Wharton High School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Wharton High School

20150 BRUCE B DOWNS BLVD, Tampa, FL 33647

[no web address on file]

SIP Authority

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

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

Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)
A school not identified for CSI or TSI, but has one or more subgroups with a Federal Index below 41%.

Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)
A school not identified as CSI that has at least one consistently underperforming subgroup with a Federal Index below 32% for three consecutive years.

Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)
A school can be identified as CSI in any of the following four ways: 1. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%; 2. Have a graduation rate at or below 67%; 3. Have a school grade of D or F; or 4. Have a Federal Index below 41% in the same subgroup(s) for 6 consecutive years.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

I. School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

To provide students with a meaningful education that develops creative, productive and responsible students.

Provide the school's vision statement.

All students will reach their maximum potential, graduate high school, and be prepared for lifelong success.

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
Rowan, Michael	Principal	Directs and coordinates educational, administrative, and counseling activities at Wharton High School. Serves as the instructional leader, and develops and evaluates educational programs to ensure conformance to state, national, and school board standards.
Lefebvre, Crystal	Assistant Principal	Helps directs and coordinates educational, administrative, and counseling activities at Wharton High School. Also, serves as the instructional leader, and develops and evaluates educational programs to ensure conformance to state, national, and school board standards.
Torres, Maria	SAC Member	Student and Parent Engagement Liaison

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.

SAC meets at least once a month to discuss upcoming plans of action and to get updates from school's administration. These meetings usually include teachers, PTSA, students, admin, and the SAC Chairperson. This year we are going to be proactively seeking for the community engagement. We are all committed to school-wide changes to progress as one.

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))

SAC Chairperson will continue to work on the agenda for the monthly meetings and the minutes after the meeting. These will now be shared will all faculty, and SAC members present at the meetings for reference. We will continue to work closely with administration on the completion of the plans put in place and on its progress.

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	73%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	83%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	ATSI
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD)* English Language Learners (ELL)* Asian Students (ASN) Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: C 2019-20: C 2018-19: C 2017-18: C
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems	

Using 2022-23 data, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	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	

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that have two or more early warning indicators:

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

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

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

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

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	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	

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

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

The number of students identified retained:

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

Prior Year (2022-23) Updated (pre-populated)
Section 3 includes data tables that are pre-populated based off information submitted in prior year's SIP.

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**	**7**	**8**	
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	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	

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

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

The number of students identified retained:

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

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review

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

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

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	42	51	50	43	52	51	43		
ELA Learning Gains				44			45		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				30			35		
Math Achievement*	36	42	38	35	39	38	33		
Math Learning Gains				41			28		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				28			30		
Science Achievement*	52	64	64	58	46	40	53		
Social Studies Achievement*	60	69	66	68	49	48	69		
Middle School Acceleration					41	44			
Graduation Rate	89	89	89	91	64	61	93		
College and Career Acceleration	66	62	65	52	72	67	43		
ELP Progress	25	39	45	48			35		

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	53
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	370
Total Components for the Federal Index	7

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
Percent Tested	97
Graduation Rate	89

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	49
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	538
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	98
Graduation Rate	91

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	29	Yes	4	1
ELL	35	Yes	4	
AMI				
ASN	78			
BLK	46			
HSP	47			
MUL	70			
PAC				
WHT	71			
FRL	42			

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	33	Yes	3	
ELL	38	Yes	3	
AMI				
ASN	74			
BLK	41			
HSP	44			
MUL	58			
PAC				
WHT	58			
FRL	43			

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	42			36			52	60		89	66	25
SWD	14			11			18	26		24	6	
ELL	8			14			21	35		67	7	25
AMI												
ASN	73			67			69	82		80	6	
BLK	34			27			36	49		44	6	
HSP	34			28			48	49		63	7	23
MUL	57			48			89	54		83	6	
PAC												
WHT	52			50			63	80		82	6	
FRL	29			24			37	45		49	7	25

