Jefferson High School

2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Jefferson High School

4401 W CYPRESS ST, Tampa, FL 33607

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Brittney Wilhelm

Start Date for this Principal: 7/15/2015

2019-20 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
2020-21 Title I School	Yes
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2020-21 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (51%) 2017-18: C (52%) 2016-17: C (49%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	[Lucinda Thompson](#)
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, [click here](#).	

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Hillsborough County School Board.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F. This plan is also a requirement for Targeted Support and Improvement (TS&I) and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CS&I) schools pursuant to 1008.33 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

To be designated as TS&I, a school must have one or more ESSA subgroup(s) with a Federal Index below 41%. This plan shall be approved by the district. There are three ways a school can be designated as CS&I:

1. have a school grade of D or F
2. have a graduation rate of 67% or lower
3. have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

For these schools, the SIP shall be approved by the district as well as the Bureau of School Improvement.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F, or a graduation rate 67% or less. Districts may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing for schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at www.floridacims.org.

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 Florida Department of Education 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.

Table of Contents

Jefferson High School

4401 W CYPRESS ST, Tampa, FL 33607

[no web address on file]

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	**2020-21 Title I School**	**2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
High School 9-12	Yes	76%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	91%

School Grades History

Year	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18
Grade		C	C	C

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Hillsborough County School Board.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a school improvement plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F (see page 4). For schools receiving a grade of A, B, or C, the district may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at https://www.floridaCIMS.org.

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 Florida Department of Education 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.

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

Jefferson High School will provide the educational services, support, and caring environment needed to enable every student to become a productive citizen.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Every Jefferson High School Student will graduate with the skills and tools necessary for a successful life.

School Leadership Team

Membership
Identify the name, email address, position title, and job duties/responsibilities for each member of the school leadership team.**:**

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Quinn, Robert	Principal	Monitors the school improvement plan. Hires instructional personnel. Evaluates staff.
Serrano, LeShea	Assistant Principal	Responsible for scheduling of students and supervision of teachers, along with the principal.
Hall, Jessica	Instructional Coach	RTI coach. Leads team in identifying tier 2 and 3 interventions.
Cannon, Bernard	Assistant Principal	Assistant principal for administration. Works with the leadership staff to supervise students, teachers, and assist with evaluation of instructional and non-instructional staff.
Amos, Shawn	Instructional Coach	Supervises and provides coaching cycles for ELA teaching staff. Coordinates interventions in reading instruction for level 1 and 2 readers.
Fitzpatrick, Rochelle	Teacher, K-12	SAC Chair. Coordinates SAC meetings and works with principal to monitor school improvement plan.
Midulla, Joseph	Teacher, K-12	Instructional leader. Works with school staff to monitor student behavior issues.
Pines, Dana	School Counselor	Works with APC and principal to ensure correct placement of students and supervision of student services.
Wright, Loletha	Other	Works with student services team to identify students in need and coordinate student needs and interventions for attendance.

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Wednesday 7/15/2015, Brittney Wilhelm

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*
1

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*
10

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
86

Total number of students enrolled at the school

1,519

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2020-21 school year.

11

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2021-22 school year.

7

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

2021-22

The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	359	375	323	342	1399
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	184	179	182	164	709
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	60	53	60	42	215
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	55	98	71	81	305
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	60	69	0	0	129
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	52	41	76	40	209

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	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	0	0	0	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 6/22/2021

2020-21 - As Reported

The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	414	361	405	412	1592
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	135	171	163	176	645
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	16	22	5	60
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	109	91	117	101	418
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	77	79	126	49	331

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	14	19	5	47

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	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	0	0	0	

2020-21 - Updated

The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	414	361	405	412	1592
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	135	171	163	176	645
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	16	22	5	60
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	109	91	117	101	418
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	77	79	126	49	331

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	14	19	5	47

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	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	0	0	0	

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data Review
Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school, or combination schools).

