

Hillsborough County Public Schools

Rampello K 8 Magnet School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	10
III. Planning for Improvement	16
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

Rampello K 8 Magnet School

802 E WASHINGTON ST, Tampa, FL 33602

[no web address on file]

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes (F.S.), requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a new, amended, or continuation SIP for each school in the district which has a school grade of D or F; has a significant gap in achievement on statewide, standardized assessments administered pursuant to s. 1008.22 by one or more student subgroups, as defined in the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), 20 U.S.C. s. 6311(b)(2)(C)(v)(II); has not significantly increased the percentage of students passing statewide, standardized assessments; has not significantly increased the percentage of students demonstrating Learning Gains, as defined in s. 1008.34, and as calculated under s. 1008.34(3)(b), who passed statewide, standardized assessments; has been identified as requiring instructional supports under the Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE) program established in s. 1008.365; or has significantly lower graduation rates for a subgroup when compared to the state's graduation rate. Rule 6A-1.098813, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.), requires district school boards to approve a SIP for each Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) school in the district rated as Unsatisfactory.

Below are the criteria for identification of traditional public and public charter schools pursuant to the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) State plan:

Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)

A school not identified for CSI or TSI, but has one or more subgroups with a Federal Index below 41%.

Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)

A school not identified as CSI that has at least one consistently underperforming subgroup with a Federal Index below 32% for three consecutive years.

Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)

A school can be identified as CSI in any of the following four ways:

1. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%;
2. Have a graduation rate at or below 67%;
3. Have a school grade of D or F; or
4. Have a Federal Index below 41% in the same subgroup(s) for 6 consecutive years.

ESEA sections 1111(d) requires that each school identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI develop a support and improvement plan created in partnership with stakeholders (including principals and other school leaders, teachers and parent), is informed by all indicators in the State's accountability system, includes evidence-based interventions, is based on a school-level needs assessment, and identifies resource inequities to be addressed through implementation of the plan. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as TSI, ATSI and non-Title I CSI must be approved and monitored by the school district. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as Title I, CSI must be approved by the school district and

Department. The Department must monitor and periodically review implementation of each CSI plan after approval.

The Department's SIP template in the Florida Continuous Improvement Management System (CIMS), <https://www.floridacims.org>, meets all state and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all ESSA components for a support and improvement plan required for traditional public and public charter schools identified as CSI, TSI and ATSI, and eligible schools applying for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) funds.

Districts may allow schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions to develop a SIP using the template in CIMS.

The responses to the corresponding sections in the Department's SIP template may address the requirements for: 1) Title I schools operating a schoolwide program (SWD), pursuant to ESSA, as amended, Section 1114(b); and 2) charter schools that receive a school grade of D or F or three consecutive grades below C, pursuant to Rule 6A-1.099827, F.A.C. The chart below lists the applicable requirements.

SIP Sections	Title I Schoolwide Program	Charter Schools
I-A: School Mission/Vision		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(1)
I-B-C: School Leadership, Stakeholder Involvement & SIP Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(2-3)	
I-E: Early Warning System	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-A-C: Data Review		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-F: Progress Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(3)	
III-A: Data Analysis/Reflection	ESSA 1114(b)(6)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(4)
III-B: Area(s) of Focus	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(i-iii)	
III-C: Other SI Priorities		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(5-9)
VI: Title I Requirements	ESSA 1114(b)(2, 4-5), (7)(A)(iii)(I-V)-(B) ESSA 1116(b-g)	

Note: Charter schools that are also Title I must comply with the requirements in both columns.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Department encourages schools to use the SIP as a “living document” by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

I. School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

Create life-long learners who will be the leaders of tomorrow.

Provide the school's vision statement.

We will provide a safe harbor that encourages personal growth through academic excellence, individual determination, and service to others.

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
Youmans, Justin	Principal	Develops, leads, evaluates, and facilitates data-based decision-making, ensures that the MTSS Team implements, documents, and communicates with staff and parents regarding school-based plans and activities. Assists in developing the master schedule and interventions within the schedule. Responsible for overall school functioning.
Hanks, Heather	Assistant Principal	Responsible for progress monitoring through data collection, data analysis, professional development and intervention approaches. Helps to develop master schedule and interventions within the schedule. Provides information about core content, identifies and analyzes key student data points to assist with Tier 2 and Tier 3 interventions within the classroom.
Faragure, Gabrielle	Magnet Coordinator	Oversee SAC School Improvement Plan as SAC Chair, Conduct SAC monthly meetings. Supports students and staff to provide services and expertise on issues ranging from interventions with groups of students to individual students with academic and behavioral needs.
Herdel, Stephanie	Assistant Principal	Responsible for progress monitoring through data collection, data analysis, professional development and intervention approaches. Helps to develop master schedule and interventions within the schedule. Provides information about core content, identifies and analyzes key student data points to assist with Tier 2 and Tier 3 interventions within the classroom. Assists SAC Chair with monitoring and implementing SIP.

