St. Petersburg High School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

St. Petersburg High School

2501 5TH AVE N, St Petersburg, FL 33713

http://www.stpetehigh.com

SIP Authority

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

I. School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

We will continually improve educational opportunities that promote highest student achievement in a safe learning environment.

Provide the school's vision statement.

100% of SPHS students will graduate!

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
Lebo, Darlene	Principal	
Bryant, Anthony	Assistant Principal	
Kaur Barrett, Shahlaine	Assistant Principal	
Otto, Chris	Assistant Principal	
Yates, Lincoln	Assistant Principal	
Anderson, Andrea	Teacher, ESE	
Gryder, Shannon	Behavior Specialist	

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 Advisory Council meets to discuss and review all data areas and work collaboratively to create our goals. Our SAC is comprised of teachers, students, parents, administration, and community members.

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 SIP will be regularly monitored through our Administrative team meetings as well as at each of our subject area PLC meetings. It will be revised as necessary based on the Progress Monitoring and data received throughout the school year to best support the needs of our students.

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	45%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	44%
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: A 2019-20: B 2018-19: B 2017-18: B
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review

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

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

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	51	47	50	57	51	51	60		
ELA Learning Gains				54			49		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				45			36		
Math Achievement*	40	36	38	50	38	38	30		
Math Learning Gains				60			28		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				58			36		
Science Achievement*	60	61	64	62	42	40	72		
Social Studies Achievement*	60	63	66	66	47	48	67		
Middle School Acceleration					45	44			
Graduation Rate	98	92	89	99	61	61	97		
College and Career Acceleration	73	69	65	68	70	67	62		
ELP Progress	60	47	45	59			41		

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	63
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	442
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	97
Graduation Rate	98

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	62

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	678
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	39	Yes	4	
ELL	46			
AMI				
ASN	67			
BLK	36	Yes	1	
HSP	63			
MUL	60			
PAC				
WHT	71			
FRL	50			

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	32	Yes	3	
ELL	42			
AMI				
ASN	72			
BLK	43			
HSP	62			

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
MUL	58			
PAC				
WHT	67			
FRL	50			

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	51			40			60	60		98	73	60
SWD	15			18			30	29		48	6	
ELL	20			24			25	29		75	7	60
AMI												
ASN	57			47			69	50		76	6	
BLK	17			12			18	32		42	6	
HSP	52			40			60	64		67	7	62
MUL	55			32			65	46		63	6	
PAC												
WHT	58			50			68	74		80	6	
FRL	35			26			40	47		56	7	50

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	57	54	45	50	60	58	62	66		99	68	59
SWD	10	33	37	9			18	13		100	35	
ELL	11	43	52	32			22	11		97	52	59
AMI												
ASN	59	69	73	71	68		59	66		100	67	92

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS

Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21	ELP Progress
BLK	23	46	42	22	41	53	19	28		100	51	
HSP	63	51	45	52	67		65	65		98	55	55
MUL	55	54	45	58	60		55	53		94	47	
PAC												
WHT	65	54	41	57	65	64	73	78		99	77	
FRL	34	47	46	29	51	52	39	45		99	54	55

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS

Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20	ELP Progress
All Students	60	49	36	30	28	36	72	67		97	62	41
SWD	11	31	31	7	35	50	21	27		85	18	
ELL	21	56	50	29	54		33	33		100	41	41
AMI												
ASN	72	55		40	26		94	66		100	60	55
BLK	27	38	33	13	28	34	30	36		94	35	
HSP	55	48	38	26	34	55	67	63		100	58	36
MUL	59	32		19	25		81	68		100	75	
PAC												
WHT	70	55	38	40	28	31	82	77		97	69	
FRL	37	39	28	21	29	37	49	49		94	39	43

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	53%	48%	5%	50%	3%
09	2023 - Spring	49%	46%	3%	48%	1%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	36%	53%	-17%	50%	-14%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	45%	46%	-1%	48%	-3%

BIOLOGY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	57%	59%	-2%	63%	-6%

HISTORY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	58%	59%	-1%	63%	-5%

III. Planning for Improvement

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

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

Students with Disabilities made up the 2 lowest components, ELA achievement and Math achievement. Multiple factors contributed to this data point. There was an increased number of students coming to us and experiencing being mainstreamed for the first time. At the same time the school experienced an unusually large amount of teacher turnover during the school year that directly impacted this population.