School Grade Component	2021			2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement				45%	56%	56%	46%	54%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				48%	54%	51%	49%	53%	53%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				33%	41%	42%	43%	43%	44%
Math Achievement				37%	49%	51%	40%	48%	51%
Math Learning Gains				40%	48%	48%	43%	49%	48%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				37%	45%	45%	34%	45%	45%
Science Achievement				62%	69%	68%	60%	65%	67%
Social Studies Achievement				71%	75%	73%	68%	73%	71%

Grade Level Data Review - State Assessments
NOTE: This data is raw data and includes ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
09	2021					
	2019	47%	55%	-8%	55%	-8%
Cohort Comparison						
10	2021					
	2019	41%	53%	-12%	53%	-12%
Cohort Comparison		-47%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	61%	66%	-5%	67%	-6%
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019					
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	68%	73%	-5%	70%	-2%
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	23%	63%	-40%	61%	-38%
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	45%	57%	-12%	57%	-12%

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

Provide the progress monitoring tool(s) by grade level used to compile the below data.

We will use district-provided baseline and mid-year assessments to monitor student progress in ELA, Mathematics, Biology, and US History for appropriate grade levels.

Grade 9				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	37	54	N/A
	Economically Disadvantaged	34	69	N/A
	Students With Disabilities	28	45	N/A
	English Language Learners	35	54	N/A
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	28	36	N/A
	Economically Disadvantaged	28	35	N/A
	Students With Disabilities	31	40	N/A
	English Language Learners	21	31	N/A
Biology	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	35	38	N/A
	Economically Disadvantaged	35	38	N/A
	Students With Disabilities	37	43	N/A
	English Language Learners	22	28	N/A
US History	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Economically Disadvantaged	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Students With Disabilities	N/A	N/A	N/A
	English Language Learners	N/A	N/A	N/A

Grade 10				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	53	51	N/A
	Economically Disadvantaged	8	8	N/A
	Students With Disabilities	21	22	N/A
	English Language Learners	54	52	N/A
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	26	35	N/A
	Economically Disadvantaged	25	35	N/A
	Students With Disabilities	N/A	N/A	N/A
	English Language Learners	N/A	N/A	N/A
Biology	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	30	28	N/A
	Economically Disadvantaged	29	28	N/A
	Students With Disabilities	N/A	N/A	N/A
	English Language Learners	29	28	N/A
US History	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Economically Disadvantaged	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Students With Disabilities	N/A	N/A	N/A
	English Language Learners	N/A	N/A	N/A

Grade 11				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	61	59	N/A
	Economically Disadvantaged	9	10	N/A
	Students With Disabilities	22	15	N/A
	English Language Learners	50	52	N/A
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	26	31	N/A
	Economically Disadvantaged	26	30	N/A
	Students With Disabilities	24	29	N/A
	English Language Learners	25	36	N/A
Biology	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	32	30	N/A
	Economically Disadvantaged	32	30	N/A
	Students With Disabilities	25	36	N/A
	English Language Learners	33	7	N/A
US History	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	39	53	N/A
	Economically Disadvantaged	39	53	N/A
	Students With Disabilities	39	53	N/A
	English Language Learners	33	43	N/A

Grade 12				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	33	N/A	N/A
	Economically Disadvantaged	2.5	N/A	N/A
	Students With Disabilities	55	N/A	N/A
	English Language Learners	75	N/A	N/A
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	31	28	N/A
	Economically Disadvantaged	31	28	N/A
	Students With Disabilities	27	34	N/A
	English Language Learners	30	22	N/A
Biology	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	22	27	N/A
	Economically Disadvantaged	22	27	N/A
	Students With Disabilities	19	28	N/A
	English Language Learners	28	22	N/A
US History	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	33	67	N/A
	Economically Disadvantaged	33	67	N/A
	Students With Disabilities	36	N/A	N/A
	English Language Learners	22	22	N/A

Subgroup Data Review

2021 SCHOOL GRADE 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
SWD	18	35	41	14	26	33	56	49		87	7
ELL	25	46	44	15	29	35	52	55		92	58
BLK	32	37	30	13	14	21	51	52		96	26
HSP	45	46	41	20	21	31	67	74		93	55
MUL	25	42								90	

2021 SCHOOL GRADE 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
WHT	50	42		41	29		77	77		85	57
FRL	37	40	34	18	19	28	59	65		93	45

