Pinellas County Schools

Countryside High School

2023-24
Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Countryside High School

3000 STATE ROAD 580, Clearwater, FL 33761

http://www.countryside-hs.pinellas.k12.fl.us/

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 and prepare each student for college, career, and life.

Provide the school's vision statement.

100% student succes.

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
Henderson, Taylor	Principal	Whole school management, instructional leadership, and school mission and vision.
Alexander, Lonnette	Assistant Principal	ESE, ELA, and Mathematics
Bernstein, Brad	Assistant Principal	iSTEM Assistant Principal (Magnet), Science, and Social Science
Overall, Erin	Assistant Principal	Science, Mathematics, and CTAE Programs
Ramos-Gonzalez, Cynthia	Assistant Principal	ESOL, Social Science, and English

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.

Our school leadership team has met in various professional learning communities to discuss school improvement initiatives, core content area processes, timelines for reflection, and steps for revision as necessary for all of our students to meet the State's academic standards. Each core academic area is represented along with the department leaders from each department on campus. Student performance data is discussed monthly and shared with respective departments each month.

Each department holds bi-weekly department meetings to discuss instructional practices, standards data reflection, previewing of instructional practices or events for the coming weeks, and are all led by the assistant principal who supervises the department. Each assistant principal works with the content supervisor from Pinellas County Schools to ensure each course is on pace with the recommended

pacing guide and that classroom instruction is at the rigor needed for our students to meet rigorous standards.

Our annual school survey provided feedback from all stakeholders including students, parents, and staff. School staff has engaged in reflective exercises and trainings that center on student-centered school environments and culture building. Student survey data was used in planning learning activities for various learning styles and content area goals were established based upon the most recent student performance data.

Our School Advisory Council is attended by students, alumni, parents, and staff each month. The administration and respective departments report out progress relative to improvement goals each month. Monthly reported data includes but is not limited to attendance, discipline, cycle assessments from progress monitoring sessions, student retention and graduation rate, accelerated curriculum rate for each grade level, and current student academic progress. Feedback is also provided regarding instructional focuses for each content area to inform all stakeholders of any new instructional strategies and/or focuses for a content area.

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))

All SIP goals will be monitored throughout the 23-24 school year to ensure effective implementation and impact on increasing student achievement in meeting the State's academic standards. Professional learning communities will be centered around student performance data.

Algebra 1A, Algebra 1, & Geometry teachers will use the BEST benchmark-based formative assessments that are new for 2023-24, for effective on-going progress monitoring. All 9th and 10th grade ELA classrooms will adopt/craft/develop a BEST benchmark tracking system where the progress of each student on each BEST benchmark will be noted, tracked, monitored and acted upon consistently throughout the year. \

Biology students will use the benchmark-based formative assessments provided three times to ensure progress monitoring. Students in need of additional supports are provided mini-lessons based upon the standards that are deficient on the benchmark assessments.

Each content area will focus on professional learning opportunities that develop action plans, aligning pertinent resources, and closely monitoring data. Planning for content areas will focus on being intentional and providing deliver of standards based instruction. The responsibility of learning should be released to students, providing feedback about the learning, and monitoring learning in multiple ways. Teacher growth will be empowered through professional learning communities, collaboration, and distributed leadership.

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 PK, 9-12

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	46%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	46%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	ATSI
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD)* English Language Learners (ELL) Asian Students (ASN) Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: C 2019-20: B 2018-19: B 2017-18: B
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	
	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	527
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	114
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	134
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	200
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	256
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	274
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	844

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	238

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	140
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12

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*	44	47	50	43	51	51	45		
ELA Learning Gains				45			43		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				39			36		
Math Achievement*	27	36	38	29	38	38	25		
Math Learning Gains				34			22		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				38			30		

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
Science Achievement*	61	61	64	56	42	40	68		
Social Studies Achievement*	62	63	66	70	47	48	68		
Middle School Acceleration					45	44			
Graduation Rate	96	92	89	96	61	61	97		
College and Career Acceleration	73	69	65	65	70	67	67		
ELP Progress	55	47	45	80			53		

** 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	60
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	418
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	97
Graduation Rate	96

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	54
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	595
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	95
Graduation Rate	96

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	43			
AMI				
ASN	86			
BLK	46			
HSP	53			
MUL	68			
PAC				
WHT	63			
FRL	53			