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

The Biology EOC data showed the largest decline from the prior year. A factor that led to this decline was teacher consistency throughout the year and the fact that we had several new teachers teaching our Biology courses. The school supported students through this change by realigning ESE supports within the classroom. As instructor changes took place, the classroom would have benefited from more culturally relevant instruction and stronger relationships. Student confidence dwindled and engagement suffered. With such significant turnover, there was a loss of standards-based instruction aligned to the appropriate level of rigor as new instructors backtracked to find students' current levels.

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

The Biology EOC data had the largest gap when compared to the state average (57% for SPHS and 63% for the state). A major factor that contributed to this gap was the fact that we had several new teachers as well as a new administrator overseeing the Biology EOC. Due to the relative newness of the instructors, there was a loss of standards-based instruction when compared to the previous year and a lack of instruction at the appropriate level of rigor as new instructors were continuing to learn and be supported.

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

The Algebra 1 EOC data showed the most improvement going from 21 to 40% proficient. A factor that led to this increase was the use of an Algebra 1 tutor to help directly support in class instruction and pull-out instruction for struggling students. Furthermore, a concentrated effort to increase rigor and implement standards-based instruction further supported this improvement.

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

N/A

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

1. Standards-based instruction
2. Appropriate level of rigor in all classrooms
3. Reduction of Disciplinary Incidences for Minority Subgroups with increased use of one-on-one mentoring supports
4. Best practices
5. Stronger and more organized supports through Content Specific Learning Communities

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 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.

1. Our current level of performance is 58% proficiency as evidenced on the US History EOC (2023).
2. We expect our performance level to be 73% proficiency by the end of the 2023-2024 school year.
3. The problem/gap is occurring because a large percentage of students begin the US History course behind grade level in reading comprehension.
4. If the rigor of the instructional practices aligned to the appropriate level of standards would occur, the problem would be reduced by 6% and the US History proficiency level would increase from 58% to 73%.

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

The percent of all students achieving proficiency on the US History EOC will increase from 58% to 73% as measured by the 2023-2024 US History EOC.

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

1. Pinellas County District Developed Cycle Assessment tests
2. Individual teacher classroom assessments
3. Teacher/student conference and checks for understanding
4. PLC teacher/administrator meetings to discuss student progress

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Chris Otto (ottoc@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. 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. WICOR strategies imbedded in all lesson plans, coupled with spiraled instruction (10-24-7) model.
2. Enhance staff capacity to identify critical content from the standards in alignment with district resources (District Social Studies Sharepoint).
3. Social studies teachers will continue to utilize Document Based Question (DBQ) Project materials, deep-dive documents, and SHEG lessons to focus on primary and secondary source material and their ability to elaborate on content.

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

These strategies are necessary to help teachers maximize their instructional impact. The data used to make this determination are the EOC results, cycle assessments data and input from our US History teachers.

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 include WICOR strategies into daily lesson plans that support students at all levels.

Person Responsible: Chris Otto (ottoc@pcsb.org)

By When:

Teachers receive professional development around inclusion WICOR strategies that include movement, collaboration and accountable talk strategies that can be implemented and modified to meet the needs of diverse learners.

Person Responsible: Chris Otto (ottoc@pcsb.org)

By When:

Teachers work in Professional Learning Community (PLC) groups with facilitated planning support to incorporate AVID's WICOR learning support strategies and create instructional materials aligned to the rigor of content benchmarks.

Person Responsible: Anthony Bryant (bryantan@pcsb.org)

By When:

Administrators help organize strategy walks or demonstration days for social studies teachers to view and reflect on the effective implementation of WICOR instructional practices.

Person Responsible: Chris Otto (ottoc@pcsb.org)

By When:

#2. Graduation specifically relating to Graduation

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.

1. Our current level of performance is 98%, as evidenced in the 2022-2023 school data.
2. We expect our performance to remain at 98% by the end of the 2023-2024 school year.
3. The problem/gap is occurring because not enough students are completing course work with the required 2.0 GPA.
4. The implementation of individualized planning with students, restorative grading practices, and effective learning communities will reduce the problem by at least 1%.

