

Hillsborough County Public Schools

# Jefferson High School



## 2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

---

## Table of Contents

---

|   |           |
|---|-----------|
| <b>School Demographics</b>                | <b>3</b>  |
| <b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>     | <b>4</b>  |
| <b>School Information</b>                 | <b>7</b>  |
| <b>Needs Assessment</b>                   | <b>10</b> |
| <b>Planning for Improvement</b>           | <b>14</b> |
| <b>Positive Culture &amp; Environment</b> | <b>0</b>  |
| <b>Budget to Support Goals</b>            | <b>0</b>  |

# Jefferson High School

4401 W CYPRESS ST, Tampa, FL 33607

[ no web address on file ]

## Demographics

Principal: Brittney Wilhelm

Start Date for this Principal: 6/27/2022

|  |   |
|--|---|
| <b>2019-20 Status</b><br>(per MSID File)   | Active  |
| <b>School Type and Grades Served</b><br>(per MSID File)  | High School<br>9-12   |
| <b>Primary Service Type</b><br>(per MSID File)   | K-12 General Education  |
| <b>2021-22 Title I School</b>  | Yes   |
| <b>2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b><br>(as reported on Survey 3)  | 100%  |
| <b>2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b><br>(subgroups with 10 or more students)<br>(subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Students With Disabilities*<br>English Language Learners<br>Black/African American Students<br>Hispanic Students<br>Multiracial Students<br>White Students<br>Economically Disadvantaged Students |
| <b>School Grades History</b>   | 2021-22: C (51%)<br>2018-19: C (51%)<br>2017-18: C (52%)  |
| <b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>  |   |
| <b>SI Region</b>   | Central   |
| <b>Regional Executive Director</b>   | <a href="#">Lucinda Thompson</a>  |
| <b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>   | N/A   |
| <b>Year</b>  |   |
| <b>Support Tier</b>  |   |
| <b>ESSA Status</b>   | ATSI  |
| * As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, <a href="#">click here</a> .   |   |

## 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](http://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

---

|                                       |           |
|---------------------------------------|-----------|
| <b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b> | <b>4</b>  |
| <b>School Information</b>             | <b>7</b>  |
| <b>Needs Assessment</b>               | <b>10</b> |
| <b>Planning for Improvement</b>       | <b>14</b> |
| <b>Title I Requirements</b>           | <b>0</b>  |
| <b>Budget to Support Goals</b>        | <b>0</b>  |

## Jefferson High School

4401 W CYPRESS ST, Tampa, FL 33607

[ no web address on file ]

### School Demographics

| School Type and Grades Served<br>(per MSID File) | 2021-22 Title I School | 2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate<br>(as reported on Survey 3) |
|--|------------------------|--|
| High School<br>9-12                              | Yes                    | 100%   |
| Primary Service Type<br>(per MSID File)          | Charter School         | 2018-19 Minority Rate<br>(Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)               |
| K-12 General Education                           | No                     | 92%  |

### School Grades History

| Year  | 2021-22 | 2020-21 | 2019-20 | 2018-19 |
|-------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| 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

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.:

| Name              | Position Title      | Job Duties and Responsibilities |
|-------------------|---------------------|---------------------------------|
| Wilhelm, Brittney | Principal           |                                 |
| Cannon, Bernard   | Assistant Principal |                                 |
| Amos, Shawn       | Instructional Coach |                                 |
| Cooper, Brittany  | Teacher, K-12       |                                 |
| Pines, Dana       | School Counselor    |                                 |
|                   |                     |                                 |

### Demographic Information

#### Principal start date

Monday 6/27/2022, Brittney Wilhelm

**Number of teachers with a 2022 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.*

0

**Number of teachers with a 2022 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.*

23

**Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school**

62

**Total number of students enrolled at the school**

1,327

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

21

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2022-23 school year.

