

Pinellas County Schools

NINA HARRIS ESE CENTER



2024-25 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

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 6

 D. Demographic Data 7

 E. Early Warning Systems 8

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review 11

 A. ESSA School, District, State Comparison 12

 B. ESSA School-Level Data Review 13

 C. ESSA Subgroup Data Review 14

 D. Accountability Components by Subgroup 16

 E. Grade Level Data Review 19

III. Planning for Improvement 20

IV. Positive Culture and Environment 32

V. Title I Requirements (optional) 35

VI. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review 39

VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus 40

School Board Approval

This plan has not yet been approved by the Pinellas County School Board.

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 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

Nina Harris is dedicated to exposing students with special needs to real world academic concepts in a safe, nurturing environment to maximize their success at home, school and in the community.

Provide the school's vision statement

100% student success.

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

Tonya Mitchell

Position Title

Principal

Job Duties and Responsibilities

The Principal is the instructional and operational leader within the school community and is critical to improving student outcomes, through the hiring, development, support, supervision and retention of high-quality instructional and support staff. As the school leader, the Principal creates a culture of rigorous learning, belonging and engagement for staff, students and families through collaboration and distributive leadership. In alignment with the Florida Principal Standards, the Principal leads the school team to increased school and student outcomes by prioritizing instruction while effectively balancing the operational, safety, and policy responsibilities of a school-building leader.

Leadership Team Member #2

Employee's Name

Michael Pursley

Position Title

Assistant Principal

Job Duties and Responsibilities

The Assistant Principal is an instructional and operational leader within the school community and is critical to improving student outcomes through staff development and effectiveness. In collaboration with and aligned to the direction of the Principal, the Assistant Principal supports the creation of the culture of rigorous learning, belonging and engagement for staff, students and families throughout the school community. In alignment with the Florida Assistant Principal Standards, the Assistant Principal supports and leads assigned school teams to increased school and student outcomes through ongoing training, coaching, feedback and support by prioritizing instruction while effectively balancing operational, safety and policy responsibilities, as assigned.

Leadership Team Member #3**Employee's Name**

Christina Vaughan

Position Title

ELL Compliance Specialist

Job Duties and Responsibilities

Compliance, graduation, student support.

Leadership Team Member #4**Employee's Name**

Jacquelyn Grimes

Position Title

Behavior Specialist

Job Duties and Responsibilities

Establishes principles of behavior change procedures with basic understanding of applied behavior analysis. Conducts and facilitates Functional Behavior Assessments and implements Positive Behavior Intervention Plans. Establishes specific behavior management programs for students as needed. Consults with school personnel, parents, and others regarding behavior strategies. Functions in the areas of behavior management and crisis intervention and is responsible to the school principal.

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

Jocelyn Avery-Wright

Position Title

ESE Teacher

Job Duties and Responsibilities

All duties associated with typical classroom instructors.

Leadership Team Member #6

Employee's Name

Joey Bower

Position Title

Parent Engagement Liaison

Job Duties and Responsibilities

Parent, SAC President

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.

At Nina Harris we meet with parents at least 2 time a year to review student education plans and seek input through surveys. We have an active PTO and School Advisory Committee (SAC). We hold school leadership meetings twice a month and the administrative team attends PLC meetings. We have several community businesses that partner with our school to provide supports for our students. We also use surveys to gain information from community and school leaders. At the March SAC meeting we specifically address school improvement and Title 1 initiatives and school needs for the upcoming school year. At the March leadership meeting we continue conversations about progress and needs for the upcoming school year. The entire school staff responds to surveys that are used to provide input on school processes and needs.

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))

We monitor our student's growth 3 times per year to access communication progress and reliability. We provide our students with the State Alternative Assessments; Datafolio and Performance Task. The results of these assessments are generally provided from the state in late July.

