

Hillsborough County Public Schools

Les Peters Academy School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	11
III. Planning for Improvement	15
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

Les Peters Academy

3930 W DR MARTIN LUTHER KING JR BLVD, Tampa, FL 33614

[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.

As an educational entity we will provide each student with the necessary tools to become productive and responsible citizens.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Our students will become academically, socially, and behaviorally proficient as we prepare them to transition back to traditional educational settings.

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
Bobo, Cornelius	Principal	<p>The Principal:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Directs and coordinates the educational, and administrative activities at the school site. • Demonstrates the Florida principal standards, serves as the instructional leader, and develops and evaluate educational programs to ensure conformance to state, national, and School Board standards. • Develops and coordinates educational programs through meetings with staff and site personnel, review of teacher's activities, and issuance of directives. • Confers with teachers, students, and site personnel regarding behavioral concerns in and out of the classroom. • Establish and maintains relationships with community organizations and other schools to coordinate educational services. • Requisitions and allocate supplies equipment and instructional material as needed. • Direct preparation of class schedules, cumulative records, and attendance reports. • Plans and monitors school budget. • Conducts staff evaluations and provides constructive feedback in effort to improve instruction and student performance.
Pettingill, Kelly	Assistant Principal	<p>The Assistant Principal will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assist with the provision of instructional, administrative, and operational leadership of the school site. • Makes our shares in the making of decisions in a timely manner, using appropriate levels of involvement so actions may be taken, and commitments made by staff and others to ensure a safe and productive learning environment. • Influences the school stakeholders by a variety of means, such as persuasive arguments, set an examples or use an expertise. • Is able to present ideals to others in an open, informative, and non-evaluative manner, is able to write and verbally communicate clearly and concisely. • Uses data to implement and/or adjust curriculum. • Provides instructional supervision gathers, analyzes, and uses data from varied and multiple sources to build relationships. • Demonstrates readiness to initiate action and takes responsibility for leading and enabling others to improve educational outcomes for students. • Organizes cooperatively with school and site staff and other stakeholders to design and implement ways to

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		<p>reach the goals and mission of the school.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Skillfully facilitates others working together effectively and shows concern for diverse perspectives.
Brabham, Joanne	School Counselor	<p>The School Counselor duties and responsibilities include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Developing, implementing and managing school guidance programs. • Program student scheduling • Advise and assist students with academic development. • Serves as Testing Chair. • Provide academic advisement and academic interventions as needed to ensure student success. • Ensure academic accommodations are implemented. • Serves as Chair of the Child Study Team.
Judge, Lynette	Other	<p>School Social Worker Provides a variety of professional Services which foster student's social, emotional, and academic growth.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Works to maximize coping skills for students in residential settings • Provides classroom support through consultation with teachers, administrators, and site personnel. • Promote and support the educational process by meeting the individual needs of students and families within the educational setting and the community. • Provides services including crisis intervention, individual counseling, and parent engagement. • Plans and develops school-based interventions with educators and site personnel. • Works with community agencies to provide support to families. <p>Assist with Positive Behavioral and Safety Support Plans.</p>

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.

At Les Peters, involving stakeholders for this site include School Leadership, Teachers and TrueCore Site Staff, Project Anchor, and Project Bridge/Project Connect. Project Anchor is for youth who have graduated from high school prior to or while in the facility's program and are transitioning into post-secondary education and/or workforce.

Partnerships with local mentors occur weekly to assist youth with coaching on presentations, education, resumes, etc. (the mentors act similar to Academic Success Coach). Project Bridge/Project Connect are community resources that assist youth with resume writing, restorative services (Driver's license, clubs, finding jobs, areas of interest when returning to their perspective homes). All youth are able to utilize the services of these stakeholders.

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))

The low performing group that we will be monitoring is the ELA Reading group. We will monitor their achievements via the Common Assessment, district pre and post assessment, and all progress monitoring (PM1, PM2, etc.) via the state FAST or BEST standards.

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 6-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Alternative Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	[Data Not Available]
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	6%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	
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)	
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	2022-23: Commendable 2021-22: Acceptable 2020-21: Commendable

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	0	
One or more suspensions	0	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	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	4	2	6	

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	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	1	
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	1	

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	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	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*		51	50		52	51			
ELA Learning Gains									
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile									
Math Achievement*		42	38		39	38			
Math Learning Gains									
Math Lowest 25th Percentile									
Science Achievement*		64	64		46	40			
Social Studies Achievement*		69	66		49	48			
Middle School Acceleration					41	44			
Graduation Rate		89	89		64	61			
College and Career Acceleration		62	65		72	67			
ELP Progress		39	45						

* 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)	
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	
Total Components for the Federal Index	
Percent Tested	
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index

OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	
Total Components for the Federal Index	
Percent Tested	
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				
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK				
HSP				
MUL				
PAC				
WHT				
FRL				

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				
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK				
HSP				

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%
MUL				
PAC				
WHT				
FRL				

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												
SWD												
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK												
HSP												
MUL												
PAC												
WHT												
FRL												

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												
SWD												
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												

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
BLK												
HSP												
MUL												
PAC												
WHT												
FRL												

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												
SWD												
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK												
HSP												
MUL												
PAC												
WHT												
FRL												

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.

III. Planning for Improvement**Data Analysis/Reflection**

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources.

Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year's low performance and discuss any trends.

The data component showing the lowest performance was ELA Reading. Significant gaps in student school attendance contributed to missed direct instruction producing significant deficiencies in basic reading skills such as comprehension and fluency.

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

Reading data component showed the greatest decline from the prior school year. Trends that occur are lack of effort from students, below grade level reading, and lack of basic reading fundamental skills, such as phonics and comprehension.

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.

