Pinellas County Schools

Palm Harbor University High School

2023-24
Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Palm Harbor University High

1900 OMAHA ST, Palm Harbor, FL 34683

http://www.phuhs.org/

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 educate all students by using effective systems that promote lifelong learning

Provide the school's vision statement.

To provide a learning environment where all students successfully complete an accelerated pathway that results in a graduation rate of 100% each year

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
Patterson, Teresa	Principal	Instructional leader and visionary for the school
Berry, Sharon	Assistant Principal	Assistant Principal of Curriculum Instructional leader of the Math department Supervises and supports teachers Ensures appropriate curriculum is being taught and utilized Monitors 10th and 12th grade students and provides academic support and guidance
Larson, Jeff	Assistant Principal	Center for Wellness & Medical Professions Program Coordinator (CWMP) Supervises and supports all CWMP teachers Instructional leader for the Science Department Monitors and supports all CWMP students Ensures appropriate medical curriculum is being taught and utilized Monitors 9th grade PHUHS students and provides academic support and guidance
Striblen, Evette	Assistant Principal	International Baccalaureate Program Coordinator (IB) Instructional leader for the English/Reading department Supervises and supports all IB teachers Monitors and supports all IB students Ensures appropriate IB curriculum is being taught and utilized Monitors 9th grade PHUHS students and provides academic support and guidance
Woodside, Mason	Assistant Principal	Assistant Principal of Athletics and Facilities Cambridge AICE Program Coordinator Instructional leader for the Social Studies department Supervises and supports all teachers Monitors and supports 10th & 11th grade students Ensures appropriate curriculum is being taught and utilized Monitors 10th & 11th grade PHUHS students and provides academic support and guidance

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-based leadership team works with District Content Specialists to analyze data, identify trends and areas of focus and rationale. In addition, reflection on past systems lead to the identification of action steps to adjust current systems in order to support increased student achievement. A plan to monitor progress toward these goals based on data captured from common formative assessments is also developed. A School Advisory Council made up of staff, student, parents and community members

review the School Improvement plan and ensure that the plan represents commitments to action to increase student achievement and accomplish school improvement goals.

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 school-based leadership team works with District Content Specialists to support teachers to engage in the process of reflection of system implementation and impact on increasing student achievement. Common formative assessments will provide data from Professional Learning communities intentionally plan to respond and differentiate instruction to support all students towards standards/benchmark-based PROFICIENCY.

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	24%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	28%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	N/A
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD) English Language Learners (ELL) Asian Students (ASN) Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: A 2019-20: A 2018-19: A 2017-18: A
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

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*	60	47	50	73	51	51	72		
ELA Learning Gains				61			58		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				53			49		
Math Achievement*	55	36	38	57	38	38	54		
Math Learning Gains				50			39		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				52			41		
Science Achievement*	74	61	64	78	42	40	86		
Social Studies Achievement*	78	63	66	85	47	48	75		
Middle School Acceleration					45	44			
Graduation Rate	100	92	89	99	61	61	99		
College and Career Acceleration	68	69	65	78	70	67	76		
ELP Progress	39	47	45	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)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	68
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	474
Total Components for the Federal Index	7

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
Percent Tested	98
Graduation Rate	100

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	66
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	725
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	98
Graduation Rate	99

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	42			
ELL	47			
AMI				
ASN	87			
BLK	54			
HSP	58			
MUL	76			
PAC				
WHT	69			
FRL	59			

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	45			
ELL	53			
AMI				
ASN	90			
BLK	70			
HSP	65			
MUL	77			
PAC				
WHT	65			
FRL	60			

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	60			55			74	78		100	68	39
SWD	13			26			33	52		28	6	
ELL	16			32			46	50		45	7	39
AMI												
ASN	77			81			92	79		91	6	
BLK	57			33			54	70			4	
HSP	51			43			65	62		58	7	28
MUL	73			52			76	88		67	6	
PAC												
WHT	60			56			75	82		68	7	41
FRL	49			45			61	70		56	7	32

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	73	61	53	57	50	52	78	85		99	78	39
SWD	21	39	37	28	33		28	61		100	60	
ELL	53	59	48	32	25		48	61		100	62	39
AMI												
ASN	92	57					100	94		100	97	
BLK	69	81		42	42		87			100	67	
HSP	68	58	53	56	44	44	77	91		100	84	42
MUL	74	63	55	76			76	83		100	86	
PAC												
WHT	73	61	51	57	51	52	77	84		99	75	38
FRL	64	56	52	51	47	48	67	80		99	67	32