ACCELERATION
1. Our current level of performance is 68 percent, as evidenced in our school grade.
2. We expect our performance level to be 78% by the end of the 2023-2024 school year.
3. The problem/gap is occurring because not enough students are sitting for Industry Certification tests, earning qualifying scores on AICE or AP exams, or taking Dual Enrollment courses.
4. If increased enrollment and passing of Industry certification classes/exams, increased alignment to AICE/AP curriculum and enrollment in Dual Enrollment courses would occur, the problem would be reduced by 10%.

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

The percent of 12th grade students achieving on-time gradation will increase from 98% to 99%, as measured by the FLDOE 2023-2024 final graduation rate.

ACCELERATION
The percent of 12th grade students successfully completing an acceleration/advanced course will increase from 68% to 78%, as measured by the accelerated score in our school grade calculation.

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

Monthly graduation committee monitoring August to February and bi-weekly March to May.

ACCELERATION
1. Student course requests and schedules that include accelerated classes
2. Students/teacher use tools and resource provided by College Board and Cambridge
3. Student grades in Dual Enrollment courses
4. Industry Certification exam results and progress through teacher/administrator conferences

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Anthony Bryant (bryantan@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. Realignment of administrative and counselor responsibilities and collaborative ways of work to decrease the number of students entering 12th grade off-track
2. Continued use of an on-site GEP/Graduation Coach dedicated to supporting seniors who are off-track.
3. Use of Canvas and TEAMS to offer more flexible tutoring
4. Restorative grading practices.

5. Refinement of MTSS processes to identify struggling students earlier.
6. Restructure scheduling of credit recovery sections to increase student engagement.

ACCELERATION
1. Enhance access to opportunities for students to successfully engage in advanced/accelerated coursework.
2. Strengthen implementation of career academies to support student engagement, learning and project-based curriculum.
3. Continued implementation of 3DE program to help provide students with engaging instruction, hands-on learning and project-based curriculum.
4. Continue to intensify staff capacity to support students in successfully completing and attaining industry certification.
5. Implement highly engaging strategies, including AVID strategies, meant to reach a diverse group of learners.

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

These strategies are necessary to help students by ensuring they complete all graduation requirements for on-time graduation. The criteria used to make this determination is our projected graduation rate for 2023-2024.

ACCELERATION
These strategies are needed to assist students by ensuring they have access to and are successful in pathways that lead to college and career readiness.

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.

Work with all seniors to review their credits towards graduation, ensure they have a plan for completing all requirements along a timeline with clearly defined goals.

Person Responsible: Anthony Bryant (bryantan@pcsb.org)

By When:

Meet with seniors and parents of seniors to ensure they have a clear understanding of what needs to be done for on-time graduation.

Person Responsible: Anthony Bryant (bryantan@pcsb.org)

By When:

Ensure all students who need remediation are provided with additional supports and opportunities during the school day as well as after school. Use Canvas and TEAMS to increase access and provide flexible options for remediation.

Person Responsible: Anthony Bryant (bryantan@pcsb.org)

By When:

Continuing to utilize the College Board CEDs and formative assessment tool data in AP PLC data discussions.

Person Responsible: [no one identified]

By When:

Implementation of Pre-AP courses to assist in preparing students to enter advanced courses.

Person Responsible: Anthony Bryant (bryantan@pcsb.org)

By When:

Pre-AP district PLC meetings

Person Responsible: Anthony Bryant (bryantan@pcsb.org)

By When:

Send teachers to AP and Pre-AP training during the summer to increase content expertise.

Person Responsible: [no one identified]

By When:

Increase enrollment in rigorous courses, AVID, and industry certification earning courses through student awareness, advisement, preparation and support for these courses.

Person Responsible: Anthony Bryant (bryantan@pcsb.org)

By When:

Meeting with 11th and 12th grade students to ensure each student is accessing the appropriate amount of rigorous coursework and/or industry certification opportunities.

Person Responsible: Anthony Bryant (bryantan@pcsb.org)

By When:

#3. 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.

