring FAST PM 1 and FAST PM 2, as well as the i-Ready diagnostics in ELA and Math and the BAS test in Science. Students will also be monitored throughout the year in their IEP meetings. ESE teachers attend regularly scheduled data chats and Professional Learning Communities (PLCs). Student data and progress toward academic goals are discussed, tracked, and planned for.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Michael Castellano (mcastellano@pinescharter.net)

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 curriculum selected to support the SWD subgroup being implemented in ELA and Reading is Tier 1 is Into Lit and iReady, Tier II is Read 180 and Tier III is System 44. In math the Tier I curriculum is Savass, Tier II is I-Ready, and Tier III is strategic skill instruction in small groups using Savass. The evidence-based curriculum selected to support the SWD subgroup being implemented in Science is Tier 1, Ed Learning, Tier II is Study Island, and Tier III is strategic skill instruction in small groups using Ed Learning.

Student participate in Tier II interventions on a weekly basis with weekly monitoring by classroom teachers and ESE facilitators. Progress is reported via Focus, the online gradebook/ student management system. parents, students, teachers, and staff have access to all progress monitoring and score reports in Focus.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The rationale for selecting this strategy is that it is a part of the continuous improvement model and feedback loop to evaluate effectiveness of intervention implementation. Planning, implementation, interventions, and monitoring are conducted on a consistent basis to maintain effective student learning. State approved core curriculum are all utilized with fidelity including common assessments across the departments in order to gauge progress in each class. Progress monitoring tools include the Florida

Assessment of Student Learning (FAST), i-Ready, Broward Assessment of Florida Assessments (BAS/BAFS), and common formative assessments (CFA). The formal campus progress monitoring timeline occurs three times a school year, in the beginning of the year with baseline data, midyear review evaluating progress towards multiple data points in Semester 1, and an end of the year data review to review progress towards goals and to gather feedback and reflect about the process and procedure.

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.

ESE Facilitators will participate in Reading, Math, and Science data chats with teachers, students, and administration. ESE teachers will complete a Data Matrix for progress monitoring of their assigned students. ESE facilitators will monitor reading and math progress using approved monitoring tools (iReady, FAST, Read 180). Content area teachers will be included ESE in common planning opportunities to prepare for daily ESE push in support. ESE facilitators will use the comment feature in Focus to record intervention used on classroom tasks and assessments according to IEP accommodations. Content area teachers and ESE teachers will attend parent teacher conferences for ESE students. Content area teachers and ESE teachers will attend intervention curriculum PD as assigned.

Person Responsible: Michael Castellano (mcastellano@pinescharter.net)

By When: By February 2024, ESE teachers will have contributed to data chat 1 and data chat 2. Based on progress monitoring information, ESE facilitators will revise their classroom instruction and pull out support according to the data trends for their caseloads.

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).

Annually, during Semester 1 of each year, an integral component of our educational system is the administration of the Program Effectiveness Survey to teachers. This survey serves as a crucial mechanism for collecting valuable feedback on the current curriculum and student support resources in use. Teachers play a pivotal role in this evaluation process, employing a comprehensive set of criteria to assess the effectiveness of these resources. Criteria include the presence of measurable outcomes, evidence of the program's efficacy in facilitating student learning, the availability of professional development opportunities, and an evaluation of the cost/benefit ratio in relation to budgetary needs.

The significance of teacher feedback becomes particularly evident in the early stages of Semester 2 when it is juxtaposed with usage analytics reports and budget reports. This comprehensive analysis, undertaken annually, provides a holistic view of the efficacy of our system-wide student information and curricular resources. The presentation of this information to leadership teams each spring serves as a cornerstone in decision-making processes regarding the continued utilization or strategic abandonment of specific resources.

This systematic approach aligns seamlessly with the budget season, ensuring that resource allocation is informed by concrete evidence derived from the needs of stakeholders. The feedback loop created by this process allows for informed decisions, facilitating the identification of funding areas crucial for enhancing student learning and curricular resources.

Through this well-established process, our educational institution, PPCS, not only outlines clear deliverables and expectations for resource use but also implements a robust monitoring process. An illustrative example of the system's efficacy is evident in the past revelation that a lack of personal internet-capable devices at home was impeding access for learners beyond school hours. Survey data and usage reports collaborated to advocate for the provision of school-issued devices, addressing the need for equitable resource access for all students. This dynamic interplay between feedback, analytics, and budget considerations exemplifies a proactive approach in ensuring the continuous improvement of our educational resources and support systems.

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

NA

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

NA

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

NA

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

NA

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.

NA

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?

NA

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?

NA

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**

NA

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.

NA

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))

NA

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))

NA

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))

NA

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))

NA

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))

NA

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).

NA

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))

NA

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))

NA

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: Other	\$0.00
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00

Budget Approval

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

No