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	72	58	49	54	39	41	86	75		99	76	45
SWD	39	49	40	26	26	35	73	35		100	47	
ELL	45	62	50	30	32	31	72	44		94	47	45
AMI												
ASN	95	78		75	40		97	82		100	91	
BLK	72	75		42	42		63			100	60	
HSP	67	57	50	46	45	43	78	72		99	75	
MUL	72	59	60	35	23		100	80		100	82	
PAC												
WHT	72	57	46	56	38	43	87	74		99	76	42
FRL	62	60	47	44	32	28	80	58		98	71	37

Grade Level Data Review– State Assessments (pre-populated)

The data are raw data and include ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data. The percentages shown here represent ALL students who received a score of 3 or higher on the statewide assessments.

An asterisk (*) in any cell indicates the data has been suppressed due to fewer than 10 students tested, or all tested students scoring the same.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
10	2023 - Spring	62%	48%	14%	50%	12%
09	2023 - Spring	63%	46%	17%	48%	15%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	42%	53%	-11%	50%	-8%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	66%	46%	20%	48%	18%

BIOLOGY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	75%	59%	16%	63%	12%

HISTORY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	78%	59%	19%	63%	15%

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.

Student achievement on the Algebra 1 assessment remains the lowest performing tested subject at PHUHS. Only 42% of the 288 students tested achieved proficiency of the new B.E.S.T. standards. This is a 2% increase from 2021-22.

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

Our school continues to trend above district and state levels for English Language Arts. However, the achievement decreased significantly in 2023 in both 9th and 10 grades. In additional, acceleration from 2020-21 to 2021-22 dropped by 11%. These two areas of student achievement represent our areas of greatest decline from the previous year.

Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends.

Our Geometry student achievement (66%) on the EOC was 21% higher than that of students across the state (48%). The standards-based grading systems utilizing common assessments is a PLC model that we hope to employ schoolwide in the future.

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

Student achievement in Geometry showed the most improvement from 2021-22 (62%) to 67% in 2022-23. In additional geometry student achievement improved 12% from 2020-21. The effective transition to standards-based grading practices and common assessments deepening the effectiveness of PLC's have been identified as actions to diffuse throughout all departments due to their positive impact on student achievement.

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

Although EWS data applies to grades k-8 we see similar trends in grades 9-12. Administration will strategically schedule level 1 readers in intensive reading classes. In addition, ELL students who are also level 1 or are placed in a specialized English language development class to support reading skills with bi-lingual assistant support.

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

- Continuation of implementation of standards-based grading practiced to adequately determine progress towards the proficiency of standards/benchmarks.
- Professional Learning communities will use data to intentionally plan to respond and differentiate instruction to support all students towards standards/benchmark-based proficiency
- develop and utilize common assessments to deepen the effectiveness of PLC's

Area of Focus
(Identified key Area of Focus that addresses the school’s highest priority based on any/all relevant data sources)

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

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

Our school continues to trend above district and state levels for English Language Arts. However, the achievement decreased significantly in 2023 in both 9th and 10 grades.

Grade Level Data:

2023 ELA 9th Grade – 63% (District 45%, State 47%)
2023 ELA 10th Grade – 62% (District 48%, State 49%)
2022 ELA 9th Grade - 71% (District 50%, State 51%)
2022 ELA 10th Grade - 74% (District 48%, State 49%)
2021 ELA 9th Grade - 72% (District 54%, State 55%)
2021 ELA 10th Grade - 71% (District 53%, State 53%)
2019 ELA 9th Grade - 69% (District 54%, State 55%)
2019 ELA 10th Grade - 73% (District 53%, State 53%)
2018 ELA 9th Grade - 68% (District 53%, State 53%)
2018 ELA 10th Grade - 73% (District 54%, State 53%

PHUHS's current level of performance is 63% in grade 9 and 62% in grade 10, as evidenced in the 2023 FAST results. The problem is increasing understanding of the B.E.S.T. standards expectations and aligning tasks, both formative and summative to the expectations of the standards. If teachers plan backwards using common texts to intentionally sequence questions and tasks aligned to the B.E.S.T. standards, students can practice higher order thinking in both independent reading of complex grade level texts and in their discussions and writing. In addition, intentionally planned systems to monitor student achievement will be implemented to inform instruction.

