

Hillsborough County Public Schools

Chamberlain High School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	9
III. Planning for Improvement	14
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	18
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	0
VI. Title I Requirements	18
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

Chamberlain High School

9401 N BOULEVARD, Tampa, FL 33612

[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 provide an environment for students to master disciplinary literacy across all content areas.

Provide the school's vision statement.

At Chamberlain, all stakeholders work together to create a learning community where students are held to high expectations. The Chamberlain community builds students who are caring, contributing citizens that can succeed in an ever-changing world.

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
Russell, Jake	Principal	
Buchert, Danielle	Assistant Principal	
Olson, Ashley	Assistant Principal	
Suarez, Luis	Assistant Principal	
Montgomery, Jennifer	Assistant Principal	
Turner, Jamie	Other	
Mayper, Sarah	Instructional Coach	
Mascherin-Brady, Colleen	Instructional Coach	
Florez, Alexander	Instructional Coach	
Chowning, Kristina	Other	
White, Hailee	SAC Member	

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.

The School Advisory Council fills these requirements and includes members from all stakeholder groups.

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 School Advisory Committee will meet twice quarterly, once after progress reports and once after report cards, to monitor progress of the SIP. Data from success coaches, instructional coaches, and/or department heads will be gathered and reviewed at these meetings.

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	Yes
2022-23 Minority Rate	88%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	100%
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: C 2019-20: C 2018-19: C 2017-18: C
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

Using 2022-23 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		
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	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 that have two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Prior Year (2022-23) As Initially Reported (pre-populated)

The number of students by grade level that exhibited each early warning indicator:

Indicator	Grade Level										Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	514	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	246	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	112	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	452	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	91	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	129	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	336	

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	182

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Prior Year (2022-23) Updated (pre-populated)

Section 3 includes data tables that are pre-populated based off information submitted in prior year's SIP.

The number of students by grade level that exhibited each early warning indicator:

Indicator	Grade Level										Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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*	30	51	50	28	52	51	24		
ELA Learning Gains				47			36		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				45			45		
Math Achievement*	19	42	38	22	39	38	19		
Math Learning Gains				37			30		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				48			43		
Science Achievement*	39	64	64	33	46	40	33		
Social Studies Achievement*	38	69	66	54	49	48	48		
Middle School Acceleration					41	44			
Graduation Rate	80	89	89	80	64	61	86		
College and Career Acceleration	38	62	65	34	72	67	45		
ELP Progress	27	39	45	36			36		

* 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	39
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	Yes
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	5
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	271
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	96
Graduation Rate	80

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	42

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index

OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	4
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	464
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	97
Graduation Rate	80

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	25	Yes	4	1
ELL	32	Yes	2	
AMI				
ASN	54			
BLK	30	Yes	3	1
HSP	37	Yes	1	
MUL	50			
PAC				
WHT	58			
FRL	37	Yes	1	

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	38	Yes	3	
ELL	37	Yes	1	
AMI				
ASN	42			
BLK	37	Yes	2	
HSP	44			

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%
MUL	37	Yes	1	
PAC				
WHT	52			
FRL	41			

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	30			19			39	38		80	38	27
SWD	15			12			15	6		19	6	
ELL	13			16			24	25		49	7	27
AMI												
ASN	54										1	
BLK	23			12			29	17		23	6	
HSP	25			17			32	41		42	7	26
MUL	50										1	
PAC												
WHT	50			41			68	56		49	6	
FRL	29			18			36	35		37	7	23

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	28	47	45	22	37	48	33	54		80	34	36
SWD	23	53	52	21	44	53	14	37		70	11	
ELL	14	42	42	10	37	52	17	38		75	46	36
AMI												
ASN	47	40		40								

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
BLK	17	41	42	18	36	60	23	44		80	8	
HSP	27	47	47	21	40	47	32	56		77	50	36
MUL	53	67		21	9		36					
PAC												
WHT	49	55		32	41	45	52	63		83	48	
FRL	26	45	43	22	36	46	32	52		78	31	35

