

Taylor County School District

Taylor County High School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	7
III. Planning for Improvement	12
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	18
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	0
VI. Title I Requirements	0
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

Taylor County High School

900 N JOHNSON STRIPLING RD, Perry, FL 32347

http://taylorcountyhighschool.ipage.com/public_html/

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Taylor County School Board on 9/7/2023.

SIP Authority

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

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

Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)

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

Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)

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

Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)

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

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

ESEA sections 1111(d) requires that each school identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI develop a support and improvement plan created in partnership with stakeholders (including principals and other school leaders, teachers and parent), is informed by all indicators in the State's accountability system, includes evidence-based interventions, is based on a school-level needs assessment, and identifies resource inequities to be

addressed through implementation of the plan. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as TSI, ATSI and non-Title I CSI must be approved and monitored by the school district. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as Title I, CSI must be approved by the school district and Department. The Department must monitor and periodically review implementation of each CSI plan after approval.

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

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

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

I. School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

The mission of Taylor County High School is to enable all students to become successful in a global society by preparing them for college/career through rigorous academic programs and a collaborative partnership with the community.

Provide the school's vision statement.

All Taylor County High School students will achieve college and career success while becoming productive citizens, willing to invest in the common good of all.

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
McCoy, Heather	Principal	
Brannen, Kelli	Assistant Principal	
Whiddon , Monica	Assistant Principal	
Kalinowski, Lea	Instructional Coach	
Jandula, Sharon	School Counselor	
Lashley, Tom	Instructional Coach	

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.

The school's leadership team along with the department chairs review the SIP during its development. Once written, the School Advisory Council again reviews the goals and suggests changes appropriate to the mission and vision of the school.

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 SIP is reviewed and revised quarterly as we receive data from progress monitoring assessments and classroom tests.

Demographic Data

Only ESSA identification and school grade history updated 3/11/2024

2023-24 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	High School 9-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	42%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	96%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	ATSI
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD) Black/African American Students (BLK)* Hispanic Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (MUL)* White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: C 2019-20: C 2018-19: C 2017-18: C
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review**ESSA School, District and State Comparison (pre-populated)**

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

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

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	40	40	50	41	41	51	43		
ELA Learning Gains				45			35		

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				23			26		
Math Achievement*	28	28	38	35	23	38	29		
Math Learning Gains				33			22		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				33			17		
Science Achievement*	61	61	64	59	34	40	58		
Social Studies Achievement*	59	59	66	56	33	48	54		
Middle School Acceleration					34	44			
Graduation Rate	89	89	89	91	60	61	95		
College and Career Acceleration	42	42	65	59	57	67	66		
ELP Progress			45						

* 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	53
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	319
Total Components for the Federal Index	6
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	89

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	48
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index

Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	475
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	97
Graduation Rate	91

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

ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	41			
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	37	Yes	2	
HSP	48			
MUL	41			
PAC				
WHT	60			
FRL	47			

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	42			
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	37	Yes	1	
HSP	47			
MUL	36	Yes	1	
PAC				

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%
WHT	53			
FRL	41			

Accountability Components by Subgroup

Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school. (pre-populated)

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS

Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2021-22	C & C Accel 2021-22	ELP Progress
All Students	40			28			61	59		89	42	
SWD	29			19			41	46		10	6	
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	23			11			29	32		34	6	
HSP	53			43							2	
MUL	54			27							2	
PAC												
WHT	44			35			73	77		46	6	
FRL	34			21			52	51		36	6	

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	41	45	23	35	33	33	59	56		91	59	
SWD	30	38	27	28	38	47	50	55		88	20	
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	27	38	25	14	24	47	30	33		94	33	
HSP	44	50										

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21	ELP Progress
MUL	35	47		27								
PAC												
WHT	47	45	21	46	36	24	79	70		92	69	
FRL	33	39	19	28	31	34	42	45		86	52	

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	43	35	26	29	22	17	58	54		95	66	
SWD	33	13	13	29	31	29	55	44		90		
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	25	23	27	21	23	11	34	41		95	50	
HSP												
MUL	36	29		20								
PAC												
WHT	50	41	24	34	22	23	69	59		96	74	
FRL	32	28	30	24	21	14	48	42		95	56	

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.

