

Hillsborough County Public Schools

Riverview 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	7
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

Riverview High School

11311 BOYETTE RD, Riverview, FL 33569

[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.

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

Provide the school's vision statement.

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

School Leadership Team, 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
Spiro, Brian	Principal	Oversee SIP goals and instructional priorities.
Canady, Jennifer	Assistant Principal	Assistant Principal of Curriculum
Warren, Michael	Assistant Principal	Assistant Principal of Administration
Davis, Kevin	Assistant Principal	Assistant Principal of Student Affairs
Foord, Carla	Assistant Principal	Assistant Principal of Student Affairs
Hursh, Catherine	Teacher, K-12	Teacher, SAC Chair, Webmaster, PLC Coordinator
Garnier, Wancarlie	Dropout Prevention Coordinator	Climate and Culture Teacher

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 Instructional Leadership Team, Admin, and the PTSA (Parent Teacher Student Alliance) collaboratively and collectively assessed data to determine Instructional Priorities in order to develop the School Improvement Plan for the 2023-2024 school year.

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))

Throughout the course of the school year, the Instructional Leadership Team, administration, action teams, and the SAC committee will review data to assess if instructional priorities are being met. The Instructional Leadership Team will have a major role in designing Professional Development opportunities to work with teachers to help meet the needs of students.

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	64%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	51%
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: B 2018-19: B 2017-18: B
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*	50	51	50	49	52	51	51		
ELA Learning Gains				50			47		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				42			44		
Math Achievement*	48	42	38	45	39	38	37		
Math Learning Gains				46			29		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				43			33		
Science Achievement*	65	64	64	65	46	40	62		
Social Studies Achievement*	69	69	66	77	49	48	75		
Middle School Acceleration					41	44			
Graduation Rate	97	89	89	94	64	61	96		
College and Career Acceleration	60	62	65	59	72	67	61		
ELP Progress	55	39	45	55			53		

** 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	63
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	444
Total Components for the Federal Index	7

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index

Percent Tested	98
Graduation Rate	97

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index

ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	57
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	625
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	97
Graduation Rate	94

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	35	Yes	2	
ELL	43			
AMI				
ASN	76			
BLK	55			
HSP	62			
MUL	73			
PAC				
WHT	70			
FRL	56			

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	34	Yes	1	
ELL	43			
AMI				
ASN	72			
BLK	49			
HSP	55			
MUL	65			
PAC				
WHT	61			
FRL	52			

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	50			48			65	69		97	60	55
SWD	15			16			26	33		33	6	
ELL	19			19			32	33		52	7	55
AMI												
ASN	60			44			82	90		78	6	
BLK	38			35			51	59		49	6	
HSP	48			44			66	63		57	7	58
MUL	62			57			76	75		73	6	
PAC												
WHT	54			58			68	77		66	6	
FRL	39			40			56	61		49	7	53

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	49	50	42	45	46	43	65	77		94	59	55
SWD	19	39	31	16	41	27	30	35		84	20	
ELL	15	39	36	24	43	39	21	57		85	64	55
AMI												
ASN	74	66		70	67		68	78		95	60	
BLK	43	46	42	31	39	39	50	66		96	41	
HSP	43	49	44	40	42	40	61	76		92	61	56
MUL	61	51	50	51	64		71	84		95	58	
PAC												
WHT	54	51	37	56	49	46	75	85		94	67	
FRL	39	43	38	40	50	46	52	65		90	51	58

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	51	47	44	37	29	33	62	75		96	61	53
SWD	15	30	35	21	35	40	33	43		88	32	
ELL	18	40	40	27	41	41	33	63		95	57	53
AMI												
ASN	70	68		50	58		69	100		100	81	
BLK	37	43	40	22	26	28	50	58		94	38	
HSP	47	43	40	32	28	36	56	77		95	65	51
MUL	55	59	57	43	24	18	56	89		100	73	
PAC												
WHT	60	51	45	49	31	40	75	78		98	65	
FRL	41	43	40	32	29	32	55	69		93	51	54

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	50%	50%	0%	50%	0%
09	2023 - Spring	50%	48%	2%	48%	2%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	39%	55%	-16%	50%	-11%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	59%	49%	10%	48%	11%

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	68%	65%	3%	63%	5%

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.

The data component showing the lowest performance was Algebra. Riverview High School had above the district and state averages for HS students only, but upper-level math students complete it in 8th grade and this "throws off" comparisons. Our strength is based on the teachers who collaborated together throughout the year.

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

The data component that showed the greatest decline is US History. We had teacher turnover early on that resulted in teachers new to the school/district/state/course (ALL of these) coming on board. We saw our largest decline with US History even with added supports for the students and teachers, however we were above state and district averages.

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.

We are at or above state averages in every tested course. The smallest gap is in ELA due to high teacher turnover in both English 1 and English 2 teacher teams over the course of the last two years.

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

The data component showing the most improvement is Math, Geometry and Algebra 1 specifically. This is mostly due to having high-impact teachers in those areas combined with strong PLC collaboration that looked at the standards, student data, and the curriculum to make intentional decisions to prepare students for the exams.

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

Attendance is a concern. (69% of students have 90+% daily attendance rates.)

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

1. Students potentially in BQ for Math
2. Students potentially in BQ for ELA
3. Students on the "bubble" (high 2s/low 3s) for proficiency in Math
4. Students on the "bubble" (high 2s/low 3s) for proficiency in ELA
5. Continued support in USH PLC

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 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.