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

The percentage of all students achieving proficiency in English Language Arts will increase from the 62nd percentile in 10th grade and 63rd percentile in 9th grade to the 80th percentile in both grade levels by the spring of 2024.

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

If teachers plan backwards using common texts to intentionally sequence questions and tasks aligned to the B.E.S.T. standards, students can practice higher order thinking in both independent reading of complex grade level texts and in their discussions and writing. In addition, intentionally planned systems to monitor student achievement data will be implemented to intentionally plan to respond and differentiate instruction to support all students towards standards/benchmark-based mastery.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Evette Striblen (striblene@pcsb.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.)

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

1- English teachers will plan and implement instruction at the level of rigor appropriate for the standard.
2- English teachers will utilize timely formative and summative assessment data to inform instruction and spiral reteaching throughout the course.

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- Teachers will used common texts from the district pacing guide, including B.E.S.T. texts to create graphic organizers with questions aligned to the F.A.S.T.

Teachers will create Anchor charts based on the B.E.S.T. standards for students to use as a classroom resource.

Teachers will use B.E.S.T. question stems to plan intentionally sequenced questions and tasks for students to respond to as they read complex grade level texts.

Teachers will bring student work samples to PLCs to discuss task-to-standard alignment. Teachers will provide feedback on how to strengthen the lesson for increased rigor.

Administrators will frequently visit English classes to observe tasks, texts and questioning, provide constructive feedback and collaborate to determine next steps

2- Teachers will create common formative assessments with their PLCs to collect data to determine student progress towards standards mastery

Teachers will use student data to plan for reteaching for the whole class, in small groups, and with individual students.

Teachers will support students with data chats where students track and monitor their own progress and reflect on their learning.

Teachers will meet monthly in PLC’s to review student data and plan action steps related to identified areas of strength or areas identified as needing improvement.

Teachers will be provided with release time to create common formative assessments aligned to the B.E.S.T. and to calibrate their questioning, tasks, and scoring.

Administrators monitor and support the use of data as teachers develop lessons and plan for instruction.

Person Responsible: Evette Striblen (striblene@pcsb.org)

By When:

Step 1

We will continue to increase staff understanding of the critical content of the B.E.S.T. standards by using common texts from the district pacing guide, including B.E.S.T. texts to create common formative assessments using guidance from district provided graphic organizers with questions aligned to the F.A.S.T. and creating anchor charts created in PLCs to support student learning.

Person Responsible: Evette Striblen (striblene@pcsb.org)

By When:

Step 2

Provide opportunities for teachers to collaborate to create and analyze task alignment to the critical content through time in PLCs and release time for calibration of creating questions and tasks and scoring reading and writing common formative and summative assessments.

Person Responsible: Evette Striblen (striblene@pcsb.org)

By When: Step 3 Teachers will use the district created tracking document for students to track their progress within a unit on the standards and/or create system for tracking student growth/reflection.

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science

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.

Our school continues to trend above district and state levels for English Language Arts. However, the achievement decreased significantly in 2023

2023 Biology EOC- 75% (District 59%, State 63%)
2022 Biology EOC - 78 % (District 60%, State 61%)
2021 Biology EOC - 86 % (District 61%, State 61%)
2019 Biology EOC - 77% (District 62%, State 67%)
2018 Biology EOC - 79% (District 63%, State 65%)

PHUHS's current level of performance is 75%, as evidenced in the 2023 NGSSS Bio EOC results. This is a decrease of 3% from the student achievement for the previous year. The problem/gap is the achievement of our SWD (35%), ELL (48%) and Black (54%) students are not achieving 75% or higher. If teachers backwards plan lessons and they use intentional and effective opportunities to pause, process and practice the learning and ask Higher Order Thinking Questions in such a way to engage ALL students in thinking, discussing and/or writing responses and personalized instruction based on cycle assessment data and formative assessments are implemented, then student groups can be created for differentiated instruction and achievement will increase. Additionally, intentionally planned systems to monitor the effectiveness of this data informed instruction will be implemented and inform instruction moving forward.

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

Percent proficient on the NGSSS Biology End of Curse Exam will increase from 75% to 90%.

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

If teachers backwards plan lessons and they use Intentional and effective opportunities to pause, process and practice the learning and ask Higher Order Thinking Questions in such a way to engage ALL students in thinking, discussing and/or writing responses and personalized instruction based on cycle assessment data and formative assessments are implemented, then student groups can be created for differentiated instruction and achievement will increase. Additionally, intentionally planned systems to monitor the effectiveness of this data informed instruction will be implemented and inform instruction moving forward.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jeff Larson (larsonje@pcsb.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.)