D. Demographic Data

2024-25 STATUS (PER MSID FILE)	ACTIVE
SCHOOL TYPE AND GRADES SERVED (PER MSID FILE)	COMBINATION PK-12
PRIMARY SERVICE TYPE (PER MSID FILE)	SPECIAL EDUCATION
2023-24 TITLE I SCHOOL STATUS	YES
2023-24 MINORITY RATE	50.7%
2023-24 ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED (FRL) RATE	74.3%
CHARTER SCHOOL	NO
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)
SCHOOL GRADES HISTORY <i>*2022-23 SCHOOL GRADES WILL SERVE AS AN INFORMATIONAL BASELINE.</i>	2023-24: 2022-23: * 2021-22: MAINTAINING 2020-21: 2019-20:

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	3	3	3	4	1	1	6	3	24
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C. (only applies to grades K-3)										0
Number of students with a substantial mathematics defined by Rule 6A-6.0533, F.A.C. (only applies to grades K-4)										0

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	1	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	4

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

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	3		2	2	5	8	2	6	4	32
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-6.0531, F.A.C. (only applies to grades K-3)	3		3	3						66

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	3		2	2	5	8	2	6	4	32

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)

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
	9	10	11	12	
Absent 10% or more school days					0
One or more suspensions					0
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)					0
Course failure in Math					0
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment					0
Level 1 on statewide Algebra assessment					0

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
	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators					0

Current Year (2024-25)

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

INDICATOR	GRADE LEVEL				TOTAL
	9	10	11	12	
Retained students: current year					0
Students retained two or more times					0

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 *		59	58	5	55	53	6	55	55
ELA Grade 3 Achievement **		64	59		63	56			
ELA Learning Gains		60	59				38		
ELA Learning Gains Lowest 25%		53	54						
Math Achievement *		62	59	3	61	55	2	34	42
Math Learning Gains		59	61				27		
Math Learning Gains Lowest 25%		51	56						
Science Achievement *		54	54		52	52	3	57	54
Social Studies Achievement *		71	72		69	68	5	57	59
Graduation Rate	83	31	71		44	74	100	49	50
Middle School Acceleration		74	71		69	70		44	51
College and Career Readiness	0	20	54		17	53	0	65	70
ELP Progress		53	59		56	55		69	70

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

**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	42%
OVERALL FPPI Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the FPPI	83
Total Components for the FPPI	2
Percent Tested	0%
Graduation Rate	83%

ESSA OVERALL FPPI HISTORY						
2023-24	2022-23	2021-22	2020-21	2019-20*	2018-19	2017-18
42%	4%	23%	22%		23%	10%

* 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	42%	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	4%	Yes	4	4
White Students	8%	Yes	4	4
Economically Disadvantaged Students	7%	Yes	4	4

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	23%	Yes	3	3

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%
English Language Learners				
Native American Students				
Asian Students				
Black/African American Students				
Hispanic Students	0%	Yes	3	3
Multiracial Students				
Pacific Islander Students				
White Students	8%	Yes	3	3
Economically Disadvantaged Students	24%	Yes	3	3

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											83%	0%	
Students With Disabilities											83%	0%	

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	5%				3%								
Students With Disabilities	5%				3%								
White Students	8%				7%								
Economically Disadvantaged Students	7%				6%								

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	6%		38%		2%	27%		3%	5%		100%	0%	
Students With Disabilities	6%		38%		3%	27%		3%	5%		100%	0%	
English Language Learners													
Native American Students													
Asian Students													
Black/African American Students													
Hispanic Students									0%				
Multiracial Students													
Pacific Islander Students													
White Students	14%				6%			0%	12%				
Economically Disadvantaged Students	4%		47%		5%	25%		5%	4%		100%	0%	

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.

There is no assessment data available for this school.

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?

All students at Nina Harris take an alternate assessment; Performance Task or Datafolio. For the purposes of this improvement plan we will refer to the data obtained regarding students who have taken the Performance Task assessment. From this data we can ascertain that ELA demonstrated the most improvement.

