

Hillsborough County Public Schools

Jefferson 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	17
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	0
VI. Title I Requirements	17
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

Jefferson High School

4401 W CYPRESS ST, Tampa, FL 33607

[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.

Jefferson High School will provide the educational services, support, and caring environment needed to enable every student to become a productive citizen.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Every Jefferson High School Student will graduate with the skills and tools necessary for a successful life.

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
Wilhelm, Brittney	Principal	Oversee writing, implementation, and progress towards SIP goals.
Cooper, Brittany	Other	Oversee and coordinate SAC meetings.
Maroon-Hart, Jocelynn	Assistant Principal	Implementation and progress monitoring of SIP Goals.
Garrett, Alexia	Other	Oversee implementation and progress monitoring of SIP goals with a focus on SWD.
Cannon, Bernard	Assistant Principal	Implementation and progress monitoring of SIP Goals.

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.

School Advisory Council holds monthly meetings to help ensure monitoring of SIP goals. Council members must also ratify the SIP before it is finalized.

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))

Goals are reviewed monthly by the SAC. Professional Development offered monthly to help build capacity amongst the staff toward goals. Bi-weekly progress monitoring through data by department heads.

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	92%
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) 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	

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*	43	51	50	40	52	51	41		
ELA Learning Gains				43			42		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				37			37		
Math Achievement*	29	42	38	39	39	38	20		
Math Learning Gains				47			19		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				47			28		
Science Achievement*	60	64	64	48	46	40	63		
Social Studies Achievement*	67	69	66	68	49	48	67		
Middle School Acceleration					41	44			
Graduation Rate	90	89	89	90	64	61	93		
College and Career Acceleration	58	62	65	47	72	67	46		
ELP Progress	41	39	45	59			46		

** 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	55
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	388
Total Components for the Federal Index	7

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index

Percent Tested	98
Graduation Rate	90

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index

ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	51
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	565
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	97
Graduation Rate	90

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	36	Yes	4	
ELL	48			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	53			
HSP	55			
MUL	56			
PAC				
WHT	68			
FRL	54			

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	3	
ELL	49			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	44			
HSP	53			
MUL	44			
PAC				
WHT	64			
FRL	49			

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	43			29			60	67		90	58	41
SWD	13			18			27	42		33	6	
ELL	36			23			48	41		58	7	41
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	38			24			55	61		53	6	
HSP	44			28			58	66		59	7	42
MUL	81			31							2	
PAC												
WHT	49			46			77	88		61	6	
FRL	40			27			57	65		55	7	45

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	40	43	37	39	47	47	48	68		90	47	59
SWD	16	29	30	30	38	30	18	37		85	24	
ELL	27	42	43	34	55	37	32	61		87	61	59
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	28	38	34	30	44	44	39	55		92	34	
HSP	43	45	39	41	47	49	49	71		89	52	62
MUL	53	33		46								
PAC												
WHT	52	50		56	61		72	78		84	58	
FRL	36	43	37	35	47	50	44	64		89	47	50

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	41	42	37	20	19	28	63	67		93	46	46
SWD	18	35	41	14	26	33	56	49		87	7	
ELL	25	46	44	15	29	35	52	55		92	58	46
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	32	37	30	13	14	21	51	52		96	26	
HSP	45	46	41	20	21	31	67	74		93	55	49
MUL	25	42								90		
PAC												
WHT	50	42		41	29		77	77		85	57	
FRL	37	40	34	18	19	28	59	65		93	45	48

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	44%	50%	-6%	50%	-6%
09	2023 - Spring	37%	48%	-11%	48%	-11%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	22%	55%	-33%	50%	-28%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	34%	49%	-15%	48%	-14%

BIOLOGY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	59%	62%	-3%	63%	-4%

HISTORY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	64%	65%	-1%	63%	1%

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 Math Achievement category showed the lowest performance. We anticipate our Math Achievement points to be 29.6 which is almost 10 points lower than the previous year. This past year did not have a math coach to support instruction. We had new standards and curriculum to learn.

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

Math Achievement showed the largest decline. We anticipate a 9.4 % drop in this category. Again, we had a new curriculum and standards for the contents.

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 state average is not out yet, but the High School Region 1 average is used here. Jefferson is 12% below the High School Region 1 average. We had some new faculty to Jefferson and our county. We had a new Department Head and some attendance concerns within the department.

