

Escambia County School District

West Florida High School/ Technical School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	8
III. Planning for Improvement	12
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	0
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	0
VI. Title I Requirements	0
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

West Florida High School/Technical

150 E BURGESS RD, Pensacola, FL 32503

www.escambiaschools.org

SIP Authority

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

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

Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)

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

Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)

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

Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)

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

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

ESEA sections 1111(d) requires that each school identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI develop a support and improvement plan created in partnership with stakeholders (including principals and other school leaders, teachers and parent), is informed by all indicators in the State's accountability system, includes evidence-based interventions, is based on a school-level needs assessment, and identifies resource inequities to be addressed through implementation of the plan. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as TSI, ATSI and non-Title I CSI must be approved and monitored by the school district. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as Title I, CSI must be approved by the school district and

Department. The Department must monitor and periodically review implementation of each CSI plan after approval.

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

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

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

I. School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

West Florida High School of Advanced Technology is an innovative high school focused on providing a unique, comprehensive, useful education that will lead to lifelong personal, career, and professional accomplishments.

The mission of West Florida High School of Advanced Technology is to prepare students for entry into chosen career fields or higher educational pursuits through incorporation of quality learning experienced by integration of academic and technical skills.

Provide the school's vision statement.

West Florida High School of Advanced Technology is a community of learners made up of students, school staff, family, community and business partners who work together to empower students to take responsibility for their learning, thereby increasing their options after high school. Our standards-based curriculum is constantly evolving to meet the diverse needs of our students, challenging them to grow to their fullest potential, thus producing dynamic citizens ready for college and/or career.

School Leadership Team, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring

School Leadership Team

For each member of the school leadership team, select the employee name and email address from the dropdown. Identify the position title and job duties/responsibilities as it relates to SIP implementation for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Shannon, Esi	Principal	
Anderson, Jeff	Assistant Principal	
Cramer, Erin	Assistant Principal	
Brand, Katie	Other	
Eshelman, William	Teacher, K-12	
Gaines, Ursula	Teacher, ESE	
Hurst, Stephanie	Teacher, K-12	
Leonard, Todd	Other	
McFarland, Angela	Teacher, K-12	
Odom, Tiffany	Teacher, K-12	
Walker, Kourtney	Teacher, K-12	
Connors, Tammy	School Counselor	
Joachim, Suzi	Other	

Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Development

Describe the process for involving stakeholders (including the school leadership team, teachers and school staff, parents, students (mandatory for secondary schools) and families, and business or community leaders) and how their input was used in the SIP development process. (ESSA 1114(b)(2))

Note: If a School Advisory Council is used to fulfill these requirements, it must include all required stakeholders.

SAC members, comprised of parents, students, and area business leaders, provide input on school needs and ideas throughout the school year and evaluate the plan as provided.

SIP Monitoring

Describe how the SIP will be regularly monitored for effective implementation and impact on increasing the achievement of students in meeting the State's academic standards, particularly for those students with the greatest achievement gap. Describe how the school will revise the plan, as necessary, to ensure continuous improvement. (ESSA 1114(b)(3))

Teachers and administrators work in Professional Learning Communities to regularly evaluate student data and lesson plan for students performing in all areas. Additionally, stakeholders also work with PLCs and administrators evaluating data and providing feedback for areas of focus and improvement.

Demographic Data

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

2023-24 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	High School 9-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	51%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	41%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	N/A
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD) Asian Students (ASN) Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: A 2019-20: A 2018-19: A

	2017-18: A
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review

ESSA School, District and State Comparison (pre-populated)

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

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

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	72	40	50	74	42	51	68		
ELA Learning Gains				69			62		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				61			57		
Math Achievement*	70	37	38	62	33	38	49		
Math Learning Gains				63			46		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				55			40		
Science Achievement*	88	58	64	90	33	40	87		
Social Studies Achievement*	82	56	66	83	47	48	86		
Middle School Acceleration					44	44			
Graduation Rate	98	79	89	99	57	61	99		
College and Career Acceleration	77	63	65	88	59	67	78		
ELP Progress		47	45						

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

See [Florida School Grades, School Improvement Ratings and DJJ Accountability Ratings](#).

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	81

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index

OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	487
Total Components for the Federal Index	6
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	98

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index

ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	74
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	744
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	99

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

ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	65			
ELL				
AMI				
ASN	85			
BLK	71			
HSP	81			
MUL	80			
PAC				
WHT	87			
FRL	75			

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	51			
ELL				
AMI				
ASN	89			
BLK	64			
HSP	79			
MUL	74			
PAC				
WHT	79			
FRL	66			

Accountability Components by Subgroup

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

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2021-22	C & C Accel 2021-22	ELP Progress
All Students	72			70			88	82		98	77	
SWD	39			55			74			58	5	
ELL												
AMI												
ASN	79			81			95	77		76	6	
BLK	58			47			73	71		75	6	
HSP	78			65			96	92		62	6	
MUL	77			81			85	74		68	6	
PAC												
WHT	77			80			93	90		81	6	
FRL	63			60			83	77		72	6	

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21	ELP Progress
All Students	74	69	61	62	63	55	90	83		99	88	
SWD	33	63	62	32	46	36				86	50	
ELL												
AMI												
ASN	81	85		80	73		100	91		100	100	
BLK	61	64	58	40	50	51	84	57		100	78	
HSP	75	75	67	69	65		85	93		100	86	
MUL	72	71	73	51	62	44	88	79		100	95	
PAC												
WHT	81	69	54	75	72	65	95	93		97	93	
FRL	63	59	50	49	52	46	88	76		98	82	

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20	ELP Progress
All Students	68	62	57	49	46	40	87	86		99	78	
SWD	22	48	50	32	50	40				86	50	
ELL												
AMI												
ASN	63	57		42	40		76	88		100	94	
BLK	51	53	50	26	37	37	72	70		99	62	
HSP	74	69	75	54	43	50	91	86		94	75	
MUL	61	62	59	49	44		90	88		100	88	
PAC												
WHT	79	67	63	69	55	54	94	93		99	86	
FRL	61	59	56	43	43	40	86	81		98	71	

Grade Level Data Review– State Assessments (pre-populated)

The data are raw data and include ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data. The percentages shown here represent ALL students who received a score of 3 or higher on the statewide assessments.