Grade	Year	ELA				
		School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
10	2023 - Spring	40%	40%	0%	50%	-10%
09	2023 - Spring	40%	40%	0%	48%	-8%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	21%	56%	-35%	50%	-29%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	38%	38%	0%	48%	-10%

BIOLOGY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	59%	58%	1%	63%	-4%

HISTORY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	57%	57%	0%	63%	-6%

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.

Math learning gains and lowest 25% learning gains showed the lowest performance. The math department had new curriculum and standards that they were learning while ensuring that students were prepared to take their EOCs in Algebra and Geometry.

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

ELA achievement and lowest 25% showed the greatest decline from the previous year. Changes in personnel including one teacher leaving during the school year contributed to this decline.

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.

Both Algebra achievement and ELA achievement showed large gaps when compared with the state average. Our ELA achievement was impacted by the resignation of one teacher and inconsistencies in classroom expectations.

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

ELA learning gains

Math learning gains for lowest 25%

Addition of a Math/Science coach and an Assistant Principal of Curriculum to work with these teachers to better meet our student's needs

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

Attendance

Low grades in Math classrooms

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

Math achievement

Math learning gains

Math learning gains for the lowest 25%

ELA achievement

ELA learning gains for the lowest 25%

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.

By adjusting our disciplinary practices to include more restorative practices rather than punitive actions, our goal is to minimize the amount of time students miss classes to help them achieve more and earn credits for graduation.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Our targeted subgroups will have a 10% reduction in out of school suspension as reflected in our student information system. We will specifically target defiance and disrespectful behavior and implement steps to correct this before it becomes time out of school.

Monitoring:

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

Weekly review of disciplinary data by our dean and assistant principal of discipline

Increased parental contact and involvement

Consistency between groups Change in grading percentages to more appropriately address the importance of testing

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Monica Whiddon (monica.whiddon@taylor.k12.fl.us)

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.)

Restorative practices

Daily gut checks

Weekly lessons in resiliency standards

Monthly data chats with students identified by the EWS

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Using these strategies allows us to have better relationships with our students and know when there is an issue before it arises.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

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

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Black/African-American**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

ELA and Math achievement for this group are both below the 41% threshold. These areas need to improve to help keep our students focused on graduation.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Student proficiency in ELA and Math will increase by 5% for each of the next two years.

Monitoring:

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

District progress monitoring
FAST testing
EOC results
Other standardized test measures
Classroom grades

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Heather McCoy (heather.mccoy@taylor.k12.fl.us)

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.)

Math tutoring
STEM/Math grant to help make math more relevant for our students
Small group instruction in weak elements
An increase in classroom seat time to receive relevant instruction

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

With a reduction in OSS/ISS for our targeted subgroups and an increase in the amount of small group interventions they receive for poor behavior choices, student proficiency will increase.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

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

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

#3. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Multi-Racial**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.

ELA and Math achievement for this group are both below the 41% threshold. These areas need to improve to help keep our students focused on graduation.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Student proficiency in ELA and Math will increase by 5% for each of the next two years.

Monitoring:

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

District progress monitoring
FAST testing
EOC results
Other standardized test measures
Classroom grades

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Heather McCoy (heather.mccoy@taylor.k12.fl.us)

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.)

Math tutoring
STEM/Math grant to help make math more relevant for our students
Small group instruction in weak elements
An increase in classroom seat time to receive relevant instruction

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

With a reduction in OSS/ISS for our targeted subgroups and an increase in the amount of small group interventions they receive for poor behavior choices, student proficiency will increase.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

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

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

#4. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Benchmark-aligned Instruction**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.

Benchmark instruction needs to be strengthened to better meet our students and their needs. Our instructional coaches will be doing PLCs this year on explicit instruction and differentiation.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Proficiency for both ELA and Math will increase by at least 5% over the next two school years.

Monitoring:

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

District progress monitoring
FAST testing
EOC results
Other standardized test measures
Classroom grades

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Kelli Brannen (kelli.brannen@taylor.k12.fl.us)

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.)

SBLT will meet with small groups of students to tutor and catch them up on essential skills.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

An additional person(s) monitoring the overall well-being of the students in the classroom to set them up for success

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

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

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

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).

Our school added a math/science instructional coach and an Assistant Principal of Curriculum to help both departments sure up their teaching to meet the needs of our students. We also added a Foundational Math course to our master schedule with the purpose of better supporting our students in math and closing their achievement gaps.