

Hillsborough County Public Schools

Sickles 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

Sickles High School

7950 GUNN HWY, Tampa, FL 33626

[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.

Our mission at Sickles High School is to teach the skills, values, and habits that will provide the highest educational experience to students with care, trust, and support.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Sickles High School will provide tools for lifelong success and instill its students with loyalty, integrity, and dignity.

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
Bielitz, Samantha	Assistant Principal	Assists with the provision of instructional, administrative, and operational leadership.
Luloff, Krista	Principal	Directs and coordinates educational, administrative, and counseling activities of a public High School site. Demonstrates the Florida Principal Standards, serves as the instructional leader, and develops and evaluates educational programs to ensure conformance to state, national, and school board standards.
Lewandowski, Gregory	Assistant Principal	Assists with the provision of instructional, administrative, and operational leadership.
David, Shane	Assistant Principal	Assists with the provision of instructional, administrative, and operational leadership.
Stonaker, Robin	Teacher, K-12	Student Advisory Council chairperson. Uses data to determine school improvement goals and needed professional development; provides coaches with strategies to use in training.

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 Student Advisory Council met to review testing data and survey results to determine areas of focus for the SIP. The SAC includes parents, teachers, school counselors, HCTA representatives, students, and community members.

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))

Progress monitoring data will be used to evaluate the efficacy of the SIP areas of focus. If gains are not made by PM 2, interventions including reading and writing bootcamps will be provided to students during club periods.

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	56%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	41%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	N/A
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: A 2019-20: A 2018-19: A 2017-18: A
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review

ESSA School, District and State Comparison (pre-populated)

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school or combination schools). Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school.

On April 9, 2021, FDOE Emergency Order No. 2021-EO-02 made 2020-21 school grades optional. They have been removed from this publication.

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	65	51	50	69	52	51	66		
ELA Learning Gains				60			57		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				46			47		
Math Achievement*	59	42	38	58	39	38	53		
Math Learning Gains				51			36		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				44			40		
Science Achievement*	72	64	64	76	46	40	67		
Social Studies Achievement*	81	69	66	84	49	48	85		
Middle School Acceleration					41	44			
Graduation Rate	97	89	89	98	64	61	96		
College and Career Acceleration	64	62	65	62	72	67	61		
ELP Progress	61	39	45	58			42		

** 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)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	71
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	499
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)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	64
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	706
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	98
Graduation Rate	98

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)**2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY**

ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	43			
ELL	56			
AMI				
ASN	87			
BLK	57			
HSP	63			
MUL	71			
PAC				
WHT	80			
FRL	61			

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	45			
ELL	54			
AMI				
ASN	75			
BLK	57			
HSP	58			
MUL	74			
PAC				
WHT	71			
FRL	56			

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	65			59			72	81		97	64	61
SWD	21			25			34	57		27	6	
ELL	32			37			43	58		64	7	61
AMI												
ASN	76			90			91	93		87	7	73
BLK	46			40			46	75		33	6	
HSP	52			47			57	76		59	7	56
MUL	70			58			80	80		55	6	
PAC												
WHT	77			69			82	84		68	6	
FRL	50			48			54	72		55	7	59

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	69	60	46	58	51	44	76	84		98	62	58
SWD	24	30	22	35	56	57	42	60		98	25	
ELL	38	50	41	47	51	48	52	62		97	47	58
AMI												
ASN	80	67	45	75	59		80	94		100	76	
BLK	55	50	35	41	48	45	67	88		100	42	
HSP	57	57	37	45	45	43	67	74		98	55	57
MUL	77	57		72	59		86	96		95	52	
PAC												
WHT	77	62	63	71	55	43	82	87		98	69	
FRL	52	52	37	42	51	50	58	75		98	50	55

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	66	57	47	53	36	40	67	85		96	61	42
SWD	29	50	48	36	28	32	43	67		94	26	
ELL	34	46	43	32	29	32	39	62		97	53	42
AMI												
ASN	80	62		72	43		85	93		100	83	
BLK	51	48	33	37	57	75	54	67		91	45	
HSP	55	52	46	40	31	39	54	78		97	52	41
MUL	68	63	40	58	41		92	83		96	67	
PAC												
WHT	74	60	52	63	36	33	74	93		96	67	
FRL	52	51	45	39	32	41	57	75		94	49	37

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	67%	50%	17%	50%	17%
09	2023 - Spring	62%	48%	14%	48%	14%

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

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	67%	49%	18%	48%	19%

BIOLOGY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	70%	62%	8%	63%	7%

HISTORY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	79%	65%	14%	63%	16%

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 1 EOC data showed that only 49% of students earned a 3 or higher, which is five points lower than the county average (but seventeen points higher than the state average). Possible contributing factors include new standards paired with a new state test with which teachers were unfamiliar.

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

ELA 9 dropped six points from the previous year. A probable contributing factor is that the test was new, making year-to-year comparisons difficult to assess.

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.

Sickles High School is above the state average in all data components.

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

The data component that showed the most improvement was Geometry, as the score increased by eight points. Potential factors include ample PLC opportunities for Geometry teachers and multiple options for free student tutoring.