19

## Demographic Data

### Early Warning Systems

Using prior year's 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 | 9   | 10  | 11  | 12  |       |
| Number of students enrolled                              | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 396 | 330 | 321 | 280 | 1327  |
| Attendance below 90 percent                              | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 134 | 108 | 103 | 117 | 462   |
| One or more suspensions                                  | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 105 | 87  | 82  | 58  | 332   |
| Course failure in ELA                                    | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0   | 0   | 50  | 0   | 50    |
| Course failure in Math                                   | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13  | 38  | 38  | 0   | 89    |
| Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment             | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 116 | 100 | 77  | 51  | 344   |
| Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment            | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 91  | 58  | 64  | 52  | 265   |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 21  | 16  | 15  | 2   | 54    |

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level who have 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 | 185 | 156 | 154 | 156 | 651   |

Using current year data, complete the table below with the number of students identified as being "retained.":

| 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

Thursday 7/14/2022

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 | 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  |       |

**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 | 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  |       |

## 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      | 2022   |          |       | 2021   |          |       | 2019   |          |       |
|-----------------------------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|
|                             | School | District | State | School | District | State | School | District | State |
| ELA Achievement             | 40%    | 52%      | 51%   |        |          |       | 45%    | 56%      | 56%   |
| ELA Learning Gains          | 43%    |          |       |        |          |       | 48%    | 54%      | 51%   |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile  | 37%    |          |       |        |          |       | 33%    | 41%      | 42%   |
| Math Achievement            | 39%    | 39%      | 38%   |        |          |       | 37%    | 49%      | 51%   |
| Math Learning Gains         | 47%    |          |       |        |          |       | 40%    | 48%      | 48%   |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 47%    |          |       |        |          |       | 37%    | 45%      | 45%   |
| Science Achievement         | 48%    | 46%      | 40%   |        |          |       | 62%    | 69%      | 68%   |
| Social Studies Achievement  | 68%    | 49%      | 48%   |        |          |       | 71%    | 75%      | 73%   |

### 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 |

| 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 |
| 2022         |        |          |                       |       |                    |
| 2019         | 61%    | 66%      | -5%                   | 67%   | -6%                |
| CIVICS EOC   |        |          |                       |       |                    |
| Year         | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2022         |        |          |                       |       |                    |
| 2019         |        |          |                       |       |                    |
| HISTORY EOC  |        |          |                       |       |                    |
| Year         | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2022         |        |          |                       |       |                    |
| 2019         | 68%    | 73%      | -5%                   | 70%   | -2%                |
| ALGEBRA EOC  |        |          |                       |       |                    |
| Year         | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2022         |        |          |                       |       |                    |
| 2019         | 23%    | 63%      | -40%                  | 61%   | -38%               |
| GEOMETRY EOC |        |          |                       |       |                    |
| Year         | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2022         |        |          |                       |       |                    |
| 2019         | 45%    | 57%      | -12%                  | 57%   | -12%               |

## Subgroup Data Review

| 2022 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 2020-21 | C & C Accel 2020-21 |
| SWD                                       | 16       | 29     | 30          | 30        | 38      | 30           | 18       | 37      |           | 85                | 24                  |
| ELL                                       | 27       | 42     | 43          | 34        | 55      | 37           | 32       | 61      |           | 87                | 61                  |
| BLK                                       | 28       | 38     | 34          | 30        | 44      | 44           | 39       | 55      |           | 92                | 34                  |
| HSP                                       | 43       | 45     | 39          | 41        | 47      | 49           | 49       | 71      |           | 89                | 52                  |
| MUL                                       | 53       | 33     |             | 46        |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| WHT                                       | 52       | 50     |             | 56        | 61      |              | 72       | 78      |           | 84                | 58                  |
| FRL                                       | 36       | 43     | 37          | 35        | 47      | 50           | 44       | 64      |           | 89                | 47                  |
| 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                  |

| 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 |
| HSP                                       | 45       | 46     | 41          | 20        | 21      | 31           | 67       | 74      |           | 93                | 55                  |
| MUL                                       | 25       | 42     |             |           |         |              |          |         |           | 90                |                     |
| 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                  |

### ESSA Data Review

This data has not been updated for the 2022-23 school year.

