Riverview High School

2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Riverview High School

11311 BOYETTE RD, Riverview, FL 33569

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Brian Sp IR O

Start Date for this Principal: 7/29/2021

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
2021-22 Title I School	No
2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	51%
2021-22 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 Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2021-22: B (57%) 2018-19: B (61%) 2017-18: B (60%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	[Lucinda Thompson](#)
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	ATSI
* 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

Riverview High School

11311 BOYETTE RD, Riverview, FL 33569

[no web address on file]

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	**2021-22 Title I School**	**2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
High School 9-12	No	51%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	64%

School Grades History

Year	2021-22	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19
Grade	B		B	B

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.

It is the mission of Riverview High School to prepare all students for a dynamic and diverse society by building knowledge, skills, and character.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The vision of Riverview High School is to develop life-long learners who value themselves and others, contribute to their community, and are productive citizens in our dynamic society,

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
Spiro, Brian	Principal	Oversee SIP goals and instructional priorities.
Hursh, Catherine	Teacher, K-12	Teacher, SAC chair, Webmaster, PLC Coordinator
Canady, Jennifer	Assistant Principal	Assistant Principal of Curriculum
Massena, Kevin	Assistant Principal	Assistant Principal of Administration
Dowling-Dickey, Yolanda	Assistant Principal	Assistant Principal of Student Affairs
Warren, Michael		Assistant Principal of Student Affairs

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Thursday 7/29/2021, Brian Sp IR O

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.*
3

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.*
15

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

118

Total number of students enrolled at the school

2,499

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

24

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

23

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	643	663	634	568	2508
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	160	167	179	194	700
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	108	124	121	76	429
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	98	1	99
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	59	0	67
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	152	123	52	1	328
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	78	116	44	0	238
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	46	61	65	91	263

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 8/18/2022

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	631	653	629	578	2491
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	131	130	125	10	396
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	51	85	55	53	244
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	132	116	110	42	400
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	98	120	98	36	352
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	91	126	110	87	414
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	106	85	89	0	280
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	8	0	0	17

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	0	0	0	0	

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	631	653	629	578	2491
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	131	130	125	10	396
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	51	85	55	53	244
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	132	116	110	42	400
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	98	120	98	36	352
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	91	126	110	87	414
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	106	85	89	0	280
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	8	0	0	17

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	0	0	0	0	

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	49%	52%	51%				58%	56%	56%
ELA Learning Gains	50%						53%	54%	51%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	42%						44%	41%	42%
Math Achievement	45%	39%	38%				57%	49%	51%
Math Learning Gains	46%						56%	48%	48%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	43%						43%	45%	45%
Science Achievement	65%	46%	40%				84%	69%	68%
Social Studies Achievement	77%	49%	48%				77%	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	81%	66%	15%	67%	14%
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	75%	73%	2%	70%	5%
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	49%	63%	-14%	61%	-12%
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	59%	57%	2%	57%	2%

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	19	39	31	16	41	27	30	35		84	20
ELL	15	39	36	24	43	39	21	57		85	64
ASN	74	66		70	67		68	78		95	60
BLK	43	46	42	31	39	39	50	66		96	41
HSP	43	49	44	40	42	40	61	76		92	61
MUL	61	51	50	51	64		71	84		95	58
WHT	54	51	37	56	49	46	75	85		94	67
FRL	39	43	38	40	50	46	52	65		90	51

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	15	30	35	21	35	40	33	43		88	32
ELL	18	40	40	27	41	41	33	63		95	57
ASN	70	68		50	58		69	100		100	81
BLK	37	43	40	22	26	28	50	58		94	38
HSP	47	43	40	32	28	36	56	77		95	65
MUL	55	59	57	43	24	18	56	89		100	73
WHT	60	51	45	49	31	40	75	78		98	65
FRL	41	43	40	32	29	32	55	69		93	51

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	12	36	36	33	46	39	53	46		88	18
ELL	16	40	37	34	53	53	64	37		89	51
ASN	63	53		76	53		92	85		100	70
BLK	41	42	39	42	49	42	75	66		91	31
HSP	52	52	44	53	54	41	82	74		92	53
MUL	65	56		67	71		91	87		97	34
WHT	70	58	48	68	60	45	87	84		93	56
FRL	47	50	44	47	50	44	79	67		91	38

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	57
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1

ESSA Federal Index	
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	55
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	625
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	43
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	72
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	49
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	55
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	65
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	61
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	52
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?