2019 SCHOOL GRADE 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
SWD	11	23	20	23	32	19	32	41		86	34
ELL	20	45	42	31	36	48	35	44		83	63
BLK	37	38	27	26	33	31	57	58		89	41
HSP	46	51	37	39	42	43	61	76		90	54
MUL	59	44		25				90		85	82
WHT	69	62		65	68		85	89		89	51
FRL	43	46	33	33	37	36	57	70		89	51

2018 SCHOOL GRADE 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 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	10	34	32	19	29	26	21	28		87	18
ELL	22	37	31	30	44	31	40	34		71	47
BLK	38	45	45	32	36	30	53	68		94	42
HSP	46	49	39	42	46	36	61	66		84	53
MUL	68	71		33	40		58			100	67
WHT	66	54		54	49		78	69		91	43
FRL	44	49	42	38	43	32	58	64		85	49

ESSA Data Review

This data has been updated for the 2021-22 school year as of 10/19/2021.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	46
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	46
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	502
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	91%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	37

Students With Disabilities	
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	45
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	37
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	49
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	52
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	

White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	57
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	44
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Analysis

Data Analysis
Answer the following analysis questions using the progress monitoring data and state assessment data, if applicable.

What trends emerge across grade levels, subgroups and core content areas?

Student learning declined due to disruptions in education resulting from eLearning, quarantining, and the pandemic. Our SWD's had lower scores.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

Math skills showed the greatest need for improvement from 2019 and from 2020-21 baseline and midyear data.

What were the contributing factors to this need for improvement? What new actions would need to be taken to address this need for improvement?

Math skills of incoming ninth grade students contributed to the need for improvement. PLC's will need to assess student skills and plan collaboratively to improve student outcomes.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

Trends for US History EOC and Biology EOC showed improvement from 2018 to 2019. In addition, ninth grade Achieve3000 data showed improvement from baseline to midyear in 2020-2021.

What were the contributing factors to this improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

Social Studies showed the most improvement. There was more of a focus on ESE, more tutoring opportunities were made available to provide support for students and teachers effectively used PLCs to plan and discuss the needs of their students.

What strategies will need to be implemented in order to accelerate learning?

1. Having a renewed focus on collaborative planning as well as frequent feedback on teaching practices.

2. Vertical articulation to assess learning gaps, and data chats with teachers and students.
3. Schoolwide progress monitoring of data.

Based on the contributing factors and strategies identified to accelerate learning, describe the professional development opportunities that will be provided at the school to support teachers and leaders.

1. Checks for Understanding (summative and formative assessments)
2. Differentiation

Provide a description of the additional services that will be implemented to ensure sustainability of improvement in the next year and beyond.

Instructional Learning Walks, Leadership Team feedback, Instructional Inquiry Cycle.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Collaborative Planning	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Increase Student Achievement by focusing on appropriate grade-level tasks. Jefferson will earn a grade of B in the 2021-2022 school year by improving collaborative planning aimed at delivering rigorous, grade-level student-centered instruction with frequent checks for understanding.
Measurable Outcome:	Our goal is to increase ELA and Math Achievement, (Learning Gains Gains, and Bottom 25%) by 3% each. SWD and ELL subgroup's Federal Index Scores will increase.
Monitoring:	The Instructional Leadership Team will conduct Instructional Learning Walks focused on gathering evidence of Grade-Level tasks. Feedback to teachers will be facilitated by instructional coaches and ILT Team members.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	[no one identified]
Evidence-based Strategy:	-Professional Development on grade level tasks. -Subject areas will align assessment strategies with appropriate grade-level standards. -All subject areas will develop interventions for students not meeting standards.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Grade Level Tasks is a central focus of the Opportunity Gap.

Action Steps to Implement

1. There will be ongoing PD sessions focused on closing the opportunity gap by challenging students with grade-level tasks and assessments. PD will be overseen by Teacher Leaders with ongoing feedback from and to teachers. The professional development plan will be differentiated based on teacher needs and skill levels.

Person Responsible	Robert Quinn (robert.quinn@hcps.net)

2. Professional Learning Communities will use knowledge of students, authentic goal setting, and formative assessment to drive instructional decisions. This will improve teachers' ability to meet student needs.

Person Responsible	Robert Quinn (robert.quinn@hcps.net)

3. Remediation plans will incorporate a recursive approach by revisiting student developed goals addressing baseline and formative assessment data to reteach in order to meet student needs in preparation for summative assessments. Opportunities to remedy content based areas of need will be offered through ELP, and through peer tutoring.