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	43	44	30	35	41	28	58	68		91	52	48
SWD	13	33	27	22	35	27	21	42		83	19	40
ELL	11	34	30	20	35	35	25	42		92	41	48
AMI												
ASN	79	55		63	43		88	92		100	69	
BLK	29	38	28	27	40	35	46	56		85	30	
HSP	31	41	33	29	36	23	50	57		88	50	45
MUL	59	35		53	43		59	73		93	52	
PAC												
WHT	62	53	27	46	48	25	75	84		96	65	
FRL	28	39	30	25	36	27	47	56		87	41	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	43	45	35	33	28	30	53	69		93	43	35
SWD	15	30	31	20	35	38	25	31		84	24	25
ELL	12	33	38	18	23	35	30	44		83	29	35
AMI												
ASN	68	70		48	37		82	83		100	66	
BLK	30	34	29	22	24	29	38	50		90	27	
HSP	31	40	36	26	27	29	41	65		89	39	33
MUL	41	46		40	36		67	93		96	52	
PAC												
WHT	67	57	44	55	33	32	75	83		97	56	43
FRL	26	36	34	24	25	31	42	57		88	27	30

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	43%	50%	-7%	50%	-7%
09	2023 - Spring	39%	48%	-9%	48%	-9%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	26%	55%	-29%	50%	-24%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	44%	49%	-5%	48%	-4%

BIOLOGY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	51%	62%	-11%	63%	-12%

HISTORY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	58%	65%	-7%	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 lowest performance found is in Math achievement with Algebra showing only 26% in 2022/23 vs 23% in 2021/22 and Geometry showing 44% in 2022/23 vs 40% in 2021/22. Some of the factors that may have contributed to these is teacher turn over/shortage.

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

The data that showed greatest decline in 2022/23 was US History Achievement with 58% vs 66% in 2021/22. Some of the factors that may have contributed to these is teacher turn over/shortage.

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 data that had the greatest gap when compared to the district in 2022/2023 was Algebra 1. Factors that contributed to this is teacher turn over/shortage. Additionally, the district compares 7th graders who take the Algebra 1 exam to our 10th graders.

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

Geometry went up by 4% in the 2022-2023 school year. During the 2022-2023 school year, our geometry teachers focused on strengthening their PLCs and using common assessment data to drive instruction.

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

Attendance is a potential area of concern.

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

Our highest priorities this school year are:
1. Standards-based instruction
2. Strengthen PLCs using best practices
3. Using assessment throughout the lesson and making real-time adjustments
4. Continued growth of our acceleration point student population.

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 Professional Learning Communities

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.

By concentrating on best practices as we establish and uphold group norms, focus on student-centered discussions, examine and critique student work, and work together to solve problems, we will increase the productivity of our professional learning communities.

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

To establish expectations, roles, and conventions, school-wide PLCs will convene. PLCs hold biweekly meetings where they concentrate on reviewing student work, working together to solve problems, providing standards-based instruction, and conducting daily and routine evaluations.

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

The PLCs will be observed by administrative and instructional leadership. Each PLC appoints a leader who will be responsible for creating an agenda and deciding whether the PLC will be data- or planning-focused.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Michael Rowan (michael.rowan@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.)

Teachers will establish and uphold norms, concentrate on student-centered conversations, evaluate student work, engage in group problem-solving, design lessons around standards based on directives, and plan for the implementation of daily assessment procedures in the PLCs.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

PLCs were highlighted as a school-wide focus in the teachers' feedback that was obtained during the pre-planning phase. With the use of these technologies, teachers will be able to support not only the whole school but also the worst quartile across all subject areas, which will result in a general improvement.

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.

PLCs will set up PLC Leads and PLC Norms. Reminding the PLC of upcoming PLC themes, materials, resources, and data to bring to the PLC is the responsibility of the PLC Leaders. Administrators will be an active part of each PLC. PLCs will focus on standards based instruction, gradual release of students, assesssing throughout, analyzing data and using the data to drive instruction.
A school-wide PD on effective PLCs will be conducted in order to increase the PLC's efficacy. The

leadership team will continue to monitor the effectiveness of PLCs. PLCs will receive additional, continuing, differentiated assistance from the administrative team and the teacher talent developer.

Person Responsible: Michael Rowan (michael.rowan@hcps.net)

By When: August 12th and every Tuesday through out the year

Teachers in PLCs will examine student data, particularly the SWD and ELL categories. PLCs will create plans for adaptations, accommodations, differentiation with enrichment, and remediation to ensure that each student's requirements are satisfied. By compiling data for PLC review and modifying their lesson plans and instruction, teachers will continue to keep an eye on the development of their students.

Person Responsible: Michael Rowan (michael.rowan@hcps.net)

By When: August 12th and every Tuesday through out the year

#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.