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	24	36	45	19	30	43	33	48		86	45	36
SWD	16	29	35	10	35	58	24	39		84	29	
ELL	9	34	45	11	30	40	15	31		75	56	36
AMI												
ASN										100	80	
BLK	15	35	46	10	29	44	16	36		89	23	
HSP	27	37	45	22	29	38	38	46		85	50	38
MUL	26	22		21	45		55			73	36	
PAC												
WHT	27	38	45	26	30		38	78		87	61	
FRL	23	36	44	17	29	42	32	46		86	42	38

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	31%	50%	-19%	50%	-19%
09	2023 - Spring	21%	48%	-27%	48%	-27%

ALGEBRA

Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	17%	55%	-38%	50%	-33%

GEOMETRY

Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	18%	49%	-31%	48%	-30%

BIOLOGY

Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	35%	62%	-27%	63%	-28%

HISTORY

Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	36%	65%	-29%	63%	-27%

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.

Algebra (17%) and Geometry (18%) were the lowest performing content areas. Students entering 9th grade do not enter with the prerequisite skills to be successful in Algebra 1. Therefore, they must be placed in Algebra 1a to build those skills.

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

U.S. History dropped 27% points from the previous year making it the greatest decline. Teachers in this department did not utilize Achievement Level Descriptors when planning for instruction. Therefore, instruction and assessment did not meet the complexity level of what is tested.

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.

U.S. History dropped 27% points from the previous year making it the greatest decline, Teachers in this department did not utilize Achievement Level Descriptors when planning for instruction. Therefore, instruction and assessment did not meet the complexity level of what is tested.

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

10th Grade English showed the most improvement with a 6-point increase. This is attributed to improvements in the 10th grade English PLC cycle in the areas of instruction, assessment, and data analysis. Additionally, teacher participated in full content planning days in which they received training on backward mapping and engaged in collaborative planning.

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.

- 1) Improvement in all tested areas by
- 2) Improvement in U.S. History by utilizing Achievement Level Descriptors when planning and instructing.
- 3) Capitalize on Acceleration points by ensuring that students are appropriately placed in AICE, Advanced Placement, Dual Enrollment, and Industry Certification.

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 Differentiation**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.

Teachers will use student formative data to plan and implement teacher-led small-group instruction. This will allow the teachers to differentiate their lessons to the individual students needs. Providing students with this small-group instruction will help students make gains and/or reach proficiency achievement levels.

Measurable Outcome:

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

By December 2023, at least 50% of all teachers, and by May 2024, at least 70% of teachers will implement standards-based, differentiated, teacher-led small-group instruction.

Monitoring:

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

The above goal will be measured by walkthroughs, PLC documentation, coaching logs, support facilitation plans, and student data.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Danielle Buchert (danielle.buchert@sdhc.k12.fl.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.)

Teacher-led small-group instruction and differentiation

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Teachers will target students individual learning needs in the small groups, allowing for differentiation that will facilitate their mastery of desired standards. Teachers have received initial training on standards-based differentiation, teacher-led small-group instruction. There will be further training continued this year. Additionally, teachers will participate in weekly content area PLC meetings in which they will analyze data, receive feedback on lessons from colleagues and coaches, and have access to leadership support.

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

#2. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Other**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.

This area of focus will address the subgroups of Students with Disabilities, English Language Learners, Black/African American Students, and Multiracial Students. According to our assessment data, these ESSA subgroups of students are under-supported. Additionally, according to our Panorama data, students do not feel supported by their teacher and Power Bi discipline data shows there is a disproportionality in the discipline of these subgroups. As a whole, we want to build a school culture where all student feel welcome and are provided with equitable support both academically and behaviorally.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Our referral and suspension data will stay within a proportionate range to our student enrollment to ensure all students are spending the maximum amount of time in class to receive necessary academic support.