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	37	Yes	1	
ELL	45			
AMI				
ASN	83			
BLK	43			
HSP	49			
MUL	52			
PAC				
WHT	58			
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	44			27			61	62		96	73	55
SWD	23			25			46	32		48	7	30
ELL	17			19			29	23		70	7	55
AMI												
ASN	55						100	85		92	5	
BLK	26			13			41	50		54	6	
HSP	34			21			53	47		70	7	53
MUL	53			33			61	68		91	6	
PAC												
WHT	51			32			66	67		75	7	55
FRL	34			21			51	55		64	7	52

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21	ELP Progress
All Students	43	45	39	29	34	38	56	70		96	65	80
SWD	18	25	24	25	40	50	21	43		94	33	
ELL	16	42	41	15	36	45	37	32		89	63	80
AMI												
ASN	68	87					83	83		100	75	
BLK	15	34	35	27	33	26	33	64		100	59	
HSP	29	38	34	20	38	44	49	58		93	63	75
MUL	48	51	42	25	35		58			94	65	
PAC												
WHT	53	48	41	34	32	45	64	76		96	65	86
FRL	31	36	32	26	33	33	46	63		93	58	75

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	45	43	36	25	22	30	68	68		97	67	53
SWD	17	33	32	12	25	38	37	44		95	36	0
ELL	13	33	27	12	21	23	41	52		94	44	53

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
AMI												
ASN	62	60		31	31		80	70		100	80	
BLK	36	48	47	13	19	36	43	38		97	60	
HSP	35	39	31	16	25	22	63	64		97	56	54
MUL	50	35		44	38		75	80		100	58	
PAC												
WHT	49	43	40	31	20	31	73	73		97	72	45
FRL	36	42	37	20	23	36	61	56		95	58	48

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	46%	48%	-2%	50%	-4%
09	2023 - Spring	44%	46%	-2%	48%	-4%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	27%	53%	-26%	50%	-23%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	28%	46%	-18%	48%	-20%

BIOLOGY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	60%	59%	1%	63%	-3%

CIVICS						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	*	68%	*	66%	*

HISTORY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	60%	59%	1%	63%	-3%

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.

Students performed lowest in the area of Algebra and Geometry for the 2022-2023 school year. Contributions to the low performing data were attendance concerns, lack of use of complex tasks, and not utilizing benchmark common assessments in like areas. These contributing factors continue to be trends that support low performance in Algebra and Geometry for the last four years. Student performance data has demonstrated

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

The US History EOC data reflected the greatest decline from the prior year. Contributions to the decline include high absenteeism,

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.

Mathematics were the component that had the greatest gap when compared to the state average. Factors that contributed to this gap were high levels of low proficiency as compared to the state average in Algebra and Geometry. Our Geometry students were hindered by two new teachers in their subject area and high absence rates. Our Algebra students also experienced turnover in staff and high absence rates that led to the low proficiency rate.

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

The 9th and 10th grade ELA data component showed the most improvement from the 2021-2022 results. Our students demonstrated an increase in proficiency from the first progress monitoring cycle to the end of the year assessment. New actions taken by our instructors include professional learning community meetings that discussed standards based data, key instructional shifts necessary for differentiation of instructional modes, and alignment of student needs to district resources.

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

Excessive absences were areas of concern as well as students who had more than one indicator (234). This data indicates the correlation between high absences and low student proficiency patterns. Students who missed fewer than 10 or more absences were significantly more successful in their core academic classes.

Correlations between these two areas of concern are being adddress through tighter systems in our MTSS efforts. Each bi-weekly meeting will dive deeper into the students with excessive absences to better assist them in remaining on track.

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

The highest priority area for school improvement for the upcoming school year is for our students to exceed proficiency in each of the core content areas. Currently, each of our content areas has significant room for growth in 2023-2024, as each area has underperformed as compared to the state.

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 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.

The current level of performance on the Math assessments in Algebra and Geometry indicates that over 70% of our students are not meeting proficiency. Data reviewed was the EOC results from 2022 and progress monitoring reporting periods.

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

CHS students will perform at 50% proficient in both Algebra and Geometry as reported on the 2023-2024 Spring EOCs. 10th graders taking Algebra 1 and Geometry will perform higher than 35% proficiency as reported on the 2023-2024 Spring EOCs.

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

Progress monitoring will be provided bi-weekly in Algebra and Geometry PLCs to gauge student proficiency on core standards. Data will be reviewed after each assessment to determine strengths and areas for growth and support.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Lonnette Alexander (alexanderlo@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.)

