Holmes County High School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Holmes County High School

105 BLUE DEVIL DR, Bonifay, FL 32425

http://hchs.hdsb.org/

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Holmes County School Board on 9/11/2023.

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.

We believe all students can learn; therefore, the mission of Holmes County High School is to provide a curriculum to develop the mental, physical, emotional, and social skills of students to enable them to make a successful transition into their chosen path upon graduation.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Our vision is to become a high school that maintains a peaceful, productive, and orderly learning environment which promotes the academic, social, and developmental needs of all students while also being ranked in the top 10% of high schools in the state in student achievement.

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
Pender, Laurence	Principal	Oversees all school based initiatives; Teacher evaluations; Maintaining upkeep of building; Faculty/staff retention/replacement
Russ, Ciara	School Counselor	Oversees the master schedule; Oversees student schedules and graduation requirements. She also provides career and academic guidance to students. ESE Lead for HCHS.
Ward, Melissa	Curriculum Resource Teacher	Assessment scheduling and monitoring; Title 1 Liason (SIP/SAC); Coordinates and monitors MTSS; Endorsed Literacy Coach providing support as teachers implement the adopted curriculum; Provides for curriculum needs and support to all teachers.
Bailey, Heather	Assistant Principal	Attendance/truancy; Discipline/behavior; Threat Assessment Team chair; Faculty/Staff retention/replacement; Teacher evaluations
Steverson, Vicki	Teacher, K-12	Provides information about core instruction, participates in the collection and analysis of data, and collaborates with the department team members to implement school-based initiatives.
Etheridge, Lucy	Instructional Media	Provides information about core instruction, participates in the collection and analysis of data, and collaborates school-wide to implement school-based initiatives, media and library reading initiatives.

Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Development
Describe the process for involving stakeholders (including the school leadership team, teachers and school staff, parents, students (mandatory for secondary schools) and families, and business or community leaders) and how their input was used in the SIP development process. (ESSA 1114(b)(2))

Note: If a School Advisory Council is used to fulfill these requirements, it must include all required stakeholders.

The school leadership team is involved in the development of the School Improvement Plan. Afterwards, the plan will be presented to the members of our school SAC committee for review. Our SAC committee will include teachers, staff, students, parents, business and community leaders. A deadline will be set to provide input. Members will email Mrs. Ward with any input and/or questions they have. If the input is reasonable, it will be added to the plan. A SAC meeting will be scheduled for final review and approval before submission to the district office.

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))

At the end of each progress monitoring window, the School Leadership Team will convene to review the data. At this point, decisions will be made as to whether we should continue with our current plan or make some changes.
Also, in between PM 1-3, as teachers or SLT members see needs arise within classrooms, they will go to our Lead and share ideas in order to get help.

Demographic Data Only ESSA identification and school grade history updated 3/11/2024	
2023-24 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	High School 9-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	Yes
2022-23 Minority Rate	14%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	84%
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)* Black/African American Students (BLK)* Multiracial Students (MUL)* White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History	2021-22: C

*2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	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	19	19
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	40	40
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21	21
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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	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	11	11

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	1	1
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1

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

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

Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Total
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	52
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	98
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	64
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	42

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

Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Total
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	27

The number of students identified retained:

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

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

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Total
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	

Grade Level header spans K–8.

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review

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

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

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	43	43	50	59	59	51	51		
ELA Learning Gains				52			54		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				38			43		
Math Achievement*	37	37	38	32	37	38	22		
Math Learning Gains				34			11		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				34			26		
Science Achievement*	64	64	64	57	32	40	62		
Social Studies Achievement*	79	79	66	68	34	48	74		
Middle School Acceleration					46	44			
Graduation Rate	91	91	89	100	56	61	99		
College and Career Acceleration	53	53	65	60	68	67	42		
ELP Progress			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)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	61
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	367
Total Components for the Federal Index	6
Percent Tested	96
Graduation Rate	91