By designing lessons backward, deconstructing the standard, and comprehending the standard's level, teachers will consciously create lessons around education that is based on standards.

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

Teachers during PLC shall adhere to a biweekly PLC log with a focus on instruction that is based on standards. Additionally, while conducting walkthroughs on standard-based teaching, ILT and department heads will gather information.

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

PLC logs will be used by instructional leadership, including the administration, to gather data to track whether teachers are developing standards-based lessons. Walkthrough forms will be used by ILT and department heads to collect data to check that teachers are implementing standard-based teachings.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Michael Rowan (michael.rowan@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 standard will be broken down by teachers, who will then use backward design lesson planning to develop and implement lessons that provide standards-aligned outcomes. Teachers will have numerous opportunity to improve their teaching by learning new skills through biweekly professional development. Additionally, teachers will receive collaborative support over model classrooms, allowing them to observe strategies being used right immediately and use them in their own classes.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Based on pre-planning information and instructor comments, it was decided to design lessons on standards. The development of new techniques is teacher-driven, teacher-selected, and teacher-guided. This enables "best practices" to be shared collaboratively by the teaching staff in order to improve learning for everyone and provide equal opportunities for all pupils.

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.

ILT that works, capable PLCs, a positive change in the culture and perspective of the school, participation in professional development activities like Teach ME Tuesdays, demonstration classrooms, and book studies. To achieve this goal, there is a guidance support team that is visible in the cafeteria, hallways,

and classrooms, as well as the Wildcat Connection. Department coaches, department heads, and instructional leadership will keep an eye on these.

Person Responsible: Michael Rowan (michael.rowan@hcps.net)

By When:

#3. 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.

Daily assessments will be utilized to track student progress throughout courses and units, make in-class and formative adjustments as needed, and give timely feedback. Due to data from classroom walkthroughs and instructor evaluations, daily assessments were chosen as the area of focus.

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

ILT, admin, and department heads, will perform walk-throughs and collect data on assessments used during daily lessons with a goal of at least three assessments per class period. In the 2022-2023 school year, the FAST ELA percentage of students with a level 3 or higher decreased by 3%, from 41% in 2021/22 to 38% in 2022/23. Algebra 1 FAST percent of students with a level 3 or higher will increase by 3%, from 23% in 2021/22 to 26% in 2022/23.

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

ILT, and department heads, will perform walkthroughs and collect data on assessments used during daily lessons.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Michael Rowan (michael.rowan@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.)

Teach Me Tuesdays will provide instructors with professional development, with a focus on daily assessments throughout lessons. Specific instructional strategies will be chosen based on data from coaching cycles and classroom walkthroughs.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Using daily assessments, teachers will be adept to enhance student learning by utilizing daily assessments to guide 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.

In PLCs, teachers plan assessments to be used throughout a lesson to determine the level of student understanding and modify the lesson as necessary. Teach Me Tuesdays, site-based professional development, demonstration classrooms, instructional coaches, department heads, and teacher talent developers will all support instructors.

Person Responsible: Michael Rowan (michael.rowan@hcps.net)

By When:

<table>
<tr><td>

#4. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Other

</td></tr>
<tr><td>

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.

</td></tr>
<tr><td>

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

</td></tr>
<tr><td>

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

</td></tr>
<tr><td>

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

</td></tr>
</table>

[no one identified]

<table>
<tr><td>

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.)

</td></tr>
<tr><td>

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

</td></tr>
<tr><td>

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).)

</td></tr>
</table>

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

<table>
<tr><td>

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

</td></tr>
</table>

No

<table>
<tr><td>

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.

</td></tr>
</table>

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

#5. 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.

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

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

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

[no one identified]

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.)

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention
(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement
List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

CSI, TSI and ATSI Resource Review
Describe the process to review school improvement funding allocations and ensure resources are allocated based on needs. This section must be completed if the school is identified as ATSI, TSI or CSI in addition to completing an Area(s) of Focus identifying interventions and activities within the SIP (ESSA 1111(d)(1)(B)(4) and (d)(2)(C).

-

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.

-

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))

-

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)

-

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))

-

Optional Component(s) of the Schoolwide Program Plan
Include descriptions for any additional strategies that will be incorporated into the plan.

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

-

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

-

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

-

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

-

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

-