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.

Principal, Assistant Principals, and Magnet Coordinator collaborated to establish instructional priorities for the 2023-2024 school year. The cultural priority was determined by the Assistant Principals and the Principal. The cultural priority of restorative practices will be implemented through trainings facilitated led by the Magnet Coordinator.

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))

Analyzing progress monitoring data provided by the STAR and FAST assessments we will be able to determine the effectiveness of the SIP. Principals and Assistant Principals will be providing walk through observation feedback monthly to ensure all teachers are implementing the instructional and cultural priorities. Trainings and professional learning opportunities will be provided for those who are struggling to effectively impact students with the greatest achievement gap. The SIP plan will be revised by the Principal, Assistant Principals and the Magnet Coordinator based on the results of the progress monitoring assessments and walk through observations.

Demographic Data

Only ESSA identification and school grade history updated 3/11/2024

2023-24 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School KG-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	65%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	43%
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) 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	

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	4	9	8	11	6	11	12	13	74	
One or more suspensions	0	1	0	0	4	0	8	4	19	36	
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	4	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	7	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	6	12	27	14	14	0	73	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	6	9	25	12	13	0	65	
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		

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	5	1	9	12	12	39	

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	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
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	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	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
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	4	9	8	11	6	11	12	13	74	
One or more suspensions	0	1	0	0	4	0	8	4	19	36	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	4	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	0	7	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	6	12	27	14	14	0	73	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	6	9	25	12	13	0	65	
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		

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	5	1	9	12	12	39

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	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
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*	66	51	53	62	51	55	62		
ELA Learning Gains				60			58		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				45			42		
Math Achievement*	75	50	55	69	41	42	59		
Math Learning Gains				74			47		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				71			30		
Science Achievement*	53	48	52	52	48	54	58		
Social Studies Achievement*	77	65	68	72	57	59	64		
Middle School Acceleration	94	70	70	96	51	51	81		
Graduation Rate		83	74		44	50			
College and Career Acceleration		33	53		68	70			
ELP Progress		52	55		73	70			

** In cases where a school does not test 95% of students in a subject, the achievement component will be different in the Federal Percent of Points Index (FPPI) than in school grades calculation.*

See [Florida School Grades, School Improvement Ratings and DJJ Accountability Ratings](#).

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	73
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	437
Total Components for the Federal Index	6

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index

Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index

ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	67
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	601
Total Components for the Federal Index	9
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

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	28	Yes	1	1
ELL	61			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	47			
HSP	77			
MUL	59			
PAC				
WHT	87			
FRL	59			

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	46			
ELL	63			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	55			
HSP	69			
MUL	58			
PAC				
WHT	73			
FRL	59			

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	66			75			53	77	94			
SWD	31			48			6				3	
ELL	63			71			50				3	
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	50			58			23	54			5	
HSP	71			79			61	81	100		6	
MUL	56			75			45				3	
PAC												
WHT	80			87			71	96	100		6	
FRL	50			61			32	65	86		6	

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	62	60	45	69	74	71	52	72	96			
SWD	29	53	43	33	60	55	47					
ELL	59	73	60	66	84		36					
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	47	57	51	54	71	77	38	48				
HSP	67	63	48	73	76	62	53	82	100			
MUL	52	65	50	67	56							
PAC												
WHT	74	61	21	83	80	79	66	95	96			
FRL	46	57	49	56	73	70	34	53	94			

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	62	58	42	59	47	30	58	64	81			
SWD	27	31	28	29	33	24	17	53				
ELL	54	61		51	43		60					
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	43	43	27	39	31	22	25	39	67			
HSP	72	68	62	67	53	44	72	70	93			
MUL	59	47		52	47		71					
PAC												
WHT	74	66	59	77	61	46	76	81	79			
FRL	49	51	35	45	40	25	48	47	75			

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
05	2023 - Spring	56%	53%	3%	54%	2%
07	2023 - Spring	59%	47%	12%	47%	12%
08	2023 - Spring	63%	44%	19%	47%	16%
04	2023 - Spring	72%	54%	18%	58%	14%
06	2023 - Spring	72%	47%	25%	47%	25%
03	2023 - Spring	69%	46%	23%	50%	19%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	76%	53%	23%	54%	22%
07	2023 - Spring	37%	36%	1%	48%	-11%
03	2023 - Spring	80%	55%	25%	59%	21%
04	2023 - Spring	80%	59%	21%	61%	19%
08	2023 - Spring	89%	57%	32%	55%	34%
05	2023 - Spring	67%	53%	14%	55%	12%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	58%	41%	17%	44%	14%
05	2023 - Spring	48%	47%	1%	51%	-3%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	100%	55%	45%	50%	50%

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

CIVICS						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	77%	64%	13%	66%	11%

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 lowest data component is reflected in Science with 53% of students at proficiency. This can be attributed to a struggle with the creation of high-quality questioning and discussion techniques.