Survey results from the student Panorama Student Survey showed a decrease in favorable responses related to self-efficacy. In addition, we are focusing on student attendance and attitude.

Measurable Outcome:

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

The Multi-Tiered Systems of Support (MTSS) committee will monitor attendance, behavior, and mental health data to progress monitor students' sense of self-efficacy. We want to increase the percentage of students meeting 90% attendance from 69% to 80%. We want to decrease students with 10 or more absences from 57% to 40%. Students will answer favorably 40% of the time to the question, "How connected do you feel to adults at your school?" on the Panorama Student Survey.

Monitoring:

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

The following will be conducted in order to monitor the area of focus:

MTSS reviews Panorama survey results to determine area for growth.

All staff members receive training on 7 Mindsets.

Action Teams regarding student support, attendance, and behavior will monitor and track data related the measurable goals described.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Wancarlie Garnier (wancarlie.garnier@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.)

7 Mindsets Program used in classrooms once a month.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The 7 Mindsets program has been successfully implemented at other district schools, and it addresses the specific needs identified by staff members for support students' social-emotional growth.

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.

The following will be conducted in order to monitor the area of focus:

MTSS reviews Panorama survey results to determine area for growth.

All staff members receive training on 7 Mindsets.

Action Teams regarding student support, attendance, and behavior will monitor and track data related the

measurable goals described.

Action Teams will meet once a month to collaborate on meeting the school wide goals related to positive culture.

Person Responsible: Wancarlie Garnier (wancarlie.garnier@hcps.net)

By When: Implemented in August of 2023 and ongoing throughout remainder of 2023-2024 school year.

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Student Engagement**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a 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.

Although most state-assessed areas saw improvement in achievement, learning gains across content areas in conjunction with evidence collected in observations and classroom walkthroughs demonstrated uneven engagement among students. Continue training to develop strategies to work with accommodations of SWD to improve student engagement.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Student achievement in state-assessed courses will improve by
 ELA - from 50% to 55% proficient (the goal is 54% and 50% respectively in learning gains and bottom quartile learning gains).
 Math - from 51% to 55% proficient (the goal is 51% and 50% respectively in learning gains and bottom quartile learning gains).
 Science - from 64% to 70% proficient
 Social Studies - from 68% to 76% proficient

Monitoring:

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

Look-fors established by the Instructional Leadership Team (ILT) are used by administrators and teachers during classroom walkthroughs to monitor trends with student engagement. Teachers will monitor student progress in Professional Learning Communities by reviewing common assessments and prioritizing specific standards for at least groups of students.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jennifer Canady (jennifer.canady@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.)

Faculty will receive professional development regarding WICOR strategies from AVID to maximize engagement while supporting student ownership of learning.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

WICOR strategies in AVID promote critical thinking about content in a way that enhances student understanding.

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.

An instructional inquiry cycle will be conducted with the ILT to determine areas of focus

Look fors based on professional literature will be identified.

Training to faculty

PLCs analyze specific standards & collaborate on best strategies

Admin walkthroughs collect trends related to these PLC-identified strategies

Admin provide trends to PLC for discussion and growth.

PLCs collaborate on incorporating student readiness for the public postsecondary level with focuses on CTE, College/Career Fairs, College and Readiness workshops, community college advisor working in conjunction with classes and students, Dual Enrollment opportunities, AICE, AP classes, and the use of Khan Academy.

SWD students will be targeted for support with ELP, close monitoring by case managers, implementation of accommodations.

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

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

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

By When: Established in August of 2023 and ongoing throughout remainder of 2023-2024 school year.

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Benchmark-aligned Instruction**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.

With the implementation of new state standards in most content areas combined with evidence collected by classroom walkthroughs and review of student work in 22-23 demonstrate opportunity to improve the consistency and depth of standards addressed in daily lessons. PLCs will develop strategies for working with SWD and meeting their specific needs and goals within the regular classroom.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Student achievement in state-assessed courses will improve by
 ELA - from 50% to 55% proficient (the goal is 54% and 50% respectively in learning gains and bottom quartile learning gains).
 Math - from 51% to 55% proficient (the goal is 51% and 50% respectively in learning gains and bottom quartile learning gains).
 Science - from 64% to 70% proficient
 Social Studies - from 68% to 76% proficient

Monitoring:

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

The instructional leadership team (ILT) will create look-fors for classroom walkthroughs, which are used to collect trends of teacher practice. In addition teachers will monitor and track student progress throughout the year in Professional Learning Communities, including creating, implementing, and monitoring action plans directly targeting deficiencies in standards mastery.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jennifer Canady (jennifer.canady@hcps.net)

Evidence-based 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.)

Common assessments, lesson plan studies, and walkthrough observations.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Research supports job-embedded professional development and ongoing feedback to support professional growth. Common assessments reviewed by teachers to create action plans also proves to support learning outcomes when targeting groups of students for remediation and/or acceleration.

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.

The following will be conducted in order to address the area of focus:

An instructional inquiry cycle will be conducted with the ILT to determine areas of focus (standards-based lessons).

Look fors based on professional literature related to standards-based lessons will be identified.

Provide initial training to faculty on standards-based planning, including an analysis of standards.

PLCs analyze specific standards and collaborate on best strategies for teaching in the classroom

Admin walkthroughs collect trends related to these PLC-identified standards taught in classrooms.

Admin provide trends to PLC for discussion and growth.

SWD students will be targeted for support with ELP, close monitoring by case managers, implementation of accommodations.

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

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

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

By When: Implemented in August 2023 and ongoing throughout remainder of 2023-2024 school year.