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	3
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	534
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	95
Graduation Rate	100

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	40	Yes	4	
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK				
HSP	30	Yes	1	1
MUL	46			
PAC				
WHT	62			

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%
FRL	55			

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	40	Yes	3	
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	30	Yes	3	1
HSP				
MUL	30	Yes	1	1
PAC				
WHT	55			
FRL	48			

Accountability Components by Subgroup

Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school. (pre-populated)

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2021-22	C & C Accel 2021-22	ELP Progress
All Students	43			37			64	79		91	53	
SWD	17			20			25	36		40	6	
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK												
HSP	30										1	
MUL	46										1	

| **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
PAC												
WHT	44			37			69	79		53	6	
FRL	39			34			51	73		43	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	59	52	38	32	34	34	57	68		100	60	
SWD	22	35	25	24	47		37	44		100	25	
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	36	36		17								
HSP												
MUL				30								
PAC												
WHT	62	55	37	35	35	36	59	70		100	61	
FRL	50	42	30	25	37	29	54	60		100	51	

| **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	51	54	43	22	11	26	62	74		99	42	
SWD	14	34	38	12	9		27			100	6	
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	30	60										
HSP												
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	54	53	39	22	9	26	64	74		99	44	
FRL	40	45	43	20	12	18	55	66		100	44	

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	47%	42%	5%	50%	-3%
09	2023 - Spring	46%	43%	3%	48%	-2%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	18%	32%	-14%	50%	-32%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	55%	45%	10%	48%	7%

BIOLOGY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	66%	47%	19%	63%	3%

HISTORY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	79%	62%	17%	63%	16%

III. Planning for Improvement

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

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

The math component is the lowest performing. School closure, due to covid, in the early Spring of 2020 is a contributing factor. Because foundational skills were not taught or consistently reviewed, students were unable to
apply or use these skills where necessary. Also, absences became an issue the following year with reoccurrences of Covid in families. Students were quarantined and instruction wasn't reliable and consistent.

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

Our ELA learning gains for black students declined by 24% from 2021-2022. Truancy was an issue during both years. The percentage truant was the same for both sets of data, 10%. Truancy was consistent throughout all four quarters of each year. The only difference was student enrollment was slightly down 2021-22.

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.

Our Multiracial Math component showed the greatest gap with a difference of 26.8%. A lack of consistent instruction and opportunities for practice and application are contributing factors. This is due to the fact that school closed in March of 2020 because of Covid. When the new school year began, students continued to be quarantined due to the pandemic missing important instruction that could not be made up properly.

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

Our English Language Arts assessment component showed the most improvement particularly with our Economically Disadvantaged students with a 9.3% difference. Our focus began to turn toward MTSS targeting Tier 2 and Tier 3 students.

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

We do not have EWS data as we are a high school. However, attendance is a real concern for our school.

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

Providing a safe learning environment
Providing authentic interventions for Tier 2 & Tier 3 students
Insuring college and career readiness
Increasing/Maintaining Graduation Rate
Supporting teachers

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 Teacher Retention and Recruitment

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed.
One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

At the end of the 2022-23 school year, we lost fifteen teachers. Thirty-three percent were first year teachers. At the end of the 2021-22 school year, we lost twelve teachers. If this trend continues our families will lose confidence in our ability to provide consistence, effective instruction. Our desire is to implement a plan to retain highly qualified teachers who understand our standards and teach with them embedded in their instruction.

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

The school plans to retain 98% of current faculty, including new hires. Administration will provide support through walkthroughs and immediate feedback. New hires will participate in a beginning teacher mentor program. Administration will begin to develop a plan for bi-weekly PLC's and professional learning opportunities. Teachers will be provided a Survey Monkey to help guide these opportunities.

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

Administrative walk through information and data analysis from each PM 1-3 will be used to monitor the desired outcome.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Melissa Ward (wardm@hdsb.org)

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.)