Lowest Performance

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

All students at Nina Harris take an alternate assessment; Performance Task or Datafolio. For the purposes of this improvement plan we will refer to the data obtained regarding students who have taken the Performance Task assessment. From this data we can ascertain that math performance was the lowest.

Greatest Decline

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

All students at Nina Harris take an alternate assessment; Performance Task or Datafolio. For the purposes of this improvement plan we will refer to the data obtained regarding students who have taken the Performance Task assessment. From this data we can ascertain that math performance demonstrated the greatest decline.

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.

There are no state gaps of which to compare our data.

EWS Areas of Concern

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

After reflecting on the EWS data, we are always concerned with attendance that is not directly related to medical needs.

Highest Priorities

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

The highest needs for Nina Harris are improved communication, ELA, Math, and behavior.

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.

Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

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 percentage of ESE students making learning gains will continue to increase above 40% as measured by the 2024-25 FAA ELA Performance Task.

In the 2024 FAA Performance Task, 44.8 % of students were at Level 1, 48.2 % at Level 2, 3.4 % at Level 3, and 3.4 % at Level 4. The majority of our students performed at Level 2. A total of 20 % of students made learning gains.

The growth issue stems from Level 1 Performance Task students lacking a reliable method of communication to express their understanding, coupled with their pre-academic learning levels due to intellectual disabilities.

During the 2023-2024 school year, evaluations were conducted to determine whether FAA Performance Task or FSAA Datafolio was the best assessment type. Currently, almost 72% of the student body is assessed via FSAA Datafolio. Previously, FAA Datafolio performance was not monitored due to the state DOE's limited data evaluation tracking system. With most students now assessed through FAA Datafolio, future focus will include both FSAA Performance Task and FAA Datafolio assessment information once available from the 2023-2024 school year.

Ongoing training for new staff includes online modules, Readtopia training, and Project Core modules, all of which are self-paced and award certificates upon completion. New hires are provided with this training information as part of their onboarding process.

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.

The percent of ESE students who made learning gains will increase from 20 % or better as measured by FAA Performance Task.

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.

FAA Performance Task score reports and FAA Datafolio Running Record/Evidence Collection Form accuracy data, collected by teachers, will be monitored by the Assistant Principal. Student Readtopia levels, which measure communication and literacy skills essential for the FAA Performance Task, will be collected by teachers and monitored by the Instructional Teacher Leader. All professional development-related action steps will be monitored through walk-through feedback, direct observations, and lesson plans.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome

Tonya Mitchell

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:

The evidence-based strategy being implemented in ELA includes direct instruction by teachers using a variety of teaching methods, such as visual supports, hands-on materials, core vocabulary supports, sensory-integrated experiences, and whole group, small group, or individualized instruction. Project Core/MELD/core vocabulary supports is a classroom-based intervention designed for students with significant cognitive disabilities who do not use speech, sign language, or symbols to meet a broad range of communication needs. The Tier 1 universal intervention in Project Core involves modeling the use of symbols combined with explicit teaching of the Universal Core vocabulary's meaning and usage. Modeling and teaching are integrated into daily activities (e.g., arrival, mealtime, personal care) and instructional routines (e.g., shared reading, predictable chart writing, alphabet knowledge). Teachers will receive annual instructional training from Readtopia's Building Wings. Additionally, communication strategies will be developed in collaboration with a Speech Language Pathologist on a monthly basis.

Rationale:

Direct instruction employs multiple evidence-based teaching strategies to accommodate the diverse learning needs of students with significant cognitive disabilities. The Multi-tiered System for Augmenting Language (mSAL) provides a three-tiered communication intervention system that supports many students who do not currently use speech, signs, or symbols to communicate. The first tier of mSAL focuses on the classroom and the classroom teacher's use of Aided Language Stimulation within a systematic routine. This approach helps establish consistent and reliable communication methods, enabling accurate assessment of student progress and determination of the most reliable assessment methods.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention:

Tier 1 – Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

Yes

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

PLC Monitoring

Person Monitoring:

Tonya Mitchell

By When/Frequency:

Annually, Monthly, with PLC minutes as evidence. Training Sign-in sheets. Weekly admin walkthroughs.