Monitoring:

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

The above goal will be measured by subgroups' academic progress, referral and suspension data, and Panorama Student Survey data.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Ashley Olson (ashley.olson@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.)

We will use Multi-Tiered System Supports (MTSS).

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Teachers will be trained on Tier 1 Classroom Behavior Management strategies. Our CCRT will run and promote Tier 1 incentives that will promote student success and positive school interactions. These incentives would address academics, attendance, and behavior. The goal is to be able to celebrate all students on campus for something positive. This will be measured and monitored by the Power Bi discipline reports and Panorama data. Tier 2 support will be used for students identified as needing additional support, such as success coaches and restorative practices. These students will be monitored and tracked by teachers, academic coaches, and success coaches.

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)).

Chamberlain used the Comprehensive Needs Assessment District Protocol to submit our Title 1 budget in April 2023. We review and make adjustments to the budget quarterly.

Title I Requirements

Schoolwide Program Plan (SWP) Requirements

This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A SWP and opts to use the SIP to satisfy the requirements of the SWP plan, as outlined in the ESSA, Public Law No. 114-95, § 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

Provide the methods for dissemination of this SIP, UniSIG budget and SWP to stakeholders (e.g., students, families, school staff and leadership and local businesses and organizations). Please articulate a plan or protocol for how this SIP and progress will be shared and disseminated and to the extent practicable, provided in a language a parent can understand. (ESSA 1114(b)(4))

List the school's webpage* where the SIP is made publicly available.

Parent link directing parents to the website

Communication on campus

SAC meetings twice each quarter

Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission, support the needs of students and keep parents informed of their child's progress.

List the school's webpage* where the school's Family Engagement Plan is made publicly available. (ESSA 1116(b-g))

Conference night

Progress reports

Community events

Student Government

Chamberlain Champions

Describe how the school plans to strengthen the academic program in the school, increase the amount and quality of learning time and help provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum. Include the Area of Focus if addressed in Part III of the SIP. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(ii))

3DE

AICE

Dual Enrollment

AP

ELP after school

Bootcamps

If appropriate and applicable, describe how this plan is developed in coordination and integration with other Federal, State, and local services, resources and programs, such as programs supported under ESSA, violence prevention programs, nutrition programs, housing programs, Head Start programs, adult education programs, career and technical education programs, and schools implementing CSI or TSI activities under section 1111(d). (ESSA 1114(b)(5))

Chamberlain Adult Education
CTE for College Credit
Dual Enrollment
Social Workers
Success Coaches have EdPlans on students.

Optional Component(s) of the Schoolwide Program Plan

Include descriptions for any additional strategies that will be incorporated into the plan.

Describe how the school ensures counseling, school-based mental health services, specialized support services, mentoring services, and other strategies to improve students' skills outside the academic subject areas. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(I))

3 counselors, 2 social workers, Hazel Mental Health, 1 school psychologist, 2 success coaches, and 2 APs, Jody's Girls Empower Group

Describe the preparation for and awareness of postsecondary opportunities and the workforce, which may include career and technical education programs and broadening secondary school students' access to coursework to earn postsecondary credit while still in high school. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(II))

3DE, Future Career Academy (signs on walls), AICE AP, Dual Enrollment,

Describe the implementation of a schoolwide tiered model to prevent and address problem behavior, and early intervening services, coordinated with similar activities and services carried out under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. 20 U.S.C. 1400 et seq. and ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(III).

CCRT - Tarty parties
Success Coach
Tardy sweeps

Describe the professional learning and other activities for teachers, paraprofessionals, and other school personnel to improve instruction and use of data from academic assessments, and to recruit and retain effective teachers, particularly in high need subjects. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(IV))

Shared leadership w/ teacher leaders
ILT
PLC communities

Describe the strategies the school employs to assist preschool children in the transition from early childhood education programs to local elementary school programs. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(V))

N/A