1. Enhance staff capacity to identify critical content from the standards in alignment with district resources.
2. Strengthen staff ability to engage students in complex tasks.
3. Strengthen staff practice to utilize questions to help elaborate on content.
4. Support staff to utilize data to organize students to interact with content in manners which differentiate/ scaffold instruction to meet the needs of every student.
5. Consistent and frequent presence of administrative leadership in the math classrooms to support teaching and learning.

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

Data results in tested areas show that students are performing amongst the lowest in the district. This is especially true of 10th graders taking Algebra 1 and Geometry. The aforementioned strategies must be consistently implemented to achieve academic excellence in mathematics at Countryside High School.

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 engage in site-based PLCs and district provided professional learning around instructional shifts, new course standards, new district and state assessments, and tracking student data based on the instructional needs identified through progress monitoring assessments and constructive feedback from administration.
2. Teachers intentionally plan in PLCs and engage in collaborative study groups to increase student engagement in standards based complex tasks, foster an environment of academic perseverance, and use data to gauge student progress toward mastery of critical content.
3. Teachers will use restorative and common grading scales, conduct frequent data chats with students to offer support for student achievement and individualized goal setting.
4. Utilization of formative and summative assessment data to determine low proficiency and remediation needs for students.
5. Administrator and department head will collaboratively monitor implementation of the district scope, sequence and curricular materials for math courses. Administrative support from Erin Overall will be provided.

Person Responsible: Lonnette Alexander (alexanderlo@pcsb.org)

By When: Ongoing

Data review of math progress in tested areas during weekly administrative team meetings.

Person Responsible: Taylor Henderson (hendersont@pcsb.org)

By When: Ongoing constructive feedback provided to administrator.

#2. 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.

Only 44% of our 9th grade learners and 45% of our 10th grade learners demonstrated proficiency on the progress monitoring assessment in 22-23. This was demonstrated in the final progress monitoring assessment and remains our critical need in 9th and 10th grade.

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

CHS students will perform at 55% proficient for both the 9th and 10th grades as reported by the Progress Monitoring 3 assessment in 2023-2024.

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

This area of focus will be monitored throughout the year during our common assessments offered throughout the year. These common assessments will provide data feedback to instructors and administrators for intervention planning purposes and additional supports.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Cynthia Ramos-Gonzalez (ramosgonzalezc@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.

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 meet in PLCs at least once per month to share ways they are teaching to the full complexity of the (insert your schools focused Benchmarks here), incorporating HOT Qs and collaboration into their lessons, and the effect placing students in the productive struggle is having on student growth.
In PLCs teachers also share ways to support students who continue to struggle with engagement in collaboration around complex tasks like HOT Qs.
Teachers use PLC time to analyze student artifacts to plan reteaching and next steps as applicable.

Person Responsible: Cynthia Ramos-Gonzalez (ramosgonzalezc@pcsb.org)

By When: Monthly monitoring through PLCs and department meetings led by Mrs. Ramos-Gonzalez.

Administrators monitor and support the implementation of the use of grade- appropriate complex texts accompanied by the use of standard connected sentence stems which are higher order thinking question's (HOT Qs) in ELA classrooms through classroom observation.

Person Responsible: Cynthia Ramos-Gonzalez (ramosgonzalezc@pcsb.org)

By When: Monthly monitoring through PLCs and department meetings led by Mrs. Ramos-Gonzalez.

ELA and reading teachers receive professional development around B.E.S.T. Benchmarks, FAST Assessment, district resources, HOT Qs, and collaborative structures

Person Responsible: Taylor Henderson (hendersont@pcsb.org)

By When: Ongoing from preschool training to PM3, staff will be centered around professional development concerning B.E.S.T. benchmarks.

#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 United States history results from the 2022-2023 FSA US History EOC indicated that only 60% of our students demonstrated proficiency on the assessment of standards.

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

CHS students will perform at 70% proficient for both the US History EOC assessment in 2023-2024.

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

This area will be monitored using common assessments in each classroom including the use of cycle assessments throughout the year to monitor student progress towards meeting standards.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Brad Bernstein (bernsteinb@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.)

TEACHERS UTILIZE INSTRUCTIONAL PRACTICES THAT SUPPORT WRITING, INQUIRY, COLLABORATION, ORGANIZATION, AND
READING (WICOR) TO RAISE ACHIEVEMENT LEVELS AND CLOSE THE ACHIEVEMENT GAP IN SOCIAL STUDIES

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

Our US History EOC results indicate the largest deficit in points for the school common assessments.

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 INSTRUCTIONAL PRACTICES THAT SUPPORT WRITING, INQUIRY, COLLABORATION, ORGANIZATION, AND
READING (WICOR) TO RAISE ACHIEVEMENT LEVELS AND CLOSE THE ACHIEVEMENT GAP IN SOCIAL STUDIES.