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

While our ELA 9th Grade score is fourteen points higher than the state average, the six-point drop from sixty-eight points to sixty-two is our greatest area of concern.

Our second area of concern continues to be Collect and Career Acceleration. Despite measures taken in the 2022 - 2023 school year, we dropped a point from 2021 - 2022.

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

1. ELA 9th Grade
2. College and Career Acceleration
3. Actionable teacher feedback

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 ELA**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.

The Sickles High School ELA 9th grade scores dropped from sixty-eight percent to sixty-two.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Sickles High School will increase ELA 9th grade scores by six percent, bringing us back to our score of sixty-eight and placing us closer to the scores of schools we are academically aligned with.

Monitoring:

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

Monthly monitoring will occur through the 9th grade PLC. Data from common assessments will be used to plan subsequent lessons.

Other monitoring will occur through Progress Monitoring data. Students in need of intervention will be identified by their PM 1 and PM 2 scores.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Shane David (shane.david@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.)

Students in need of intervention will attend ELA bootcamps every three weeks.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Rigorous research provides strong evidence that high-impact tutoring can produce large learning gains for a wide range of students, including those who have fallen behind academically. Tutoring is one of the most effective ways to increase achievement for students from lower income families. This is of particular importance at Sickles, as forty percent of students qualify for free or reduced lunch.

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.

Monthly: 9th grade ELA teachers will meet twice per month; once to create a common assessment for specific standards and a second time to review data produced by common assessments. This cycle will continue throughout the school year.

Person Responsible: Shane David (shane.david@hcps.net)

By When: Last day of each month.

Progress Monitoring Cycles: 9th grade ELA teachers will use data from PM cycles one and two to identify students who are in need of intervention. These students will be flagged for ELA bootcamps.

Person Responsible: Shane David (shane.david@hcps.net)

By When: September 29, 2023 and January 26, 2024

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Career & Technical Education**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.

The Sickles High School College and Career Acceleration dropped one point over the last cycle.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Sickles High School will increase College and Career Acceleration to sixty-six percent.

Monitoring:

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

School counselors will monitor enrollment number in CTE, AP, AICE, and Dual Enrollment courses and identify students who may be candidates for these and other college preparatory programs.

CTE teachers will monitor student certification progress.

APC will use AICE student survey data to increase number of AICE courses offered each year.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Shane David (shane.david@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.)

Course selection data will inform ILT and school counselors about which programs will require greater recruitment efforts.

CTE teachers will identify and counsel students who are not progressing with certification efforts.

AVID will use standardized test and grade data to identify students who are in the middle and might be successful in AP, AICE, Dual Enrollment, and CTE with additional support.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

These strategies target specific students who are capable of success in AP, DE, AICE, and CTE courses but may be unaware of their availability. Each use methods of progress monitoring (grades, standardized test data, etc.) to identify qualified students.

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.

August - October: School counselors will identify students who have not earned a CTE point and counsel those students on course availability and probability of success. When possible, students will be enrolled in these courses for second semester.

Person Responsible: Shane David (shane.david@hcps.net)

By When: October 31, 2023

November - December: Students currently enrolled in AP, DE, AICE, CTE, and AVID courses will promote programs via elective class visits and curriculum fairs.

Person Responsible: Robin Stonaker (robin.stonaker@hcps.net)

By When: December 15, 2023

January: School counselors and volunteer faculty members will host parent nights for each grade level to make stakeholders aware of course offerings and certification opportunities.

Person Responsible: Shane David (shane.david@hcps.net)

By When: January 31, 2024

March: APC will use course selection data to identify AP, DE, AICE, and CTE courses in need of additional recruitment.

Person Responsible: Shane David (shane.david@hcps.net)

By When: March 31, 2024

#3. 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.

Insight data indicated that teachers would appreciate more specific feedback from evaluations, particularly tools that can be immediately implemented to strengthen instruction and improve student outcomes.

Measurable Outcome:

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

On each evaluation feedback form, teachers will receive specific strategies to use in their classroom as related to areas of focus identified by the evaluator. The results of these strategies should be evident in walk-throughs and future evaluations but will be measured by the Insight survey results that become available at the end of the 2023 - 2024 school year.

Monitoring:

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

Faculty Insight survey results will show an increase in perceived value of evaluations and feedback.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Samantha Bielitz (samantha.bielitz@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.)

All teachers will be provided with a flip-chart of the evaluation instrument as well as Sickles-specific feedback language for each domain.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Teachers will understand the expectations of classroom observation and will be able to clearly decipher non-numerical feedback in order to improve classroom instruction.

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.

Teachers who are new to Sickles High School will be provided with a flip-chart of the evaluation instrument as well as Sickles-specific feedback language for each domain.

Person Responsible: Samantha Bielitz (samantha.bielitz@hcps.net)

By When: September 5, 2023

Administration and ILT will create a "Teacher Toolbox" of strategies to provide teachers along with their evaluation feedback forms. These tools will focus on one strategy in order to avoid overwhelming teachers with information.

Person Responsible: Krista Luloff (krista.luloff@hcps.net)

By When: Ongoing