Science teachers will plan and implement student-centered instruction at the level of rigor appropriate for the standard.

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

By scaffolding support for students and following standards-based instruction (provided by the district) we can ensure that there are many opportunities for intentional practice and skill development thus student growth can be tracked using Cycle Assessments and inform instruction moving forward. Assessment checkpoint will be quarterly.

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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

Teachers backwards plan lessons to include learning tasks where students are scaffolded to demonstrate achievement of the learning target.

Person Responsible: Jeff Larson (larsonje@pcsb.org)

By When: Weekly

Teachers will bring student work samples to PLCs to discuss task-to-target alignment and provide feedback on how to strengthen the lesson for increased rigor.

Person Responsible: Jeff Larson (larsonje@pcsb.org)

By When: Monthly

Teachers use a 10-2-2 or gradual release model to ensure the frequent release of learning to students. Intentional and effective opportunities to pause, process and practice the learning will be included in daily lessons.

Person Responsible: Jeff Larson (larsonje@pcsb.org)

By When: Daily

Teachers will write into lesson plans and ask Higher Order Thinking Questions in such a way to engage ALL students in thinking, discussing and/or writing responses.

Person Responsible: [no one identified]

By When: Daily

Administrators will frequently visit science classes to observe rigor of student tasks, provide constructive feedback and collaborate to determine next steps.

Person Responsible: Jeff Larson (larsonje@pcsb.org)

By When: Bi-Weekly

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Social Studies

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.

Our school is trending above district and state levels for U.S. History. However, the achievement on the U.S. History EOC at PHUHS decreased in 2023 to 78% from 85% in 2022.

Grade Level Data:
2023 Social Studies 78%. (District 59% State 63%)
2022 Social Studies 85%. (District 67% State 65%)
2021 Social Studies 74%. (District 63.3% State 63%)
2019 History EOC - 87% (District 70%, State 70%)
2018 History EOC - 79% (District 70%, State 68%)

PHUHS's current level of performance is 78% as evidenced in the 2023 U.S. History EOC.

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

Students enrolled in U.S. History at PHUHS will increase proficiency to 90% as measured by the U.S. History EOC. We will monitor our cycle and formative assessments to reveal trends within common learning standards which will lead to appropriate individualized and class review. Teachers will be implementing common standards within their formative assessments at the appropriate levels of rigor. The purpose of the data we receive from assessments will be used to inform instruction and include specific cognitive tasks.

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

Effective PLC's will monitor and analyze performance matters data as well as common standards through formative assessments to inform instruction moving forward. Data will continue to be reviewed and monitored at each PLC meeting. Administration will also complete walkthroughs and provide meaningful feedback.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Mason Woodside (woodsidem@pcsb.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.)

Appropriately enhance teacher ability to identify critical content from common standards in alignment with district provided resources. Staff will be supported to utilize data to appropriately organize students to differentiate and scaffold instruction to meet the needs of each student to increase student achievement.

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

Increase teacher ability to effectively use data to align common standards at the appropriate level of rigor with the use of district resources to increase individual student achievement.

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.

Ensure all U.S. History teachers can access and utilize student data to inform and guide instruction. Teachers will complete individual benchmark chats with all students.

Person Responsible: Mason Woodside (woodsidem@pcsb.org)

By When: Ongoing by unit and cycle assessments.

Teachers engage in district led professional learning opportunities and PLC's to collaboratively ensure lessons are aligned appropriately with standard.

Person Responsible: Mason Woodside (woodsidem@pcsb.org)

By When: Reference PLC calendar and District PD opportunities.

Provide professional development opportunities to support teachers in engaging students in complex tasks.

Person Responsible: Mason Woodside (woodsidem@pcsb.org)

By When: Ongoing throughout the school year.

Teachers will use cycle and formative data to guide the development and implementation of remediation plans and spiraled instruction plans each quarter.

Person Responsible: Mason Woodside (woodsidem@pcsb.org)

By When: Ongoing by unit and cycle assessments.

Teachers will plan lessons intentionally to engage all students in cognitively complex tasks that are appropriately aligned with the standard.

Person Responsible: Mason Woodside (woodsidem@pcsb.org)

By When: Ongoing throughout the school year.

#4. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

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.