Person Responsible	Robert Quinn (robert.quinn@hcps.net)

4. Literacy, Math, and RtI coaches will work with teachers to share and model their knowledge of best practices using strategies including WICOR (Writing, Inquiry, Collaboration, Organization, and Reading), AVID, KAGAN, etc. to facilitate teacher and student success. ELL and ESE Resource Teachers will assist with strategies for differentiation to support teachers and students.

Person Responsible	Robert Quinn (robert.quinn@hcps.net)

5. Post Secondary Readiness. Literacy and Math coaches, along with all teachers, will implement SAT and ACT strategies into core and non-core classes. In addition, students scheduled into classes giving them opportunities to earn industry certifications.

Person Responsible	Robert Quinn (robert.quinn@hcps.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the SafeSchoolsforAlex.org, compare the discipline data of the school to discipline data across the state and provide primary or secondary areas of concern that the school will monitor during the upcoming school year. Include how the school culture and environment will be monitored through the lens of behavior or discipline data.

Based on the Safe Schools For Alex report, Jefferson High School reported 4.4 incidents per 100 students, which places the school in the "High" category, ranked #383 out of 505 high schools. In addition, Jefferson ranked in the "High" category for the number of suspensions reported. The categories of "Violent Incidents" and "Property Incidents" were both identified as being in the "Very High" range, with 46 violent incidents and 2 property incidents. There were 26 Drug/ Public Order incidents, which placed Jefferson in the "Middle" range. Jefferson's suspension information also places the school in the "High" range. The primary areas of focus will be "Violent Incidents" and Suspension rate.

Jefferson will utilize existing MTSS and RtI initiatives to continue monitoring discipline, referral, and suspension data and plan schoolwide interventions. In addition, we will work to prevent violent incidents before they occur by implementing a Tier One Behavior Plan.

Part IV: Positive Culture & Environment

A positive school culture and environment reflects: a supportive and fulfilling environment, learning conditions that meet the needs of all students, people who are sure of their roles and relationships in student learning, and a culture that values trust, respect and high expectations. Consulting with various stakeholder groups to employ school improvement strategies that impact the positive school culture and environment are critical. Stakeholder groups more proximal to the school include teachers, students, and families of students, volunteers, and school board members. Broad stakeholder groups include early childhood providers, community colleges and universities, social services, and business partners.

Stakeholders play a key role in school performance and addressing equity. Consulting various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment.

Our goal is to establish a culture where all stakeholders feel psychologically and physically supported by implementing Social and Emotional Learning (SEL) structures, building meaningful relationships and modeling exceptional character to positively impact a schoolwide culture for learning. As such we will work collaboratively to help students gain the skills and habits needed for personal and academic success. We will continue to
communicate every child's progress to the parents by sending home quarterly progress alerts and holding parent teacher conferences. We will also encourage parents to participate in all of our events by sending

home newsletters and flyers, making parent link calls, and posting everything on our website and social media.

Identify the stakeholders and their role in promoting a positive culture and environment at the school.

Some examples of how the school builds relations with stakeholders include:
- Open House
- Conference Nights
*A set time each quarter for parents to come in and discuss student progress
- Dragon Fest
*Community partners, Leadership Academies and school clubs come together to create a fun family event
- N.A.P.S. Conference
- Health & Wellness Expo
- AVID District Awareness Day (ADAD)
- AVID College Spirit Week and Career Exploration Day
- College Signing Day & National Sports Signing Day (Athletic Department and AVID)
* Working with local business partners to create incentives for students and staff
*Empowering ELL parents to advocate for their children
- SAC/PTSA
- Parent Link/Remind (phone text system)
- Community Events
- Great American Teach-In
- Volunteer Orientation/Recognition
- Ongoing community partnerships
* Jefferson has a Suncoast Branch where students, faculty and staff can open accounts and make deposits. A Suncoast representative is present to take any money and applications back to the branch. Teachers can also request that the Suncoast Student Team deliver financial presentations to their classes.

Part V: Budget

The approved budget does not reflect any amendments submitted for this project.

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Collaborative Planning	$0.00
		Total:	$0.00