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

Staff will participate in PLCs with academic, behavior, and communication focuses, facilitated by School-Based Leadership Teams, to support the implementation of Project Core strategies, Comprehensive Literacy for All literacy strategies, activities, and best practices in communication, literacy, and academics.

Action Step #2

Readtopia Training

Person Monitoring:

Tonya Mitchell

By When/Frequency:

Data will be taken quarterly and loaded to the Student Data Tracking database.

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

Teachers will participate in school-wide training days focused on student communication, as well as annual new or refresher training for Readtopia, and monthly communication training with SLP support.

Action Step #3

Modeling Communication

Person Monitoring:

Tonya Mitchell

By When/Frequency:

Will be documented in SLP's treatment plans. Will be used daily and student progress will be documents in student IEPs

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

Speech Language Pathologists will model the use of various communication modes during lessons and therapy sessions to increase student engagement.

Area of Focus #2

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

Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

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 percentage of ESE students making learning gains is projected to increase above 20% as measured by the 2024-25 FAA ELA Performance Task. In the 2024 FAA Performance Task, 55.6 % of students were at Level 1, 37 % at Level 2, 3.7 % at Level 3, and 3.7 % at Level 4. Most students performed at Level 1, with over 50 % showing no learning gains in math.

The primary growth issue is that Level 1 Performance Task students lack a reliable method of communication to express their understanding, and they are still operating at a pre-academic learning level due to intellectual disabilities.

During the 2023-2024 school year, evaluations were conducted to determine whether FAA Performance Task or FAA Datafolio was the best assessment type. Currently, almost 72 % of the student body is assessed via FAA Datafolio. Previously, FAA Datafolio performance was not monitored due to the state DOE's limited data evaluation tracking system. With most students now assessed through FAA Datafolio, future focus will include both FAA Performance Task and FAA Datafolio assessment information once available from the 2023-2024 school year.

Ongoing training for new staff includes online modules, Readtopia training, and Project Core modules, all of which are self-paced and award certificates upon completion. New hires are provided with this training information as part of their onboarding process.

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.

The percent of ESE students who made learning gains will increase from 20% or better as measured by FAA Performance Task.

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.

FAA Performance Task score reports and FAA Datafolio Running Record/Evidence Collection Form accuracy data, collected by teachers, will be monitored by the Assistant Principal. Student Readtopia levels, which measure communication and literacy skills essential for the FAA Performance Task, will be collected by teachers and monitored by the Instructional Teacher Leader. All professional development-related action steps will be monitored through walk-through feedback, direct observations, and lesson plans.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome

Tonya Mitchell

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:

The evidence-based strategy being implemented includes direct instruction using a variety of teaching methods, such as visual supports, hands-on materials, core vocabulary supports, sensory-integrated experiences, whole group/small group/individualized instruction, and repeated instruction. Project Core/MELD/core vocabulary supports is a classroom-based intervention for students with significant cognitive disabilities who do not use speech, sign language, or symbols to meet a broad range of communication needs. The Tier 1 universal intervention in Project Core involves modeling the use of symbols combined with explicit teaching of the meaning and use of the Universal Core vocabulary. Modeling and teaching are integrated into daily activities (e.g., arrival, mealtime, personal care) and instructional routines (e.g., shared reading, predictable chart writing, alphabet knowledge). Teachers will receive annual instructional training from Readtopia's Building Wings. Additionally, communication strategies will be developed in collaboration with a Speech Language Pathologist on a monthly basis.