1. Our current level of proficiency is 50 percent as evidenced in the EOCs (2022, Algebra 1 and Geometry).
2. We expect our proficiency level to be 55 percent by the end of the 2022-2023 school year.
3. The problem/gap is occurring because of a need for more student centered instruction that aligns with the level of rigor of the standards.
4. If student centered rigorous instruction would occur, the problem would be reduced and student learning gains would increase by 5 percent.
5. Increase overall learning gains from 60 to 65 percent

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

The percent of all students achieving proficiency will increase from 50 percent as measured by the Algebra 1 EOC and 62 percent by the Geometry EOC.

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

1. Regular assessment and progress monitoring – Pre-AP checkpoints, teacher-created assessments, district-provided mini-assessments, two challenges, cycle assessments
2. Teacher/student conferences and checks for understanding, i.e. data chats.
4. Data-driven PLC meetings (pacing calendar monitoring, spiraling of content with HW warmups, exit tickets) to support mastery of benchmarks, with increased focus on 10th grade achievement.
5. Administrative walk-throughs and observations to monitor and assess instructional practices that include differentiated learning.

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.)

1. Enhance staff capacity to identify critical content from the standards in alignment with district resources.
2. Strengthen staff ability to implement effective instruction practices, including AVID strategies and focused note taking.
3. Regular utilization of IXL, Imagine Math, Albert IO, and Aleks.
4. Utilizing the Algebra 1 tutor to target A.A. students and provided them with strategic supports with standards-based instruction and analysis of data to drive individual student needs.
5. Continuous recycling of benchmarks into the curriculum

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

These strategies are necessary to help teachers maximize their instructional impact. The data utilized to make this determination are our FSA EOC results (2023), Cycle Assessment results and input from our Mathematics department members.

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.

The benchmark(s) being taught will be posted and clear to all students

Person Responsible: Lincoln Yates (yatesl@pcsb.org)

By When:

Calculators on all student desks every day (or Desmos calculator on their laptops)

Person Responsible: Lincoln Yates (yatesl@pcsb.org)

By When:

Reference sheets on students' desks every day

Person Responsible: Lincoln Yates (yatesl@pcsb.org)

By When:

Administrators will lead the planning of PLCs (co-creating agendas with lead teachers and/or Tara); Ensure teachers have planning resources during the PLCs including the BEST blue benchmark book (or electronic version), district planning documents provided for each module, & and textbook resources etc.

Person Responsible: Lincoln Yates (yatesl@pcsb.org)

By When:

Administrators will observe evidence of the use of AVID best practices during classroom visits (collaborative structures, math accountable talk, student-centered classrooms, students taking and referring to their notes etc.)

Person Responsible: Lincoln Yates (yatesl@pcsb.org)

By When:

Algebra 1A, Algebra 1, & Geometry teachers will use the BEST benchmark-based formative assessments that are new for 2023-24

Person Responsible: Lincoln Yates (yatesl@pcsb.org)

By When:

Algebra 1A & Algebra 1 teachers must use district provided benchmark-based common assessments OR create their own as a team with support from the high school team

Person Responsible: Lincoln Yates (yatesl@pcsb.org)

By When:

TDEs will be provided for Algebra 1A, Algebra 1 & Geometry teachers for on-site professional development quarterly to ensure all teachers and math AP can attend/participate and grow!

Person Responsible: Lincoln Yates (yatesl@pcsb.org)

By When:

#4. 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 current level of performance is 52 percent (49% for 9th grade and 56% for 10th grade), as evidenced in the 2023 FAST Progress Monitoring (PM) 3 assessment. We expect our performance to be 62% by the end of the 2023-2024 school year. The problem/gap is occurring because the level of student-centered rigor is not aligned to the standards level at which students are tested, particularly with key literary elements and how they enhance and add layers and/or style. If an increase in high engagement and collaboration in rigorous strategies would occur, including the use of higher-order thinking question stems for literary elements and author perspective, conditions for deeper learning would be created and the problem would be reduced by 8 percent and student learning gains would increase by 10 percent.

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

The percent of L25 students demonstrating proficiency in reading will increase from 45 to 55 percent as measured by the Spring 2024 FAST PM3 assessment. The percentage of all students achieving ELA proficiency for the 2023-2024 school year will increase from 52% to 62%, as measured by the FAST PM3 assessment.