| ESSA Federal Index  |      |
|---|------|
| ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)  | ATSI |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students  | 51   |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students                                    | NO   |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target                                    | 1    |
| Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency | 59   |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index                                       | 565  |
| Total Components for the Federal Index  | 11   |
| Percent Tested  | 97%  |
| Subgroup Data   |      |
| Students With Disabilities  |      |
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities                                      | 34   |
| Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?              | YES  |
| Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%       | 0    |
| English Language Learners   |      |
| Federal Index - English Language Learners                                       | 49   |
| English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?               | NO   |

| English Language Learners  |     |
|--|-----|
| Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%       | 0   |
| 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%        | 0   |
| 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%                  | 0   |
| Black/African American Students  |     |
| Federal Index - Black/African American Students                                | 44  |
| Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?        | NO  |
| Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0   |
| Hispanic Students  |     |
| Federal Index - Hispanic Students  | 53  |
| Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?                      | NO  |
| Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%               | 0   |
| Multiracial Students   |     |
| Federal Index - Multiracial Students   | 44  |
| Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?                   | NO  |
| Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%            | 0   |
| 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%       | 0   |
| White Students   |     |
| Federal Index - White Students   | 64  |
| White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?                         | NO  |
| Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%                  | 0   |

| Economically Disadvantaged Students  |    |
|--|----|
| Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students                                | 49 |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?        | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0  |

## Part III: Planning for Improvement

### 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?

ELA achievement and science both had declines as a school. Math and social studies either maintained or showed growth as a school.

SWD students trend down in ELA Achievement, Social Studies, and Science. SWD students showed growth in mathematics.

#### What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

Steady decline in ELA Achievement data from 46.4% in 2017 to 39.5% overall. SWD students at Jefferson score 6.5% below the district SWD average in ELA Achievement.

SWD achievement in science decrease from 56% to 17% this school year. Our science scores for the school decreased by 13%, from 63.5% to 48.4%.

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

Lack of effectiveness in PLCs for science impacted the overall effectiveness in this subject. Attendance concerns impacted continuity of learning. Procedures for effective PLCs, support from district leaders in planning and curriculum.

#### What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

Overall math achievement increased 20% but still remained 13% below the district average. SWD students scored 2% higher than the district SWD average in math achievement.

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

Effective PLC structures that included planning for common assessments and common lesson structure. Remediation plans developed as a department.

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

Planning for standards-based lessons. Implementing PLC Structure focused on standards and progress monitoring. Utilizing common assessments to analyze student achievement.

**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.**

Monthly Professional Development time will be set aside for Instructional Leadership Team to training faculty on lesson structures. PLC training occurred during Pre-planning and will structure for district support is in place for each tested subject.

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

Department Heads will work with their content supervisors to support their leadership and the growth of the department. Extended Learning Program structure has been updated to analyze standards and remediate students based on student data.

### **Areas of Focus**

Identify the key Areas of Focus to address your school's highest priorities based on any/all relevant data sources.

:

**#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities**

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**  
**Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.**

SWD students are performing significantly below their counterparts in ELA and Science. SWD students score 15.7% in ELA, where the entire population scores 39.5%. SWD Students score 17.5% in Science, where the entire population scores at 48.4%.

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

SWD students will increase by 5% in both ELA Achievement and Science Achievement.

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

ESE Support Facilitation to pull small group will be used in both ELA and Science in the Master Schedule. Subgroup data will be pulled for both subject and analyzed by tradition and support facilitation teachers.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Brittney Wilhelm (brittney.wilhelm@hcps.net)

**Evidence-based Strategy:**  
**Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.**

ESE Support Facilitators will utilize small group support in both ELA and science. These instructors will pull struggling students to reteach low standards from the traditional classroom. Students will receive this support in addition to their classroom lessons.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:**  
**Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.**

Small group support for students with SWD has an effect size of .47. According to Hattie, this indicates learning extends beyond that which is expected just from attending school.

**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.

Ensure that master schedule supports SWD students having access to ESE Support Facilitators in tested subjects.