Rationale:

Direct instruction using a variety of teaching strategies incorporates multiple evidence-based learning methods to address the diverse needs of learners with significant cognitive disabilities. The Multi-tiered System for Augmenting Language (mSAL) is a three-tiered communication intervention system designed to support many students who do not currently use speech, signs, or symbols to communicate. The first tier of mSAL focuses on the classroom and the classroom teacher's use of Aided Language Stimulation within a systematic routine. This approach helps establish consistent and reliable communication methods, allowing for accurate assessment of student progress and the determination of the most effective assessment methods.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention:

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 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

Math aligned lessons

Person Monitoring:

Assistant Principal

By When/Frequency:

Annually, Monthly through administrative walkthroughs and PLC meeting minutes.

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

step:

Teachers will incorporate real-world, culturally relevant math lessons aligned with the B.E.S.T. Access Points (AP).

Action Step #2

PLCs

Person Monitoring:

Tonya Mitchell

By When/Frequency:

Annually, Monthly support PLC meetings and DWT. Administrative walk-thorough observations. Training sign-in sheets will be reviewed.

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

Staff will participate in PLCs with academic, behavior, and communication focuses, facilitated by School-Based Leadership Teams, to support the implementation of Project Core strategies, Comprehensive Literacy for All strategies, activities, and best practices in communication, literacy, and academics. Administrators will attend specific PLC meetings.

Action Step #3

Professional Development

Person Monitoring:

Tonya Mitchell

By When/Frequency:

Staff will participate in Monthly PLCs with academic, behavior, and communication focuses facilitated by School Based Leadership Teams to support implementation of the Project Core strategies, Comprehensive Literacy for All literacy strategies, activities, and communication/literacy/academic best practices. Teachers will participate in school wide training days focused on student communication. Teachers will participate in new or refresher training for Readtopia annually and Communication training monthly with SLP support.

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

Staff will participate in PLCs with academic, behavior, and communication focuses facilitated by School Based Leadership Teams to support communication/literacy/academic best practices. Teachers will participate in school-wide training days focused on student communication and will engage in new or refresher training sessions.

Area of Focus #3

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

ESSA Subgroups specifically relating to Black/African American Students (BLK)**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.

A significant percentage of our black students have very limited consistent or reliable mode of

communicating their understanding of learning targets. Through AAC these students are being provided with alternatives to communication. These students require exposure to real world experiences to help them relate to and understand the learning targets and better process and retain information. Based on the 2023 year's FAA (ELA) results, only 15% of our African American students are currently performing at level 2 or above. To increase proficiency for the 85% that are at Level 1, we will incorporate the use of culturally relevant lesson plans aligned to the standards and continue to develop and refine students' modes of communication to improve reliability. Thereby, achieving an increase in achievement and a reduction in behaviors.

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.

The percentage of black students achieving at performance level 2 or above will increase from 15% to 20% as measured by the FAA 2024.

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.

Student communication consistency will be monitored quarterly and reported on the student communication database and progress reports concurrent with grading period.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome

Jocelyn Avery-Wright

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:

The evidence-based strategy being implemented in this area includes direct instruction using a variety of teaching strategies (such as visual supports, hands-on materials, core vocabulary supports, sensory integrated experiences, whole group/small group/individualized instruction, repeated instruction). Project Core/MELD (core vocabulary supports) is a classroom-based intervention for students with significant cognitive disabilities who do not use speech, sign language, or symbols to meet a broad range of communication needs. The Tier 1, universal intervention in Project Core calls for modeling the use of symbols combined with explicit teaching of the meaning and use of the Universal Core vocabulary. Modeling and teaching are integrated into daily activities (arrival/dismissal, mealtime, personal care,) instructional routines that include real world and diverse experiences.

