Medical Academy At D.W. Waters School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Medical Academy At D.W. Waters

2704 N HIGHLAND AVE, Tampa, FL 33602

[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.

The mission of the Medical Academy at D.W. Waters is to provide a holistic education and the support that will enable all students to reach their maximum potential.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The vision of the Medical Academy at D.W. Waters is to prepare students through Health Services Programs for life and careers in the medical field.

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
Woods, Rashad	Principal	Through demonstration of the Florida Principal Standards, Mr. Woods serves as the administrative and instructional leader developing, coordinating and evaluating educational programs for all students and ensuring all members of the school leadership team carry out directives in line with the implementation of these programs and the school goals written in the school improvement plan. He is responsible for the operation of the school leadership team and all sub-committees overseeing, monitoring, and supporting the work through meetings with staff as well as encouraging the facilitation of communications and coordination with parents, students, and other community stakeholders.
Sladky, Desiree	Teacher, K-12	Ms. Sladky is responsible for delivering Reading instruction for grades 9-12. She also chairs the School Advisory and Improvement Councils.

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.

Stakeholders are involved in the development of the SIP by providing valuable input. As this is a new program, the SIP development has been instrumental in establishing a solid foundation for program growth. Stakeholders have providing input regarding building culture, parent involvement, facility development and student/staff incentives.

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))

The initial goals set forth in the SIP will serve as a foundation for how instruction is delivered. As we monitor assessment performance of our students, the SIP will be revisited as the needs of our students change. To ensure that the SIP is truly a living document, we will revisit as we progress monitor throughout the school year.

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)	Combination School PK-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Alternative Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	0%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	0%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	
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) Black/African American Students (BLK)* Hispanic Students (HSP) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)*
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	
School Improvement Rating History	2021-22: MAINTAINING 2018-19: MAINTAINING 2017-18: MAINTAINING 2016-17: COMMENDABLE
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*		51	53	0	51	55	0		
ELA Learning Gains				18			20		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile									
Math Achievement*		50	55	8	41	42	6		
Math Learning Gains									
Math Lowest 25th Percentile									
Science Achievement*		48	52	0	48	54			
Social Studies Achievement*		65	68	0	57	59			
Middle School Acceleration		70	70		51	51			
Graduation Rate		83	74	47	44	50	56		
College and Career Acceleration		33	53	4	68	70	0		
ELP Progress		52	55		73	70			

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)	
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	
Total Components for the Federal Index	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
Percent Tested	
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	CSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	11
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	Yes
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	77
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	77
Graduation Rate	47

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				
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK				
HSP				
MUL				
PAC				
WHT				
FRL				

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	80			
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	39	Yes	3	
HSP	60			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT				
FRL	16	Yes	3	3

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												
SWD												
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK												
HSP												
MUL												
PAC												
WHT												
FRL												

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	0	18		8			0	0		47	4	
SWD										80		
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK										39		
HSP										60		
MUL												
PAC												
WHT												
FRL	0			18						47	0	

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	0	20		6						56	0	
SWD												
ELL										50		
AMI												
ASN												
BLK										52	0	
HSP										55	0	
MUL												
PAC												
WHT												
FRL	0	20		6						56	0	

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.

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.

Our ELA achievement in the 21-22 SY was our area of lowest performance. The overall low number of students tested contributed to a lower than expected performance.

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

Our ELA Achievement for the 21-22 SY was our greatest area of decline. The overall low number of students tested contributed to a lower than expected performance.

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.

There is not data comparison available due to number of students tested.

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

There is not data comparison available due to number of students tested.

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

N/A

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

Attendance will be a focal point for improvement in the 23-24 SY.
Testing all students will be a focal point for improvement in the 23-24 SY.
Improved ELA performance will be a focal point for improvement in the 23-24 SY.

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

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Teacher Retention and Recruitment

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.

Students will receive tutoring in subjects/areas of historical low performance. Based on prior data, the greatest area of need is ELA/Reading. The extended learning will take place during the school day. This will increase student access to services.

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

Throughout the 23-24 SY, we will increase the percentage of students achieving a Level 2 or higher by at least 50% by the end of the school year.

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

By utilizing data from progress monitoring, we will have two measurable points on the state assessment that will guide our instructional practice and give key indicators to that will alert as to what students are struggling and where the struggle is taking place.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Rashad Woods (rashad.woods@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.)

Based on first progress monitoring data, we will engage in rigorous extended learning program enrollment. All students achieving a Level 2 or lower will be enrolled in ELP either before (breakfast) or during school hours (lunchtime).

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

By engaging in strategic practice of deficient skills, we will be able to strengthen those areas of performance.

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.

Early identification of struggling readers prior to initial progress monitoring assessment.

Person Responsible: Rashad Woods (rashad.woods@hcps.net)

By When: 4th week of school

#2. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Teacher Retention and Recruitment

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.

Providing faculty/staff with ongoing professional development and leadership opportunities. These opportunities will be provided based on observed/expressed areas of strength and interest. Faculty will be provided the opportunity to explore subject area electives to teach as a part of their scheduled courseload.

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

Retain 100% of faculty from the 23-24 SY to the 24-25 SY.

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

Through quarterly meetings that will engage faculty regarding school culture, student behavior/ performance and areas of needed improvement being met.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Rashad Woods (rashad.woods@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.)

Teacher professional development will take place in the form of leadership growth and opportunity being made available to all faculty.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

As teachers are a part of establishing the foundation of the growing program, the desire to continue being a part of the building process will increase.

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.

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

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).

There will be bi-weekly Problem-Solving Leadership Team meetings. These meetings are designed around the idea of faculty engagement and approaching school leadership not in isolation but as a collaborative network. During these meetings, all conversation will revolve around culture, student performance and consistent school improvement.