An asterisk (*) in any cell indicates the data has been suppressed due to fewer than 10 students tested, or all tested students scoring the same.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
10	2023 - Spring	72%	40%	32%	50%	22%
09	2023 - Spring	76%	38%	38%	48%	28%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	50%	38%	12%	50%	0%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	82%	48%	34%	48%	34%

BIOLOGY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	88%	56%	32%	63%	25%

HISTORY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	82%	54%	28%	63%	19%

III. Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis/Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources.

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

While Students with Disabilities (SWD) data reflects performance above the state data, they are still moving in a positive direction on the academic continuum. West Florida's students had a combined proficiency of 51.8% on last year's performance where the district scored 17%.

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

While we did not have a notable decline in any category, we had a 2-point decline in Biology due to the fact that we had a number (50) of students that were first-time test-takers for the Biology EOC who were also ELA retakes. Lack of academic vocabulary acquisition was a contributing factor.

Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends.

Geometry scored 37 points above the state and had the most significant gap compared to the state average. Meticulous attention to detail in assigning the right instructional personnel to the course and then taking it a step further and as much as possible assigning the best instructional personnel to each student based on that student's academic history contributed to this success. Additionally, each teacher offered tutoring; there was also small group break-out instruction, and exam reviews that incentivized student participation and fostered friendly competition.

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

Students with Disabilities (SWD) showed the most improvement in Biology. We increased by 74 points. The implementation of the accommodations of small group and extended time for Students with Disabilities (SWD) aided in increasing of the score.

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

The data that showed the lowest performance for West Florida High School is our daily average attendance. The contributing factors to last year's low performance were insufficient communication and post-pandemic factors, including systemic social and academic isolation. West Florida High School did not have one academic area that had a significant decline; however, the area that we need to work on is increasing average daily attendance.

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

Decreasing the number of students with 5 or more absences per quarter.

Increase the learning gains for Students with Disabilities in all content areas.

Area of Focus

(Identified key Area of Focus that addresses the school's highest priority 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 crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

The federal index for SWD students at West Florida in the 21-22 school year had a combined proficiency of 51.8%. The district scored 17%. West Florida's SWD are still moving in a positive direction on the academic continuum; however, the overall school federal index was 74%.

Measurable Outcome:

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

The federal index gap for SWD students (51) compared to overall students (74) will decrease by 50% going from 23 point gap to 11 point gap or less when calculated for the 23-24 school year.

Monitoring:

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

The data metrics that will be utilized to monitor the federal index for the overall population and SWD subgroup will be district created quarterly progress monitoring; ELA reports generated from MyPerspectives, iLit45, Pre-AP assessments, and Progress Learning (formerly USA Test Prep); and Math reports generated from ALEKS, Schoolnet assessments, Delta Math, and the "All Things Algebra/Geometry" intervention/support program. The leadership team will conduct weekly walkthroughs to monitor the implementation of planning, professional development, and remediation. The leadership team will also review school wide data twice a month. The team will meet with the teachers to discuss the data and determine future instructional practices and identify needs for remediation or reteaching opportunities.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Esi Shannon (eshannon1@ecsdf.us)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Teachers will use overt direct instruction, with an emphasis on ESE inclusion services to increase student engagement. They will provide multiple opportunities of exposure and feedback resulting in high-yield effect size. Teachers will also implement differentiated small group instruction, review progress monitoring tools, and conduct student data chats.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The rationale for these strategies is evidenced-based research by John Hattie and Robert Marzano that overt direct instruction, students engaging with the content, and teacher feedback have a high effect size.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

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

Planning/PLC: Structured planning with the school-based PLC leaders will occur 1 time a week. Teachers will practice collaborative structures and create exemplars for student answers, lab work, and written evidence of understanding according to state standards and benchmarks. Teachers will create lesson plans to include tasks, student feedback, and parent communication in Canvas and FOCUS platforms.

Person Responsible: Esi Shannon (eshannon1@ecsdfi.us)

By When: August 10, 2023 to continue through May 24, 2023

Classroom walks/feedback: The leadership team will conduct classroom walks once a week to monitor the implementation of planning outcomes. The leadership team will provide feedback to teachers after each visit and determine coaching support based on the data metrics and class walks. The team will determine future instructional practices and identify needs for remediation or reteaching opportunities based on the qualitative and quantitative data.

Person Responsible: Erin Cramer (ecramer@ecsdfi.us)

By When: August 10, 2023 to continue through May 24, 2023

Data: The leadership team will meet with teachers to discuss prior year data for overall population in comparison with subgroups to include SWD at the beginning of the year. The leadership team will analyze data metrics from Schoolnet probes, unit tests, and quarterly progress monitoring assessments, and meet with teachers for data chats quarterly. Teachers will have data chats with SWD students for the unit assessments. On-going feedback will be given to students through Canvas for assignments, activities, and assessments. The administration will review student grades weekly.

Person Responsible: Esi Shannon (eshannon1@ecsdfi.us)

By When: August 10, 2023 to continue through May 24, 2023