Rationale:

Direct instruction using a variety of teaching strategies includes multiple evidence-based learning

strategies to reach the variety of learners with significant cognitive disabilities. The multi-tiered System for Augmenting Language (mSAL) is a three-tiered system for providing communication intervention that offers support to many students with significant cognitive disabilities who do not currently use speech, signs, and/or symbols to communicate. The first tier of mSAL is focused on the classroom and the classroom teacher using Aided Language Stimulation in a systematic routine. This strategy will help build consistent and reliable modes of communication, accurately assess student progress and determine the most reliable method of assessment across various backgrounds and cultures.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention:

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 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

Real-World Culturally Relevant Lessons

Person Monitoring:

Assistant Principal

By When/Frequency:

Daily walkthroughs, lesson plan reviews, and PLC minutes.

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

Teachers will incorporate real-world culturally relevant ELA and social studies lessons aligned with the B.E.S.T. Access Points.

Area of Focus #4

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 percent of ESE students who make reliability gains in communication will continue to increase as measured by 2024-2025 Student Communication Database. Our level of performance from the 2023-2024 school year was 4.3% Emergent Communicators (down from 31.8% last year), 60.24% Consistent communicators (up from 42.8% last year), and 35.4% Reliable communicators (up from 42.8% last year). The majority of our students were performing at the Consistent communication level. The percentage of students who made improvements of at least 1 level was 43.3%; the percentage of students who remained the same as previous year was 54.5%; the percentage of students who decreased by 1 or more levels was 4.3%. Since 2021-2022 school year, all instructional

staff are required to complete the Project Core professional development modules. Over the past year, teachers have continued to receive training to support communication through monthly PLCs focused on communication, site-based training days, and district wide trainings. During the 2023-2024 school year, in order to support student communication, all Pre-K – 12 teachers implemented communication instruction and comprehensive literacy instruction via the Readtopia Curriculum; all teachers of students in the Extended Transition program implemented communication instruction during their curriculum lessons. Parents have received information on how to support student communication through Title 1 back-to-school night in the fall and the Agency Fair in the spring.

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.

The percent of ESE students who make learning gains will increase from 43.3% to 47% as measured by the Readtopia communication benchmark, reflected in the communication database.

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.

Benchmarks will be taken quarterly and late in the 4th quarter, the communication database will be updated by teachers.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome

Christina Vaughan

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:

The evidence-based strategy being implemented in all areas includes direct instruction using a variety of teaching strategies (such as visual supports, hands-on materials, core vocabulary supports, sensory-integrated experiences, whole group/small group/individualized instruction, repeated instruction). Project Core/MELD/core vocabulary supports is a classroom-based intervention for students with significant cognitive disabilities who do not use speech, sign language, and/or symbols to meet a broad range of communication needs. The Tier 1, universal intervention in Project Core calls for modeling the use symbols combined with explicit teaching of the meaning and use of the Universal Core vocabulary. Modeling and teaching are integrated into daily activities (arrival, mealtime, personal care, specials) and instructional routines (shared reading, predictable chart writing, alphabet, and numbers). Following consistent implementation of these interventions, the data show that of the 44 students who were rated Emergent communicators at the end of the 22-23 school

year, 1 remained Emergent, 40 moved up one level to Consistent, and 2 moved up two levels to Reliable, by the end of the 2023-2024 school year.

Rationale:

Direct instruction using a variety of teaching strategies includes multiple evidence-based learning strategies to reach the variety of learners with significant cognitive disabilities. The multi-tiered System for Augmenting Language (mSAL) is a three-tiered system for providing communication intervention that offers support to a large number of students with significant cognitive disabilities who do not currently use speech, signs, and/or symbols to communicate. The first tier of mSAL is focused on the classroom and the classroom teacher using Aided Language Stimulation in a systematic routine. This will help build consistent and reliable modes of communication, so we can accurately assess student progress and determine the most reliable method of assessment.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention:

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 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

Student Engagement

Person Monitoring:

Tonya Mitchell

By When/Frequency:

Daily, monitored through treatment plans and IEP's.

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

Speech Language Pathologists will model the use of a variety of communication modes during lessons/therapy sessions to increase student engagement.