Our school was trending above district and state levels for Algebra 1 End of Course Exam during 2021(60%) and 2022(40%), even though there was a significant drop between those 2 years. However, achievement on the Alg. 1 EOC increased by 6% (46%) for 2023 from 2022. This was higher than District (28%) and state (32%) proficiency. A deeper analysis of data shows that our 9th graders (55%) performed significantly better than our 10th graders (27%) taking the Alg. 1 EOC.

2023 Algebra EOC – 46% (District 28%, State 32%)

2022 Algebra EOC - 40% (District 26%, State 31%)

2021 Algebra EOC - 60% (District 36%, State 30%)

2019 Algebra EOC - 39% (District 55%, State 61%)

2018 Algebra EOC - 46% (District 57%, State 62%)

Our school continues to increase achievement for the Geometry EOC. There was a 4% increase in achievement over last year, and a 10% increase since 2021. PHUHS was 19% over the district and 18% over the State. Geometry continues to be above the district and State in achievement on the Geometry EOC.

2023 Geometry EOC – 66% (District 47%, State 48%)

2022 Geometry EOC - 62% (District 49%, State 44%)

2021 Geometry EOC - 55% (District 35%, State 40%)

2019 Geometry EOC - 64% (District 56%, State 57%)

2018 Geometry EOC - 76% (District 56%, State 56%)

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

The percent of student's achieving proficiency on the Algebra 1 End of Course Exam will increase from 46% - 60%. In addition, the proficiency of student achievement on the Algebra EOC for 10th grade students will increase achievement from 27% - 40%.
The percent of student's achieving proficiency on the Geometry End of Course Exam will increase from 66% - 75%.

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

Intentionally planned systems to monitor the effectiveness of this data informed instruction will be implemented and inform instruction moving forward.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Sharon Berry (berrysh@pcsb.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.)

Math teachers will plan and implement student-centered instruction at the level of rigor appropriate for the standard utilizing all district resources.

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

The rationale would be for teachers to work together to help prepare students for the higher order thinking questions that are utilized on the End of Course exams. Student-centered so that the planning incorporates the diversity of learning styles of all students. And, with the idea that if a student changes classes, the teachers are doing the same as the others.

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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

Teachers will bring student work samples to PLCs to discuss task-to-target alignment. Teachers will provide feedback on how to strengthen the lesson for increased rigor. Teachers will also attend all quarterly district PLC meetings.

Person Responsible: Sharon Berry (berrysh@pcsb.org)

By When: Expectation will be for teachers to bring examples each PLC meeting ongoing throughout the year so as to best determine best practices to ensure lessons are at the appropriate level.

Teachers will use intentional and effective opportunities to pause, process and practice the learning that will be included in daily lessons. Teachers will utilize district planning documents.

Person Responsible: Sharon Berry (berrysh@pcsb.org)

By When: Expectation is that teachers do this throughout the school year to ensure that students are understanding and comprehending the content so that skills learned are able to be incorporated on all assessments.

Teachers will write into lesson plans and ask Higher Order Thinking Questions in such a way to engage ALL students in thinking, discussing and/or writing responses.

Person Responsible: Sharon Berry (berrysh@pcsb.org)

By When: Expectation is that teachers incorporate this throughout the school year to ensure students are prepared for the End of Course exam.

Administrators will frequently visit math classes to observe rigor of student tasks, provide constructive feedback and collaborate to determine next steps.

Person Responsible: Teresa Patterson (pattersont@pcsb.org)

By When: Throughout the school year to ensure that teachers are continuously supported in teaching at the appropriate rigor for all students to be successful on their End of Course exam.

#5. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

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.

Our school was trending above district and state levels for Algebra 1 End of Course Exam during 2021(60%) and 2022(40%), even though there was a significant drop between those 2 years. However, achievement on the Alg. 1 EOC increased by 6% (46%) for 2023 from 2022. This was higher than District (28%) and state (32%) proficiency. A deeper analysis of data shows that our 9th graders (55%) performed significantly better than our 10th graders (27%) taking the Alg. 1 EOC.

2023 Algebra EOC – 46% (District 28%, State 32%)

2022 Algebra EOC - 40% (District 26%, State 31%)

2021 Algebra EOC - 60% (District 36%, State 30%)

2019 Algebra EOC - 39% (District 55%, State 61%)

2018 Algebra EOC - 46% (District 57%, State 62%)

Our school continues to increase achievement for the Geometry EOC. There was a 4% increase in achievement over last year, and a 10% increase since 2021. PHUHS was 19% over the district and 18% over the State. Geometry continues to be above the district and State in achievement on the Geometry EOC.

