

Strawberry Crest High School



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	13
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	19
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	0
VI. Title I Requirements	0
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

Strawberry Crest High School

4691 GALLAGHER RD, Dover, FL 33527

[no web address on file]

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.

To become the district's leader in developing successful students.

Provide the school's vision statement.

To Create Responsible Empowered Scholars for Tomorrow (CREST)

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
Watson, Mark	Principal	Oversee the implementation of the SIP and support Professional Learning opportunities.
Hobbs, Trent	Assistant Principal	Oversee the implementation of the SIP and reflection of progression toward our goals
HimelfarbCustard, Genna	Assistant Principal	Principal Designee; oversee SIP and it's implementation.
Parker, Angela	Teacher, K-12	Working collaboratively with the Principal and HCTA teacher representative to organize and oversee the voting process.

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.

A system of Action Teams has been created with teacher leaders and teacher involvement. The Family and Community Action Team responsibilities will help identify and support effective ways for parents to support student learning and capacity for self-discipline, to help parents build their own networks and find ways to use community organizations and business to support school goals. The School Culture and Climate Action Team will be concerned with factors affecting the health, safety, belonging and esteem of students, faculty and staff of the school.

SIP Monitoring

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

Cassandra Mattison is the Curriculum and Instruction Team Leader with team members Angelique Diaz, Erin Oteiza, Paul Bonanno and Joseph Borreca.

Lesley Shea is the Family and Community Action Team Leader.

Madeline Turner is the Climate and Culture Action Team Leader with team members Angelique Diaz, Erin Oteiza, Paul Bonanno, Robin Schwarz, Brianne Walburn, Joseph Borreca, Kendall Nickerson, Mario Meulener, John Kelly, Amparito Hernandez, Wendy Beaver, and Jasmine Lane.

Tracy Flanagan is the Data Analysis Team Leader with team members Angelique Diaz, Joseph Borreca, and Kendall Nickerson.

Angela Parker is the Professional Learning Team Leaders with team members John Van Hezewyk, Robin Schwarz, Brianne Walburn, Lisa Nichols, and Kendall Nickerson

LaTasha Parkmond is the Technology Team Leader with team members Robin Schwarz and John Kelly.

All team members are responsible for working toward common goal of improving students' learning and well-being through collaboration and shared leadership, become an expert in the team's topic, communicate goals, objectives and accomplishments to the entire school community, developing and executing plans and sharing problems as they emerge.

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	65%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	78%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	ATSI
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD)* English Language Learners (ELL)* 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: B 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*	53	51	50	54	52	51	57		
ELA Learning Gains				53			54		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				35			36		
Math Achievement*	44	42	38	49	39	38	49		
Math Learning Gains				47			44		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				42			48		
Science Achievement*	64	64	64	65	46	40	71		
Social Studies Achievement*	71	69	66	71	49	48	65		
Middle School Acceleration					41	44			
Graduation Rate	97	89	89	98	64	61	98		
College and Career Acceleration	74	62	65	66	72	67	62		
ELP Progress	24	39	45	31			62		

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

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

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	61
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	427
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	98
Graduation Rate	97

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	56
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	611
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	98
Graduation Rate	98

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	37	Yes	3	
ELL	40	Yes	2	
AMI				
ASN	97			
BLK	66			
HSP	51			
MUL	85			
PAC				

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%
WHT	72			
FRL	51			

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	39	Yes	2	
ELL	38	Yes	1	
AMI				
ASN	92			
BLK	60			
HSP	47			
MUL	80			
PAC				
WHT	62			
FRL	48			

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	53			44			64	71		97	74	24
SWD	17			21			21	33		34	6	
ELL	15			30			31	33		51	7	24
AMI												
ASN	97			94			100	98		96	6	
BLK	50			43			57	86		64	6	
HSP	33			37			47	55		64	7	24

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
MUL	76			71			92	80		88	6	
PAC												
WHT	58			49			70	79		80	6	
FRL	32			35			47	55		63	7	29

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	54	53	35	49	47	42	65	71		98	66	31
SWD	16	37	30	29	44	37	33	35		92	40	
ELL	12	35	33	33	48	40	25	35		94	34	29
AMI												
ASN	97	79		94	71		99	98		100	94	
BLK	51	46	45	28	58		62	67		100	79	
HSP	34	42	34	40	44	36	46	60		96	54	32
MUL	68	59					80	89		100	86	
PAC												
WHT	61	56	34	57	50	41	77	75		98	68	
FRL	37	43	34	39	44	37	49	58		96	50	41