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

1. Performance Measurement assessments and Pre-AP Classroom Assessments.
2. Monitor ThinkCERCA data to analyze trends based on the performance of students.
3. Teacher/student conferences and checks for understanding, as well as student data chats.
4. PLC teacher/administrator meetings to discuss student progress.
5. Monthly Pre-AP teacher districtwide PLC meetings.
6. Student standards tracking system to regularly review and analysis student performances and levels.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Anthony Bryant (bryantan@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. Continue to enhance staff capacity to identify critical content from the standards in alignment with district resources.
2. Support staff to utilize student data, anchor charts, graphic organizers and critical reading protocols to organize students to interact with content in manners which differentiates/scaffolds instruction to meet the needs of each student.
3. Enhance staff capacity to support students in complex tasks through purposeful activation and transfer strategies.
4. Learning communities will utilize mutual learning model to improve collaboration and the design and implementation of instructional practices that result in high student achievement and differentiated learning.

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

These strategies are essential to help teachers to maximize their instructional impact. The data used to make this determination are FAST Progress Monitoring data, FAST ELA results and input from our ELA/ Reading teachers.

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.

Continue the collaboration and implementation of daily/weekly literacy strategies across all content areas, specifically focused note-taking and other effective writing strategies.

Person Responsible: Anthony Bryant (bryantan@pcsb.org)

By When:

Use of FAST Assessment and Progress Monitoring data to drive PLC conversations and craft grade level team action steps, and run data chats with kids to help them set personalized goals.

Person Responsible: Anthony Bryant (bryantan@pcsb.org)

By When:

Use BEST Benchmark Tracking System, FAST Data Chat Forms and other practices/resources to monitor student progress and implement differentiated instruction within the ELA and Reading classes.

Person Responsible: Anthony Bryant (bryantan@pcsb.org)

By When:

BEST Texts will be utilized with fidelity in alignments with the course pacing guides to grow student proficiency and performance levels.

Person Responsible: Anthony Bryant (bryantan@pcsb.org)

By When:

Administration will monitor and support the use of grade-appropriate complex text, including BEST Texts, and sentence stems/higher-order thinking questions that align with the appropriate standards.

Person Responsible: Anthony Bryant (bryantan@pcsb.org)

By When:

Reading teachers will conduct weekly data and goal setting chats with students regarding reading cycle assessments and in-class progress. Teachers and students will use district provided tracking and goal setting sheets to guide these chats.

Person Responsible: Anthony Bryant (bryantan@pcsb.org)

By When:

Resources such as anchor charts, graphic organizers and critical reading protocols will be used in ELA classes to promote student-centered learning through scaffolding and differentiated instructional practices.

Person Responsible: Anthony Bryant (bryantan@pcsb.org)

By When:

ELA and Reading teachers will meet in PLCs at least once a month to collaborate on assessing of student work, incorporating appropriate rigor and resources into their daily lessons, and implementing differentiated instruction to meet student needs and address areas of focus, including literary elements.

Person Responsible: Anthony Bryant (bryantan@pcsb.org)

By When:

Provide teachers with opportunities for professional development, including BEST benchmarks, FAST assessments, focus-note taking and district resources.

Person Responsible: Anthony Bryant (bryantan@pcsb.org)

By When:

#5. 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.

1. Our current level of proficiency is 57 percent as evidenced in the Biology EOC.
2. We expect our proficiency level to be 65 percent by the end of the 2023-2024 school year.
3. The problem/gap is occurring because lost instructional time due to absences, a need for teacher acclamation to new curriculum, a new staff to our school and need for more meaningful interactions between student and content.
4. Students below proficiency in reading and ELA are more likely to be the students who are deficient in biology, as evidenced in the EOC data.
5. Increase overall learning gains from 57 to 65 percent

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 earning proficiency on the Biology EOC will increase from 57 to 65 percent, as measured by the 2023-2024 Biology EOC.