2023 Geometry EOC – 66% (District 47%, State 48%)

2022 Geometry EOC - 62% (District 49%, State 44%)

2021 Geometry EOC - 55% (District 35%, State 40%)

2019 Geometry EOC - 64% (District 56%, State 57%)

2018 Geometry EOC - 76% (District 56%, State 56%)

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

The percent of student's achieving proficiency on the Algebra 1 End of Course Exam will increase from 46% - 60%. In addition, the proficiency of student achievement on the Algebra EOC for 10th grade students will increase achievement from 27% - 40%.
The percent of student's achieving proficiency on the Geometry End of Course Exam will increase from 66% - 75%.

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.)

Math teachers will utilize timely formative and summative assessment data to inform spiral reteaching throughout the course.

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

To help increase the Math achievement proficiency with all students, teachers will utilize to organize students to interact with content in manners which differentiates/scaffolds instruction to meet the needs of each student. Identify critical content from the standards in alignment with District resources. Engage students in complex tasks. Strengthen staff ability to meet the educational needs of SWD and ELL students and provide appropriate supports in the classrooms to ensure all our subgroup students are meeting standards and making gains.

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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

Teachers utilize common formative assessments and use the collected data to gauge student progress toward mastery of the course content.

Person Responsible: Sharon Berry (berrysh@pcsb.org)

By When:

Teachers use student data to plan small group instruction and station rotations.

Person Responsible: Sharon Berry (berrysh@pcsb.org)

By When:

Teachers use benchmark-level data to plan reteaching opportunities for whole-class, small group and individual students based on trends. Teachers support students with data chats where students are guided to standards-based resources for reteaching followed by reassessments to determine success of reteaching and inform next steps.

Person Responsible: Sharon Berry (berrysh@pcsb.org)

By When:

Teachers meet in monthly PLC's to review student data (collected from multiple sources, including common assessment and/or quarterly district progress monitoring assessments) and plan action steps related to identified areas of strength or areas identified as needing improvement.

Person Responsible: Sharon Berry (berrysh@pcsb.org)

By When:

Teachers will use Level-Up, District Challenges, IXL (Alg. 1/Geo) and Imagine Math (Alg. 1A) to enhance their classroom instruction.

Person Responsible: Sharon Berry (berrysh@pcsb.org)

By When:

Administrators monitor and support the use of data as teachers develop lessons and plan for small group instruction and station rotations.

Person Responsible: Teresa Patterson (pattersont@pcsb.org)

By When:

#6. 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.

Our acceleration rate for 2021-22 fell from 78% to 67% of students successfully completing an accelerated pathway. Our school vision is to provide a learning environment where all students successfully complete an accelerated pathway that results in a graduation rate of 100% each year

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

100% of students will successfully complete an accelerated pathway through Advanced Placement, Dual Enrollment or AICE course or earn an industry certification which aligns with their passion while earning their diploma.

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

Intentionally planned systems to open access to accelerated coursework and support students to explore opportunities based on their interests (passion) and goals (purpose) after graduation.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Teresa Patterson (pattersont@pcsb.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.)

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

Our mission is to educate all students by using effective systems that promote lifelong learning.

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.

Implement a PBIS system that engages and supports students to determine their accelerated pathway.

Person Responsible: Jeff Larson (larsonje@pcsb.org)

By When:

Utilize AP potential data to identify and recruit students to register for AP courses who have yet to do so.

Person Responsible: Teresa Patterson (pattersont@pcsb.org)

By When:

Cohort data will be utilized to identify students who benefit from access to on campus Dual Enrollment course opportunities

Person Responsible: Sharon Berry (berrysh@pcsb.org)

By When: Pre-school and end of semester 1

#7. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

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 achievement of the Student with Disabilities in ELA and Science are areas of focus.

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).

The district allocates SIP funds to each school as prescribed by the legislature. Principals present to the School Advisory Council the amount of their SIP Funds, their SIP, and how the SIP funds will support the plan. The SAC reviews and votes on approval of the SIP and use of SIP funds. The SIP funds are spent in alignment with the SIP, and reviewed by the SAC throughout the year. Expenditures that deviate from the approved SIP are presented to the SAC, which votes to approve or deny the expense.

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: Instructional Practice: ELA	$0.00
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Science	$0.00
3	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Social Studies	$0.00
4	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math	$0.00
5	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math	$0.00
6	III.B.	Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Other	$0.00
7	III.B.	Area of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities	$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.

No