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	57	54	36	49	44	48	71	65		98	62	62
SWD	14	30	30	25	37	42	20	11		91	33	
ELL	14	36	34	27	44	48	33	31		96	30	62
AMI												
ASN	97	74		80	61		99	96		100	93	
BLK	51	48	36	32	25		54	75		100	62	
HSP	39	46	35	42	47	55	59	50		98	49	65
MUL	75	72		77	55		87	75		100	71	
PAC												
WHT	64	56	40	56	42	35	73	73		98	64	

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
FRL	38	45	33	42	45	50	56	50		97	44	63

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	52%	50%	2%	50%	2%
09	2023 - Spring	55%	48%	7%	48%	7%

ALGEBRA

Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	47%	55%	-8%	50%	-3%

GEOMETRY

Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	46%	49%	-3%	48%	-2%

BIOLOGY

Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	64%	62%	2%	63%	1%

HISTORY

Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	72%	65%	7%	63%	9%

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.

English Language Proficiency Progress showed the lowest performance. Ealy Warning Systems attendance and discipline appear to be the contributing factors.

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

English Language Proficiency Progress showed the greatest decline from the prior year. Ealy Warning Systems attendance and discipline appear to be the contributing factors.

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.

The data components with the greatest gap when compared to the state average was Mathematics Low 25% Learning Gains. Ealy Warning Systems attendance and discipline appear to be the contributing factors.

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

Social Studies Achievement showed the most improvement. Professional Learning was offered weekly and monthly with a focus on embedding writing, inquiry, collaboration, organization and reading into every lesson, using data to drive more intentional professional learning communities and increasing engagement in the classroom with a focus on technology.

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

High percentage of chronic absenteeism among Hispanic students. High percentage of disciplinary action among students with disabilities.

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

1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to English Language Learners
2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities
3. Positive Culture ad Environment specifically relating to Early Warning Systems.

Area of Focus

(Identified key Area of Focus that addresses the school's highest priority based on any/all relevant data sources)

#1. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Early Warning System**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.

Positive culture and environment specifically relating to student attendance will focus on improving student attendance in order to positively impact student achievement, particularly with students who are chronically absent - defined as missing 10% or more of the school year.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Decrease absenteeism and disciplinary actions.

Monitoring:

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

Student attendance, led by the attendance team, will be monitored daily, monthly, and quarterly by analyzing data from EdConnect, and other data sources, in the school's electronic attendance data wall.

The data will

be monitored and tracked to look for trends and patterns and used to intervene before chronic attendance can occur. The attendance will be reviewed so attendance plans, for students who are chronically absent, can be adjusted, if necessary. The attendance team will meet bimonthly to review all data to adjust the SIP's Action Steps. The attendance team will share attendance data with the leadership team monthly and with the entire staff, School Advisory Council, and parents/other stakeholders monthly to inform and employ them in implementing action steps to improve student attendance.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Genna HimelfarbCustard (genna.himelfarbcustard@hcps.net)

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.)

Rtl will be focused on strengthening Tier 1, 2, and 3 to improve student attendance, particularly with students with chronic absenteeism, and those in ESSA Subgroups ELL and SWD.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The rationale for using Rtl for attendance is to utilize a schoolwide process that supports students at all three

tiers. The following two sources document the effectiveness of Rtl:

-John Hattie's Effect Size on Response to Intervention: 1.29

-Kim and Streeter's Strategies and Interventions for Improving School Attendance | Encyclopedia of Social Work (oxfordre.com)

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.

Principal forms an Attendance Team to monitor Tiers 1, 2, and 3.

The team meets the third Monday of the month during Early Release to problem-solve.

Monthly schoolwide parent newsletters, in multiple languages, include information about attendance with bite-size facts and how frequent absences impact student achievement.

Conduct focus groups with students and families of varying attendance levels to identify effective strategies for attendance and potential barriers.

The Attendance Team will regularly review attendance data with teachers to ensure timely interventions have started and/or are ongoing and appropriate support is provided as soon as barriers are identified. identify barriers and needed resources.

The Attendance Team will develop and communicate, with staff, clear and consistent guidelines for contacting families when Tier 3 students are absent.

Consider referral to the School Social Worker to develop a Student Attendance Improvement Plan, in partnership with the student's parents.

Person Responsible: Mark Watson (mark.watson@hcps.net)

By When: By the end of the 2023-24 school year

To provide additional support to the underperforming ESSA subgroup: ELL, ELL students' attendance is monitored by the ESOL Resource Teacher (ERT). The ERT and bilingual aide makes parent contact to identify barriers and needed resource.

Person Responsible: Trent Hobbs (trent.hobbs@hcps.net)

By When: By the end of the 2023-24 school year

#2. 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.

Instructional Practice specifically related to SWD Student Achievement.

17% ELA, 22% Algebra, 12% Geometry and 21% in Biology tested proficient.

Measurable Outcome:

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

The Federal Index of SWD student achievement will increase from 39% to 41% when best teaching practices are embedded in all content areas through rigorous tasks that are aligned with grade level and content area standards.