Action Step #2

Collaboration

Person Monitoring:

Tonya Mitchell

By When/Frequency:

Weekly, evidenced in IEP notes.

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

Teachers will collaborate with Speech Language Pathologists on a variety of communication modes that meet the individual needs of their students to include any updates/changes that students may need.

Action Step #3

New Staff

Person Monitoring:

Tonya Mitchell

By When/Frequency:

Monthly through staff meetings

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

All new instructional staff will read Dr. Karen Erickson's book, Comprehensive Literacy for All and

another book study will be offered for these teachers.

Action Step #4

Modeling

Person Monitoring:

Tonya Mitchell

By When/Frequency:

Daily, monitored through walkthroughs

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

Teachers will model the use of individual student communication modes during daily activities and instruction.

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.

In 21 -22 there were 1,970 behavior calls documented by the school behavior team. Aggression accounted for 54% of the calls. Out of Area (OOA) accounted for 21.4% of calls. At that time, the school-wide focus shifted to increasing student communication and academic engagement. Since implementing evidence-based strategies and interventions directly related to student communication and engagement in learning for 2 school years. Data for the 2023-2024 school year show a total of 1,450 behavior calls documented by the school behavior team, a decrease of 520 calls or 35.9%. Aggression calls accounted for 66.2% of calls and OOA calls accounted for 16.1% of the calls. The OOA calls decreased by 4.7%.* Aggression calls rose by 21.8% over a 2-year period.
(*Note – the remainder of calls, 23.6% included disruption and not following directions)

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 total number of behavior intervention calls will be reduced by 10%. Calls for OOA will be reduced by 5% through continued improvements in student communication and academic engagement and the number of calls for aggression will be reduced by 5% through implementation of an emotional regulation curriculum.

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.

Behavior call logs are maintained on a daily basis. Individual behavior is reported to parents in IEPs and through quarterly progress reports. Administration continuously monitors school-wide behavior data and trends and shares the data with SAC and school staff on a regular basis. Discipline referral data will be monitored by administration.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome

Jacquelyn Grimes

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 VB-MAPP criterion-reference assessment tool will continue to be used to assess and monitor individual student verbal behavior. Improved communication for all students will continue to be a major school-wide focus to lead students to gain increasingly reliable self-advocacy skills. These interventions will continue to increase student engagement in their learning. Zones of Regulation, a research-based curriculum designed to develop student awareness of feelings, energy and alertness levels while exploring a variety of tools and strategies for emotional regulation and pro-skills, will be used with an identified group of students. This will be done through individual or small group lessons per student need. This intervention will be used to help students identify and regulate their emotions, leading to a decrease in aggressive behaviors.

Rationale:

Since we began a school-wide focus of increasing student communication in the 2021-2022 school year, with strategies to increase student communication reliability and student engagement, we have seen documented growth in communication and a decrease in student behaviors. Use of evidence-based strategies help students increase communication and increase engagement. The decrease in OOA behavior calls shows students remaining engaged at a higher rate than was seen prior to use of these strategies. Aggression calls have continued to increase. The majority of calls are for a small number of our student population. By identifying these students and will can begin implementing the Zones of Regulation curriculum and teach these students specific strategies to help them better regulate emotions and behaviors within the classroom and school environment.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention:

Tier 1 – Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

Yes

Action Steps to Implement:

Action Step #1

Emotional Regulation

Person Monitoring:

Jacquelyn Grimes

By When/Frequency:

Monthly

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

Students requiring emotional regulation support will be identified through the MTSS process and referred to the student services team.

Action Step #2

Modeling

Person Monitoring:

Tonya Mitchell

By When/Frequency:

Weekly

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

Speech Language Pathologists will model the use of a variety of communication modes during lessons/therapy sessions to increase student engagement. Teachers will model use of individual student communication systems.

Action Step #3

Relevant Curriculum

Person Monitoring:

Tonya Mitchell

By When/Frequency:

Weekly, evidenced in walkthroughs

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

Teachers will incorporate real-world, culturally relevant lessons during academic instruction. The Zones of Regulation Curriculum lessons will be ongoing for identified students.