Math assessments saw improvement in all areas including proficiency and learning gains.
9th grade English Language Arts (ELA) performance improved while 10th grade performance decreased, however 10th grade exhibited greater learning grades on the ELA assessment.
Biology assessment achievement improved 3% and Social Studies (US History) achievement improved 2%.
All subgroups either improved or remained consistent from the 20-21 school year to the 21-22 school year, in math and English Language Arts assessments. While the school saw an increase in science and social studies achievement overall, marginalized subgroups showed a decrease in overall proficiency from the 20-21 school year to the 21-22 school year.(e.g. ELL, economically disadvantaged students, etc.)

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

English reading proficiency for all subgroups have the greatest room for improvement. Although 10th grade ELA scores demonstrated learning gains, proficiency fell by 5% compared to the previous year. Although 9th grade ELA showed improvement in overall proficiency, learning gains within this grade

band went down compared to the previous year. A focus on learning gains across all subgroups in both 9th and 10th grade should net significant improvements.

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

Teacher attrition was most affected at the 10th grade English level resulting in students going with long term subs or coverage from other teachers for extended periods of time.
The master schedule for the current year required changes in teacher assignments to ensure high quality and experienced teachers working directly with our 9th and 10th grade English classes. Furthermore, collaboration between reading and English teachers has been enhanced due to implementation of new curriculum and standards which should enhance the effectiveness of addressing deficient skills as determined by baseline assessments.

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

Mathematics scores improved in both overall proficiency and learning gains. This is mostly due to accelerating learning due to learning loss in the prior year, related to e-learning and pandemic issues. Collaborative planning and persistent with high expectations for students resulted in positive outcomes in both Algebra and Geometry courses.

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

Collaborative planning and persistent with high expectations for students resulted in positive outcomes in both Algebra and Geometry courses. Teachers utilized school and district created assessments to monitor, track, and plan proactively for standards that students struggled with the most.

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

The strategies implemented to accelerate learning include a strong focus on Professional Learning Communities (PLCs). PLCs collaborate together to look at student data, create action plans to address specific needs for groups of students, and monitor the effectiveness of these action plans to adjust throughout the year.

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.

Our instructional priorities will focus on standards-based lesson planning and implementing engaging strategies to challenge student thinking. Members of the Instructional Leadership Team, which consists of teachers from each of the departments, work together to develop schoolwide workshops focused specifically on the priorities. These workshops provide resources and strategies for faculty members to use for professional growth and implementation within their Professional Learning Communities. Administrators assigned to PLCs provide feedback directly related to these priorities when conducting walkthrough observations in the classrooms.

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

In addition to a more structured and consistent approach to Professional Learning Communities that align to our instructional priorities, Riverview High School is committed to implementing a series of programs and initiatives expected to improve student outcomes. This includes offering rigorous courses through the Cambridge International program. These are offered in addition to the current AP and dual

enrollment course offerings to expand access to rigorous coursework for all students regardless of test scores. Riverview High School is also implementing a schoolwide social-emotional program through the 7 Mindsets initiative. This will allow us to address the mental health needs and concerns of all our students and staff to promote a safe and welcoming environment, which is expected to lead to stronger learning outcomes. Improved processes for monitoring and following up with students who have attendance concerns have also been established to maximize the amount of instructional time our students are spending with highly qualified educators as opposed to learning virtually or through make up work.

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

:

#1. 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.**	With the implementation of new state standards in most content areas combined with evidence collected by classroom walkthroughs and review of student work in 21-22 demonstrate opportunity to improve the consistency and depth of standards addressed in daily lessons. PLCs will develop strategies for working with SWD and meeting their specific needs and goals within the regular classroom.
Measurable Outcome: **State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.**	Student achievement in state-assessed courses will improve by 3 points: ELA - 52 Math - 48 Science - 68 Social Studies - 80
Monitoring: **Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.**	The instructional leadership team (ILT) will create look-fors for classroom walkthroughs, which are used to collect trends of teacher practice. In addition teachers will monitor and track student progress throughout the year in Professional Learning Communities, including creating, implementing, and monitoring action plans directly targeting deficiencies in standards mastery.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Jennifer Canady (jennifer.canady@hcps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy: **Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.**	Common assessments, lesson plan studies, and walkthrough observations.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: **Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.**	Research supports job-embedded professional development and ongoing feedback to support professional growth. Common assessments reviewed by teachers to create action plans also proves to support learning outcomes when targeting groups of students for remediation and/or acceleration.

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.

The following will be conducted in order to address the area of focus:
An instructional inquiry cycle will be conducted with the ILT to determine areas of focus (standards-based lessons).
Look fors based on professional literature related to standards-based lessons will be identified.
Provide initial training to faculty on standards-based planning, including an analysis of standards.
PLCs analyze specific standards and collaborate on best strategies for teaching in the classroom
Admin walkthroughs collect trends related to these PLC-identified standards taught in classrooms.
Admin provide trends to PLC for discussion and growth.