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

There was no decline in the state-tested subjects from the 2021-2022 to the 2022-2023 school year.

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 above the state average in all subject areas. Last year we intentionally focused on small group instruction and closing our achievement gap within our school. Our data-based lesson planning helped to support students in their areas of academic need.

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

The subject areas that showed the greatest improvement were in Math (+5) and Civics (+5). Teachers utilized data-based small group instruction to support areas of need.

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

The absences of 10% or more is a potential area of concern. There are 74 total students that are indicated of being absent 10% or more. The students performing at a level 1 on the state directed FAST assessment (ELA) also brings concern. The total number of students performing at this level is 73.

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

1. Mastering high-quality questioning techniques
2. Mastering effective discussion strategies
3. Implementing Restorative Practices

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.

Based on the 2022-2023 Panorama Data, Rampello is 11% lower than the district average at a 53% when students are asked about the care and respect interactions between teachers and students. Therefore, we are implementing restorative practices schoolwide to increase the feeling of care and respect throughout the school.

Measurable Outcome:

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

There will be an increase from 53% to 65% on the 2023-2024 Panorama Data on the question regarding student and teacher mutual care and respect.

Monitoring:

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

Restorative Practice trainings will be implemented during faculty meetings throughout the school year based on the book of Fisher & Frey. These trainings will be led by the Magnet Coordinator and implemented by administration and instructional leadership team members. Principal, Assistant Principals, and Magnet Coordinator will conduct daily walk-through observations throughout the school to monitor the implementation of restorative practices. During the first panorama survey this section will be analyzed to determine the overall effectiveness of the area of focus.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Gabrielle Faragure (gabrielle.faragure@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.)

Restorative practices are evidence-based interventions that have been implemented in schools to foster a positive and inclusive school environment, promote conflict resolution, and enhance social and emotional learning among students. These practices are rooted in the principles of restorative justice, which emphasize repairing harm, building relationships, and involving all stakeholders in the resolution process.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Overall, restorative practices provide a holistic approach to discipline and conflict resolution in schools, focusing on repairing harm, building relationships, and fostering a positive and supportive learning environment. The evidence-based nature of these practices is reflected in their potential to reduce disciplinary issues, enhance student well-being, and contribute to a more inclusive and engaged school community.

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.

Develop trainings based on the Restorative Practices text by Fisher & Frey.

Person Responsible: Gabrielle Faragure (gabrielle.faragure@hcps.net)

By When: Monthly

Facilitate trainings for teachers and staff during faculty meetings.

Person Responsible: Gabrielle Faragure (gabrielle.faragure@hcps.net)

By When: Monthly

Teachers and staff will take learned knowledge and implement it throughout their class and school. Administration will monitor the implementation of restorative practices.

Person Responsible: Gabrielle Faragure (gabrielle.faragure@hcps.net)

By When: Daily

#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.

To build a classroom environment that encourages critical thinking, active participation, and effective communication using high-quality questioning & discussion techniques.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Using the FAST data, we will increase our ELA proficiency from 64% to 70% (+6%), increase Math proficiency from 75% to 80% (+5%), Science from 53% to 60% (+7), Civics from 77% to 82% (+5). Algebra EOC will maintain a proficiency level of 95-100%.

We will intentionally focus on closing the opportunity gap, or achievement gap, of our Black students, Hispanic students, and students with disabilities (SWD). For our Black Students and SWD we will increase the percent of students scoring level 3 or higher by at least 15% in every school grade component. For our Hispanic Students we will increase the percent of students scoring level 3 or higher by at least 5%.

Monitoring:

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

We will monitor our monthly and quarterly district progress monitoring data as well as our state mandated FAST and STAR progress monitoring windows.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Heather Hanks (heather.hanks@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 provide monthly professional learning opportunities for our staff on highly effective questioning techniques and quality discussion strategies during faculty meetings. In addition to our faculty meeting professional learning opportunities, we will be hosting Classroom Demonstration Days where teachers will have the opportunity to watch fellow teachers who have mastered these strategies and techniques in action. This will be followed by a meeting with administration to determine next steps for teachers.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Professional learning opportunities provide teachers with continued learning to enhance their instructional techniques and improve student engagement.

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 will collaborate to determine high-quality questioning techniques and effective discussion strategies during faculty meeting.

Person Responsible: Gabrielle Faragure (gabrielle.faragure@hcps.net)

By When: Monday 8/28

Teachers will collaborate during PLCs to implement the high-quality questioning techniques and effective strategies into daily lessons.

Person Responsible: Heather Hanks (heather.hanks@hcps.net)

By When: bi-weekly

Administrators will complete walk throughs that will provide feedback on the observed instructional priority.

Person Responsible: Heather Hanks (heather.hanks@hcps.net)

By When: monthly