Weekly walkthroughs by leadership team as well as timely feedback. Our instructional coach will provide coaching cycles to assist teachers in implementation of instructional practices.

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

When teachers know their administration is involved and concerned with their professional growth, it makes a difference. Also, if we hold our faculty to a higher standard, they will eventually hold themselves there too.

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.

1. Survey will be conducted to assess faculty needs
2. Once information has been evaluated, plans will be made for PLCs
3. A schedule will be created and faculty will be informed.
4. Materials will be purchased and PLCs will begin.

Person Responsible: Melissa Ward (wardm@hdsb.org)

By When: Survey conducted by September 1, 2023 PLC's begin first week of October 2023

#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.

The percentage of students scoring level 3 or higher during the 2021-22 school year in math was thirty-two compared to the states fifty-three percent. After looking at each component of data this was determined to be the greatest area of need.

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

By the end of the 2024 school year, HCHS will increase their math achievement by 30% as reported at the end on PM 3.

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

Data monitoring through all three PM windows.
Data from Intensive math courses for students scoring Level 1's on previous years progress monitor.
MTSS documentation

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Melissa Ward (wardm@hdsb.org)

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.)

MTSS
Intensive math courses
Exact Path and Study Island

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

MTSS tracks a students progress and allows interventions to be monitored and adjusted as needed.
Intensive math courses allows for struggling students to receive instruction on skills they are struggling with.
Exact Path/Study Island is a research and evidence based program which supports students with math skills and 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.

Progress Monitor PM1-PM3
Assign students to Intensive Math classes based on EOY assessment scores.
Meet with teachers to establish who their MTSS students are. Set up meetings and talk to parents.
Train teachers on Exact Path and Study Island.

Person Responsible: Melissa Ward (wardm@hdsb.org)

By When: September 1, 2023

#3. 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.

2021-2022 data indicate ELA proficiency rate of 59%, math proficiency rate of 32%, science proficiency rate of 57%, and a Social Studies rate of 68%. All areas are above state average with the exception of math.

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

State student data will reflect a minimum proficiency rate of 50% or higher in all school grade components.

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

Data from PM windows 1-3 will be used to monitor student mastery of grade level benchmarks. SBLT will monitor target/task alignment through weekly focused classroom walkthrough using the standard tool.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Heather Bailey (heatherl.bailey@hdsb.org)

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.)

Biweekly PLCs to target areas of need.
Co-Planning and Co-Teaching with Instructional Coach.
Data meetings in order to adjust and plan for instruction.

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

By focusing on areas of professional need/weakness, co-planning and teaching, and looking closely at data, we can build capacity and therefore provide more effective instruction where our students can succeed.

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.

1.Create a school calendar that includes assessment dates, professional learning sessions, and data meetings.
2. Monitor teacher use of data.
3. Data analysis of monthly assessments and progress monitoring data for student growth.

Person Responsible: Melissa Ward (wardm@hdsb.org)

By When: September 1, 2023

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).

The School Based Leadership Team will meet and discuss how our funds can be used. At this point, we will have a specific place to make a list of resources needed. Once a month we will come together to discuss any projects/needs that have been brought to our attention and see if we can

Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE)

Area of Focus Description and Rationale
Include a description of your Area of Focus (Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA) for each grade below, how it affects student learning in literacy, and a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed. Data that should be used to determine the critical need should include, at a minimum:

- The percentage of students below Level 3 on the 2022 statewide, standardized ELA assessment. Identification criteria must include each grade that has 50 percent or more students scoring below level 3 in grades 3-5 on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.

- The percentage of students in kindergarten through grade 3, based on 2021-2022 end of year screening and progress monitoring data, who are not on track to score Level 3 or above on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.

- Other forms of data that should be considered: formative, progress monitoring and diagnostic assessment data.