Monitoring:

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

Conference with teachers of SWD regularly to reflect on progress and student data.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Trent Hobbs (trent.hobbs@hcps.net)

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.)

Utilization of Action Teams to advocate and encourage community support, and WICOR based professional learning/best teaching practices implementation through weekly and monthly PD opportunities offered by the AVID Site Team and Action Teams.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The integration of WICOR in lesson plans enhances the student learning due to the deeper cognition and processing opportunities that these strategies provide. It is not a specific strategy, but rather the ability to plan strategies that fit the need and may overlap in WICOR.

ELL PL trains teachers to successfully implement reading and writing strategies for ELL students that will impact all subject areas. This helps students with success in all areas of school and for post-secondary readiness.

AVID (Advancement Via Individual Determination) is a nonprofit that changes lives by helping schools shift to a more equitable, student-centered approach.

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 4 - Demonstrates a Rationale

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.

1. WICOR based professional development weekly with more in depth trainings monthly providing specific support differentiating for the SWD student
2. Review of PM1, PM2 and PM3 assessments to determine area of need for SWD students
3. Review of grades after every nine weeks to determine area of need for SWD students
4. Classroom visits to monitor and support the implementation and effectiveness of WICOR strategies and the use of differentiation for SWD students
5. Communication between stakeholders utilizing Spanish speakers, when necessary
6. Post-Secondary Readiness: enrichment activities, internships, community service, and service learning to explore careers and colleges, training centers, Intermediate Care Facilities (ICFs), group homes, Transitional & Supported Living to ensure SWD student readiness for the public postsecondary level
7. Use the Continuous Improvement Cycle to guide discussions about implementation, identify roadblocks and solutions, set SMART goals, and celebrate successes with specific regards to the SWD student

Person Responsible: Trent Hobbs (trent.hobbs@hcps.net)

By When: By the end of the 2023-2024 school year.

#3. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to English Language Learners**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.

Instructional Practice specifically related to ELL student achievement.
0% ELA, 17% Algebra, 25% Geometry and 33% Biology tested proficient.

Measurable Outcome:

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

The Federal Index for ELL student achievement will increase from 38% to 41% when best teaching practices are embedded in all content areas through rigorous tasks that are aligned with grade level and content area standards.

Monitoring:

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

Reading and English class grades, State Progress Monitoring Assessments

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Trent Hobbs (trent.hobbs@hcps.net)

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.)

Utilization of Action Teams to advocate and encourage community support, and WICOR based professional learning/best teaching practices implementation through weekly and monthly PL opportunities offered by the AVID Site Team and Action Teams.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The integration of WICOR in lesson plans enhances the student learning due to the deeper cognition and processing opportunities that these strategies provide. It is not a specific strategy, but rather the ability to plan strategies that fit the need and may overlap in WICOR.

ELL PL trains teachers to successfully implement reading and writing strategies for ELL students that will impact all subject areas. This helps students with success in all areas of school and for post-secondary readiness.

AVID (Advancement Via Individual Determination) is a nonprofit that changes lives by helping schools shift to a more equitable, student-centered approach.

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 4 - Demonstrates a Rationale

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.

1. WICOR based professional learning weekly with more in depth monthly professional learning with ELL strategies.
2. Review of PM1, PM2 and PM3 assessments to determine area of need within ELL students' population
3. Review of grades after every nine weeks to determine area of need within ELL students population
4. Classroom visits to monitor and support the implementation and effectiveness of WICOR strategies and ELL strategies
5. Communication between ELL students' stakeholders utilizing Spanish speakers and Translator Apps.
6. Post-Secondary Readiness: enrichment activities, internships, community service, and service learning to explore careers and colleges to ensure student readiness for the public postsecondary level.
7. Use the Continuous Improvement Cycle to guide discussions about implementation, identify roadblocks and solutions, set SMART goals, and celebrate successes specifically with regards to ELL students.

Person Responsible: Trent Hobbs (trent.hobbs@hcps.net)

By When: The end of the 2023-24 school year

CSI, TSI and ATSI Resource Review

Describe the process to review school improvement funding allocations and ensure resources are allocated based on needs. This section must be completed if the school is identified as ATSI, TSI or CSI in addition to completing an Area(s) of Focus identifying interventions and activities within the SIP (ESSA 1111(d)(1)(B)(4) and (d)(2)(C)).

At the beginning of the school year, after first semester and at the end of the school year, the School Leadership Team (SLT) will examine funding from all sources, assess whether individual school spending levels really reflect the need, review critical dimensions of resource equity beyond funding, identify root causes of resource inequities, and check for sustainability. The SLT will align school funding and planning timeline engaging a wide range of stakeholders.