Reading data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average. Comprehension of what is read, and fluency are the most problematic components of Reading. Trends that occur are lack of effort from students, below grade level reading, and lack of basic reading fundamental skills, such as phonics and comprehension.

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

Math is the data component that showed the most improvement. No new action was taken.

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

48.3% of the student population is comprised of African American, American Indian, Hispanic or Multiracial students. However, 100% of the students present as High Risk due to their Department of Juvenile Justice involvement, poor school attendance and low academic performance, resulting in significant academic gaps.

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

The highest priorities for the 2023-2024 school year are:
Differentiated Instruction
Increase academic performance

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 Early Warning System**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.

31.8% of the student population is comprised of African American, Hispanic or Multiracial students. However, 100% of students present as High Risk due to Department of Juvenile Justice involvement and poor school attendance, resulting in significant academic gaps.

Measurable Outcome:

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

EWS identified students enrolled in the program for greater than 90 school days shall increase their Common Assessment score by 3%. Common Assessment will be administered upon the student's arrival and dismissal into and from the program.

Monitoring:

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

EWS identified students enrolled in the program for greater than 90 school days shall increase their Common Assessment score by 3%. Common Assessment will be administered upon the student's arrival and dismissal into and from the program.

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.)

Common Assessment will be administered upon the student's arrival and dismissal into and from the program.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

100% of the student population is comprised of students identified with one or more Early Warning. Our students present as High Risk due to either their Department of Juvenile Justice involvement, low socioeconomic status, course failures, grade retention, below level grade performance, low assessment scores, chronic disciplinary actions, or poor school attendance, resulting in significant academic gaps.

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

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Differentiation**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.

Due to significant delays in On Grade Level academic performance in the area of Mathematics as indicated by state and school site academic assessments, Differentiated Instruction shall be implemented on Tier 2 and Tier 3 levels for all students not academically performing on grade level.

Common Assessment will be administered to all students upon enrolling in the program. Data results will drive differentiating instruction as specific computer-based tier 2 and tier 3 interventions will be developed and implement it to address student areas of deficiency.

Measurable Outcome:

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

All students not achieving Level 3 or higher on statewide assessments will receive a minimum of tier 2 academic instructional interventions in an effort to increase academic performance by one bucket level over the course of a school year. Ongoing progress monitoring will track students' response to intervention and additional academic supports will be added as needed, based on response to intervention.

Students not achieving Level 3 or higher on statewide assessments will receive Tier 2 and Tier 3 academic instructional interventions increasing academic performance by one bucket level over the course of a school year.

Monitoring:

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

Ongoing weekly progress monitoring will be conducted by the classroom teacher; ongoing bi-weekly progress monitoring will be conducted by members of the instructional leadership team. Progress monitoring plans will be reviewed and updated every semester.

Incorporation of differentiated instruction via computer-based applications and direct instructions are the evidence-based strategies being implemented.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jene Johnson (jene.johnson@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 not achieving level 3 or higher on statewide assessments will receive tier two and tier 3 academic instructional interventions increasing academic performance by one bucket level over the course of a school year.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Students present at various academic levels, with most students presenting significantly below grade level, due to significant lapses in their educational careers. These significant gaps in direct academic instruction has resulted in a lack of basic academic fundamental proficiency. Differentiated instruction allows teachers to meet students at their level of academic proficiency in an effort to mitigate and improve those academic deficiencies.

HCPS offers this research-based strategy as in service to Aid and professional development for teachers throughout the school year.

Star Testing will be administered to all students throughout their duration in the program. Data will drive differentiating instruction as specific computer-based tier 2 and tier 3 interventions will be developed and implement it to address areas of deficiency.

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

#3. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups**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.

Due to the significant delays in On Grade Level academic performance in the area of Mathematics as indicated by state and school site academic assessments, Differentiated Instruction shall be implemented on Tier 2 and Tier 3 levels for all ESSA identified students not academically performing on grade level.

Common Assessment will be administered to all ESSA identified students upon enrolling in the program. Data results will drive differentiating instruction as specific computer-based tier 2 and tier 3 interventions will be developed and implemented to address student specific areas of deficiency.

Measurable Outcome:

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

All ESSA identified students not achieving Level 3 or higher on statewide assessments will receive a minimum of Tier 2 academic instructional interventions in an effort to increase academic performance by one bucket level over the course of a school year. Ongoing progress monitoring will track students' response to intervention and additional academic supports will be added as needed, based on response to intervention.

ESSA identified students not achieving Level 3 or higher on statewide assessments will receive Tier 2 and Tier 3 academic instructional interventions in an effort to increase academic performance by one bucket level over the course of a school year.

Ongoing progress monitoring will track students' response to intervention and additional academic supports will be added as needed, based on response to intervention.

Monitoring:

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

Weekly Ongoing Progress Monitoring will be conducted by the classroom teacher; bi-weekly Ongoing Progress Monitoring will be conducted by members of the Instructional Leadership Team. Ongoing Progress Monitoring plans will be reviewed and updated every semester.

Incorporation of differentiated instruction via computer-based applications and direct instructions are the evidence-based strategies being implemented.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jene Johnson (jene.johnson@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.)

ESSA identified students not achieving Level 3 or higher on statewide assessments will receive Tier 2 and Tier 3 academic instructional interventions increasing academic performance by one bucket level over the course of a school year.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Students present at various academic levels, with most students presenting significantly below grade level, due to significant lapses in their educational careers. These significant gaps in direct academic instruction have resulted in a lack of basic academic fundamental proficiency. Differentiated instruction

allows teachers to meet students at their level of academic proficiency in an effort to mitigate and improve those academic deficiencies.

HCPS offers this research-based strategy as Professional Development to aid classroom teachers in direct academic 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.

No action steps were entered for this area of focus