ILT reviews schoolwide trends to adjust and plan for next round of professional development, focusing on prioritized area(s) for growth.

Based upon ILT's reviews, the process may repeat starting with providing initial training to the faculty based on standards-based planning.

Person Responsible   Jennifer Canady (jennifer.canady@hcps.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Student Engagement	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.	Although most state-assessed areas saw improvement in achievement, learning gains across content areas in conjunction with evidence collected in observations and classroom walkthroughs demonstrated uneven engagement among students. Continue training to develop strategies to work with accommodations of SWD to improve student engagement.
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	Student achievement in state-assessed courses will improve by 3 points: ELA - 52 Math - 48 Science - 68 Social Studies - 80
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	Look-fors established by the Instructional Leadership Team (ILT) are used by administrators and teachers during classroom walkthroughs to monitor trends with student engagement. Teachers will monitor student progress in Professional Learning Communities.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Brian Spiro (brian.spiro@hcps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.	Faculty will receive professional development regarding WICOR strategies from AVID to maximize engagement while supporting student ownership of learning.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.	WICOR strategies in AVID promote critical thinking about content in a way that enhances student understanding.

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.

The following will be conducted addressing the area of focus (student engagement)
An instructional inquiry cycle will be conducted with the ILT to determine areas of focus
Look fors based on professional literature will be identified.
Training training to faculty
PLCs analyze specific standards & collaborate on best strategies
Admin walkthroughs collect trends related to these PLC-identified strategies
Admin provide trends to PLC for discussion and growth.
PLCs collaborate on incorporating student readiness for the public postsecondary level with focuses on Career & Technical Education, College/Career Fairs, College and Readiness workshops, community college advisor working in conjunction with classes and students, Dual Enrollment opportunities, AICE, AP

classes, and the use of Khan Academy.

ILT reviews schoolwide trends to adjust and plan for next round of professional development, focusing on prioritized area(s) for growth.

Based upon ILT's reviews, the process may repeat starting with providing initial training to the faculty(student engagement).

Person Responsible   Brian Spiro (brian.spiro@hcps.net)

#3. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to student self efficacy

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.	Survey results from the student Panorama Social-Emotional Learning survey conducted in the Spring 2022 showed a decrease (8%) in favorable responses related to self-efficacy. This area is the lowest scored component of all components surveyed. (37%) MTSS and student services along with ESE Case managers to develop unique ways to assist SWD to improve accessibility to activities on campus.
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	Survey results for the self-efficacy section of the Panorama Survey will increase 3% in the fall (40%) and another 3% in the spring (43%)
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	The Multi-Tiered Systems of Support (MTSS) committee will monitor attendance, behavior, and mental health data to progress monitor students' sense of self-efficacy.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Yolanda Dowling-Dickey (yolanda.dowling-dickey@hcps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.	In addition to other supports, the MTSS committee coordinates the implementation of the 7 Mindsets social emotional curriculum at the tier 1, tier 2, and tier 3 levels.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.	The 7 Mindsets program has been successfully implemented at other district schools, and it addresses the specific needs identified by staff members for support students' social-emotional growth.

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.

The following will be conducted in order to address the area of focus:
MTSS reviews Panorama survey results to determine area for growth
MTSS and student services members receive training on 7 Mindsets
Student services members train staff on 7 Mindsets each month.
MTSS coordinates tier 1 supports, such as quotes of the day, student of the month, champions walk, etc., to set positive tone and promote positive climate

MTSS coordinates Tier 2 supports for students who may benefit from groups, targeted assemblies, or specific 7 Mindsets lessons.
MTSS coordinates Tier 3 supports for students with greatest need, matching with mentors and referring for mental health services.
MTSS reviews data to track student progress within the three tiers, adjusting as needed.

Person Responsible   Brian Spiro (brian.spiro@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.

Use of results from Panorama SEL survey of teachers and based on results, providing resources for teachers including professional development on their needs.
Small tokens of appreciation for faculty members including lunches, dinners, and treats.
Avenues of open communication to administration and administrative supports available.
Form committees and clubs that support positive culture on campus (ex: Sunshine Committee, H.Y.P.E., Student Government Association, etc.).

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

Katrina Emerich : Climate and Culture Resource teacher - plans PD, provides supports resources for teachers and staff, and open for support.
Teachers : Building with relationships with colleagues and students and give feedback on needs.
Administration : Set high expectations for a positive climate. Provide supports and resources to teachers and staff, empower teachers.
Students: Take on leadership roles on campus and serve as positive models for other students.
Parents (Through Parent-Teacher-Student Association - PTSA): Fundraise for student programs and supports for teachers. Volunteer as mentors and organize events to promote student connection to the campus.