Grades K-2: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

Grades 3-5: Instructional Practice specifically related to Reading/ELA

Measurable Outcomes
State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each grade below. This should be a data-based, objective outcome. Include prior year data and a measurable outcome for each of the following:

- Each grade K -3, using the coordinated screening and progress monitoring system, where 50 percent or more of the students are not on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment;

- Each grade 3-5 where 50 percent or more of its students scored below a Level 3 on the most recent statewide, standardized ELA assessment; and

- Grade 6 measurable outcomes may be included, as applicable.

Grades K-2 Measurable Outcomes

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

Monitoring

Monitoring
Describe how the school's Area(s) of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcomes. Include a description of how ongoing monitoring will impact student achievement outcomes.

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome
Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Evidence-based Practices/Programs

Description:
Describe the evidence-based practices/programs being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each grade and describe how the identified practices/programs will be monitored. The term "evidence-based" means demonstrating a statistically significant effect on improving student outcomes or other relevant outcomes as provided in 20 U.S.C. §7801(21)(A)(i). Florida's definition limits evidence-based practices/programs to only those with strong, moderate or promising levels of evidence.

- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs meet Florida's definition of evidence-based (strong, moderate or promising)?

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align with the district's K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan?

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align to the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards?

Rationale:
Explain the rationale for selecting practices/programs. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting the practices/programs.

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs address the identified need?

- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

Action Steps to Implement
List the action steps that will be taken to address the school's Area(s) of Focus. To address the area of focus, identify 2 to 3 action steps and explain in detail for each of the categories below:

- Literacy Leadership

- Literacy Coaching

- Assessment

- Professional Learning

Action Step	Person Responsible for Monitoring

Title I Requirements

Schoolwide Program Plan (SWP) Requirements
This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A SWP and opts to use the SIP to satisfy the requirements of the SWP plan, as outlined in the ESSA, Public Law No. 114-95, § 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

Provide the methods for dissemination of this SIP, UniSIG budget and SWP to stakeholders (e.g., students, families, school staff and leadership and local businesses and organizations). Please articulate a plan or protocol for how this SIP and progress will be shared and disseminated and to the extent practicable, provided in a language a parent can understand. (ESSA 1114(b)(4))
List the school's webpage* where the SIP is made publicly available.

The SIP will be accessible through our school and district website. We will also post a link on our Facebook page. There will also be a hard copy located in the front office and in the media center.

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))

HCHS does maintain a website and a Facebook page. We also offer a number of ways parents can volunteer at our school. For example, we invite parents, community, and business leaders to be a part of our SAC committee.

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))

We plan to build a culture of support. Implementing professional learning opportunities, being in the classrooms with the teachers, co-teaching, co-planning, and working things out with them, we think will strengthen our program.

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))

NA

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))

We have an on site school counselor. Beyond this, our district contracts with counseling services which meet with students in an designated location at our school. Also, our district School Safety and Mental Health department readily steps in with guidance.

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))

Students at our school are allowed to dual enroll with local colleges and technical schools. Seniors are also allowed to enroll in OJT (On the Job Training).

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).

All students are help to the discipline plan described in the Student Code of Conduct. If a student has a specific behavior plan due to diagnosed disability, this would be followed in order to prevent future issues. The behavior plan will be referred to in all instances and re-evaluated as necessary.

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))

Professional learning opportunities are provided for all throughout the year. We are looking forward to implementing PLCs this year. Also, at the district level, professional learning is provided for all adopted curriculums. Opportunities are also offered for content areas through the district and our local consortium.

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))

NA

Budget to Support Areas of Focus

Part VII: Budget to Support Areas of Focus

The approved budget does not reflect any amendments submitted for this project.

1	III.B.	Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Teacher Retention and Recruitment	$0.00
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Benchmark-aligned Instruction	$0.00
3	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Benchmark-aligned Instruction	$0.00
		Total:	$0.00

Budget Approval

Check if this school is eligible and opting out of UniSIG funds for the 2023-24 school year.

Yes