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

Science Achievement increase from 48% to 58% this past year. PLCs were restructured in this department. We had a new Department Head. This department absorbed vacancies instead of using long-term substitutes.

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. Increase math achievement.
2. Focus on bottom quartile and learning gains in all subjects.
3. Create systems for new writing test in ELA.

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.

Build on our positive school culture and increase attendance by honoring the legacy and traditions of Jefferson High School.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Improve student average daily attendance from 90% to 93% for the 2023-2024 school year. Reduce the percentage of teacher who missed more than 7 days by 10%.

Monitoring:

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

Attendance reviewed monthly to monitor student attendance rates. Culture leadership team will meet to review teacher attendance percentages quarterly.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Brittney Wilhelm (brittney.wilhelm@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.)

The underlying evidence-based interaction would be an improvement in teacher-student relationships. A positive impact on teacher-student relations and interactions will be the result of increased attendance.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

John Hattie lists teacher-student relations as having a .52 effect size. Increased student and teacher attendance will impact teacher-student relations and interactions.

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.

Continue to celebrate teachers and students through the Distinguished Dragon Awards

Person Responsible: Brittney Wilhelm (brittney.wilhelm@hcps.net)

By When: Each month throughout the year.

Attendance and Culture Committees to create incentives for students/teachers.

Person Responsible: Brittney Wilhelm (brittney.wilhelm@hcps.net)

By When: monthly

Success Coaches to hold meetings with students with attendance concerns to plan for support.

Person Responsible: Bernard Cannon (bernard.cannon@sdhc.k12.fl.us)

By When: As needed, reviewed monthly.

Utilize Student Government Leaders to develop activities that celebrate the history of Jefferson and build student and teacher spirit.

Person Responsible: Bernard Cannon (bernard.cannon@sdhc.k12.fl.us)

By When: reviewed weekly

#2. 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.

Standards aligned lessons to deliver and assess learning of grade-level, rigorous content.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Each tested area developed a goal for their subject.

ELA will increase level 3 proficiency by 3%.

Math will increase the percent of students who earn a level 3 by 4%.

Biology will increase the percent of students who earn a level 3 by 2%.

US History will increase the percent of students who earn a level 3 by 3%.

Monitoring:

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

PLC data, common assessments, and progress monitoring will allow for monitoring of the instructional practice goal.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jocelynn Maroon-Hart (jocelyn.marron-hart@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.)

According to the What Works Clearing house, organizing instruction and study time has a promising Tier 3 impact.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Using the PLC structure, common planning times, common assessments and progress monitoring, we can ensure that instruction is organized to have a positive impact on academic gains.

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 3 - Promising 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.

Effectively discuss data trends and plan for addressing deficiencies during PLC.

Person Responsible: Jocelynn Maroon-Hart (jocelyn.marron-hart@hcps.net)

By When: 2 x monthly throughout the year.

Create schedule to afford more time for teachers collaborate during planning periods where possible.

Person Responsible: Jocelynn Maroon-Hart (jocelyn.marron-hart@hcps.net)

By When: July and August

Provide students common assessments created by district leaders for data analysis.

Person Responsible: Jocelynn Maroon-Hart (jocelyn.marron-hart@hcps.net)

By When: Schedule determine in collaboration with Assistant Principal for Curriculum and each Department Head.

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)).

As an Additional Targeted Support and Improvement school, we have allocated \$400 per teacher to support classroom initiative and supplies. Our school has instituted a free school supply store for our students paid through Title I. Title I paid to purchase No Red Ink subscription for all of our students to support writing in the classroom.

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.

The SIP is provided to parents through our Website (<https://www.hillsboroughschools.org/domain/3840>) and in our SAC meetings. These meetings include a monthly update on our SIP progress and feedback protocol from our stakeholders to implement change as necessary. Teachers create the goal for the tested subjects to be added to the SIP during pre-planning. Teachers receive a copy of the SIP in August and are provided time to give input prior to a school vote.

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))

Jefferson includes parents, community members, and students in our PTSA and SAC committees. Each of these groups focuses on creating an inclusive and welcoming environment for our parents and students. We review data and discuss barriers to access that can be addressed at the school site. (<https://www.hillsboroughschools.org/domain/3840>)

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))

Jefferson has reduced its passing periods to 4 minutes to afford more classroom instructional time. We institute a 10-minute rule on campus. This rule limits passes outside of the classroom during the 1st 10 minutes and the last 10 minutes of the class to preserve instructional time.

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))

n/a