**Person Responsible**

Brittney Wilhelm (brittney.wilhelm@hcps.net)

Pair Support teachers will content area teachers for planning during PLC.

**Person Responsible**

Brittney Wilhelm (brittney.wilhelm@hcps.net)

Identify needs of SWD students through IEP to schedule them appropriately.

**Person Responsible**

Brittney Wilhelm (brittney.wilhelm@hcps.net)

Create support structure for teachers to discuss needs of SWD students in the classroom.

**Person Responsible**

Brittney Wilhelm (brittney.wilhelm@hcps.net)



**#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction****Area of Focus****Description and****Rationale:**

**Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.**

Steady decline in ELA Achievement data from 46.4% in 2017 to 39.5% overall. Our science scores for the school decreased by 13%, from 63.5% to 48.4%.

**Measurable****Outcome:**

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

ELA and Science achievement will increase by 10% overall.

**Monitoring:**

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

Teachers will participate in PLC meetings. Each meeting is focused on either common assessment data trends or assignments that meet the level the standard dictates. Reviewing Progress Monitoring data to plan for student instruction around standards that test low. ELP will used to continue to remediate the standards that are low performing for students. Teacher will work within their departments to break down standards and align their lessons.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Brittney Wilhelm (brittney.wilhelm@hcps.net)

**Evidence-based****Strategy:**

**Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.**

Our strategy of focusing on standards in instruction has an effect size of .75 on teacher clarity.

**Rationale for Evidence-based****Strategy:**

**Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.**

John Hattie indicate significant effect size of .75 on Standards aligned instruction.

**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.

Standard based assessment of students will occur through PM testing to increase Student readiness for the post secondary level.

**Person Responsible** Brittney Wilhelm (brittney.wilhelm@hcps.net)

PLC time provided to teacher within their work day.

**Person Responsible** Brittney Wilhelm (brittney.wilhelm@hcps.net)

PLC training provided to staff during Pre-planning.

**Person Responsible** Brittney Wilhelm (brittney.wilhelm@hcps.net)

Standards support provided by district supervisors for each tested subject.

**Person Responsible** Brittney Wilhelm (brittney.wilhelm@hcps.net)

Progress Monitoring Testing scheduled for each class for data analysis.

**Person Responsible** Brittney Wilhelm (brittney.wilhelm@hcps.net)

Common assessments planned as a team to support student learning.

**Person Responsible** Brittney Wilhelm (brittney.wilhelm@hcps.net)

Extended Learning Program offered to student and teachers to assist in remediation.

**Person Responsible** Brittney Wilhelm (brittney.wilhelm@hcps.net)

Reading coach will support data analysis and planning for ELA.

**Person Responsible** Shawn Amos (shawn.amos@sdhc.k12.fl.us)

Parents involvement will be encouraged throughout the year through the Student Advisory Committee.

**Person Responsible** Brittany Cooper (brittany.cooper@hcps.net)

Parent involvement will be encouraged and communicated through ELP.

**Person Responsible** Brittany Cooper (brittany.cooper@hcps.net)

## 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 is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies that impact the school culture and environment. 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.

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

Jefferson has created a culture committee comprised of teachers. This committee will help to monitor the overall climate of the school and plan celebration activities to boost culture. SAC committee is 30 members. These members are teachers, parents, and students. Active participation in monitoring the school environment will be encouraged through positive contact with the SAC Chair. A full time Climate and Culture Resource Teacher is tasked with providing support to the students and staff for positive school culture. Student Government will have an active role in encouraging student and staff to participate in school spirit activities. We have implemented the Dragon Award to recognize departments throughout the year. We are bringing back the Distinguished Dragon Award to recognize students who are working hard in school.

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

Climate and Culture Resource Teacher - Mary Frieras - manages positive school culture through planned activities and serving as liaison for the culture committee.

SAC Chair - Brittany Cooper - manages positive parental connection through SAC meetings.

SGA Teacher - Constance Scott - manages school spirit activities and the Student Government Association.

PTSA - Joel Reagan - manages parental involvement and support through PTA