Person Responsible: Brad Bernstein (bernsteinb@pcsb.org)

By When: Ongoing

Social studies teachers will continue to integrate literacy standards into the social studies content via Document Based Question (DBQ) Project material.

Person Responsible: Brad Bernstein (bernsteinb@pcsb.org)

By When: Daily and Ongoing

Teachers regularly incorporate knowledge checks (formative assessments) and use the collected data to gauge student progress toward mastery of the course content.

Person Responsible: Brad Bernstein (bernsteinb@pcsb.org)

By When: Daily/Weekly

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 reviewing, remediating, and reteaching critical content related to the rigor of course standards/ benchmarks.

Person Responsible: Brad Bernstein (bernsteinb@pcsb.org)

By When: Monthly

Teachers conduct frequent data chats with students to offer support for student achievement and individualized goal setting.

Person Responsible: Brad Bernstein (bernsteinb@pcsb.org)

By When: Weekly/Monthly

Tutoring sessions at lunch

Person Responsible: Brad Bernstein (bernsteinb@pcsb.org)

By When: Periodically around the school year, especially before and/or after cycle assessments and the EOC

#4. 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.

DATA SOURCES TO REVIEW:
Biology EOC results. Countryside current level of performance is 60% proficient (other sources of data used for monitoring will include Cycle 1-3 assessments, teacher-created common assessments, and PLC collaborative planning documents/notebook).

2022-2023 Climate Survey results will be used to assess current state of positive culture and environment.

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

We expect our performance to be 70% proficient on the Bio EOC assessment data by May 2024.

We expect our stakeholder climate survey (either district generated, or teacher generated) to reflect a positive culture and environment: specifically, over 60% of all subgroups surveyed will reflect positively.

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

Data will be collected from Cycle 1-3 assessments created by the district, teacher-created common assessments, district created common assessments, and PLC collaborative planning documents. This data will be reviewed twice monthly at PLC meetings and then disseminated to the Administrative team meetings monthly.

Teacher-generated climate surveys will be collected first and second quarter and reviewed at PLC meetings. District climate survey will be collected third quarter and reviewed with Administrative team.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Erin Overall (overalle@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.)

Strategy 1: Science teachers will plan and implement student-centered instruction at the level of rigor appropriate for the standard through Focused Note Taking.

Strategy 2: Science teachers will utilize restorative practices/grading, standards-based assessments and grading, and will include Student Support Teams when needed to promote positive culture in the classroom and support academic success.

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.

Strategy 1 Action Steps
• Teachers use each phase of AVID Focused Note Taking when writing-to-learn in science.
• Lesson plans to include Higher Order Thinking Questions and unpacking standards.
• Administrators visiting classrooms weekly.
* Teachers will build student stamina on testing by providing uninterrupted EOC practice questions time. Gradual release of this task over time as well as lengthening the uninterrupted time as the year progresses.
*Teacher-lead Lunch Bunch as needed to remediate specific students in standards of deficiency or need.
*Administrative/guidance counseling with students who are Level 1 and Level 2 after Cycle 1 and Cycle 2 assessments.
*Administrative and staff encourage student participation in Level Up programs and district holiday competitions.
*Teachers utilize instructional practices that support writing, inquiry, collaboration, organization, and reading (WICOR) to raise achievement levels and close the achievement gap in science.

Person Responsible: Erin Overall (overalle@pcsb.org)

By When: Lesson plans - immediately. AVID Strategies - immediately. EOC practice - Aug-Sept: teacher assisted bell work, Oct-Nov: release to student work, Dec-Apr: 100% independent work Lunch Bunch: quarterly

#5. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Other

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

To continue to improve the positive culture and climate of our campus, at Countryside, we will reduce the number of student referrals by 10%.

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

There were 1038 total school referrals in 2022-2023 and we will reduce that number to under 900 total referrals for 2023-2024.

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

We will monitor our total school referral data monthly to look for trends in discipline frequencies.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Lonnette Alexander (alexanderlo@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.)

Positive behavior systems for our school include our ROAR positive behavior system which outlines expectations for each area of the campus.

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

This ROAR strategy inlcudes the use of Cougar cash for positive incentives that are offered on our campus.

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.

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

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: Math	$0.00

2	**III.B.**	**Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA**	**$0.00**
3	**III.B.**	**Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Social Studies**	**$0.00**
4	**III.B.**	**Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Science**	**$0.00**
5	**III.B.**	**Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Other**	**$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