V. Title I Requirements (optional)

A. Schoolwide Program Plan (SWP)

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 ESEA Section 1114(b). This section of the SIP is not required for non-Title I schools.

Dissemination Methods

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. (ESEA 1114(b)(4))

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

At Nina Harris we provide our parents with information through multiple methods. We use Title 1 school meetings, SAC meetings, our school website and this year we will add an update in the principal's update. We will also add a report to the Parent Teacher Organization.

<https://www.pcsb.org/ninaharris>

Positive Relationships With Parents, Families and other Community Stakeholders

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 Parental and Family Engagement Plan (PFEP) is made publicly available. (ESEA 1116(b-g))

At Nina Harris we have a vast community of partners. We communicate on our web site and social media and point to point contacts with local businesses and partners.

<https://www.pcsb.org/ninaharris>

Plans to Strengthen the Academic Program

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 II of the SIP. (ESEA Section 1114(b)(7)ii))

At Nina Harris all students are students with significant cognitive disabilities. Our number one area of concern is improving communication skills for all students. Through improved communication we see improvements in ELA, Math, and behavior. We intend to continue to improve communication

through PD and implementing a standard curriculum.

How Plan is Developed

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). (ESEA Sections 1114(b)(5) and 1116(e)(4))

This plan addresses all students in the school. All students are ESE on and IEP.

B. Component(s) of the Schoolwide Program Plan

Components of the Schoolwide Program Plan, as applicable

Include descriptions for any additional, applicable strategies that address the needs of all children in the school, but particularly the needs of those at risk of not meeting the challenging state academic standards which may include the following:

Improving Student's Skills Outside the Academic Subject Areas

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. (ESEA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(I))

All students at Nina Harris are students with significant cognitive delays. No student at Nina Harris has required SBMH services. There is a "girl's group" that supports several girls as a social development support.

Preparing for Postsecondary Opportunities and the Workforce

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. (ESEA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(II))

Students have the opportunity to take coursework focused on career exploration and the development of job-related skills.

Addressing Problem Behavior and Early Intervening Services

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 ESEA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(III)).

At Nina Harris we have three behavior specialists. One behavior specialist is a Behavior Analyst. We have implemented the VBMap to assess student abilities in behavior. We have active PBiS and MTSS programs.

Professional Learning and Other Activities

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. (ESEA section 11149b)(7)(iii)(V)).

In the past four years we have completed and will continue to attend many PD's to include ATIA (Communication Conference), Applied Behavior and Registered Behavior Training, Project-Core, Comprehensive Literacy for All book study, and Readtopia Communication and Literacy Curriculum.

Strategies to Assist Preschool Children

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

N/A

VI. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review

This section must be completed if the school is identified as ATSI, TSI or CSI (ESEA Sections 1111(d)(1)(B)(4) and (d)(2)(C) and 1114(b)(6)).

Process to Review the Use of Resources

Describe the process to review the use of resources to meet the identified needs of students.

Nina Harris has an active School Advisory Committee (SAC). All school improvement fund requests come from the school leadership team, from the staff at large and is presented to the SAC. The SAC discusses SIP spending and votes on spending at SAC meetings.

Specifics to Address the Need

Identify the specific resource(s), rationale (i.e., data) and plan to address the need(s) (i.e., timeline).

At Nina Harris all students are students with significant cognitive disabilities. Our number one area of concern is improving communication skills for all students. Through improved communication we see improvements in ELA, Math, and behavior. We intend to continue to improve communication through PD and implementing a standard curriculum.

VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus

Check if this school is eligible for 2024-25 UniSIG funds but has chosen not to apply.

No

BUDGET	ACTIVITY	FUNCTION/ OBJECT	FUNDING SOURCE	FTE	AMOUNT
Plan Budget Total					0.00