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

Pinellas County District Developed Cycle Assessment tests and/or Pre-AP Classroom Assessments
Use of common classroom assessments
Teacher/student conferences and checks for understanding
Semi-monthly PLC teacher/administrator meetings to discuss student progress
Monthly Pre-AP teacher districtwide PLC meetings
Pre-IB Biology PLC meetings to discuss student progress

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Shahlaine Kaur Barrett (kaurbarretts@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.)

Strengthen staff ability to engage students in complex tasks.

Support staff to utilize data to organize students to interact with content in manners which differentiates/scaffolds instruction to meet the needs of each student.

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

These strategies are needed to assist teachers in maximizing their instructional impact. The data used to make this determination are the Biology EOC results, cycle assessment data, Pre-AP assessments and input from our Biology department.

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.

Identify students in biology with deficiencies in reading an ELA. Create scaffolding to teach scientific language using reading strategies.

Person Responsible: Shahlaine Kaur Barrett (kaurbarretts@pcsb.org)

By When:

Provide training for teachers in WICOR and Focused Note Taking strategies to assist students with engagement in the material

Person Responsible: Shahlaine Kaur Barrett (kaurbarretts@pcsb.org)

By When:

Use of data driven, standards focused PLC time for teachers of biology to collaborate and create common assessments.

Person Responsible: Shahlaine Kaur Barrett (kaurbarretts@pcsb.org)

By When:

#6. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Black/African-American

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.

1. African-American students currently show an achievement level of 27%, as measured by the ESSA Federal Index (2023).
2. The problem is occurring due to lost instructional time due to lost instructional time due to discipline issues and absenteeism.
3. If culturally relevant teachers and restorative practices would occur, achievement would increase by 10%.

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

The percent of African-American students reaching an achievement level of 3 or higher will increase from 27% to 37% as measured by the ESSA Federal Index.

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

1. Pinellas County District Developed Cycle Assessment tests and/or Pre-AP Classroom Assessments
2. Use of common classroom assessments
3. Teacher/student conferences and checks for understanding
4. PLC teacher/administrator meetings to discuss student progress
5. Monthly Pre-AP teacher districtwide PLC meetings
6. Use of School Profiles dashboard to monitor discipline/attendance disparities

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Darlene Lebo (lebod@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. Implement culturally relevant instructional practices in classrooms such as cooperative small group and equitable grading practices.
2. Strengthen the ability of all staff to establish and maintain positive relationships with all students.
3. Support the development and/or implementation of school-wide ownership of equitable practices that engage students in acknowledging and adhering to processes and procedures.

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

These strategies are necessary to help teachers maximize their instructional impact on African-American students. The criteria used to make this determination is our ESSA Federal Index.

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.

Continue to train and support staff in equitable grading practices

Person Responsible: Darlene Lebo (lebod@pcsb.org)

By When:

Provide targeted restorative practice updates throughout the year.

Person Responsible: Darlene Lebo (lebod@pcsb.org)

By When:

Continue to train and support all staff in implementing highly engaging strategies that reach all students.

Person Responsible: Darlene Lebo (lebod@pcsb.org)

By When:

Continue to train and support staff in the use of Hi-Tide to better understand the full picture of at-risk students and to improve the support of the whole child.

Person Responsible: Darlene Lebo (lebod@pcsb.org)

By When:

#7. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to English Language Learners

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.

1. Our current level of performance is 21 percent achievement, as evidenced in the ESSA Federal Index (2022).
2. We expect our performance level to be 30 percent achievement by the end of the 2023-2024 school year.
3. The problem/gap is occurring as a result of the need for additional individualized support based on English language proficiency needs to provide access to complex, grade level content.
4. If additional individualized support and skills practice would occur, the problem would be reduced by 9 percent.

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

The percent of ELL students making learning gains will increase from 21 to 30 percent or higher, as measured by the ESSA Federal Index.

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

1. Pinellas County District Developed Cycle Assessment tests and/or Pre-AP Classroom Assessments
2. Use of common classroom assessments
3. Teacher/student conferences and checks for understanding
4. PLC teacher/administrator meetings to discuss student progress
5. Monthly Pre-AP teacher districtwide PLC meetings

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Anthony Bryant (bryantan@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.)

Support staff to utilize data to organize students in order to interact with content in manners which differentiates/scaffolds instruction to meet the needs of each student.

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

These strategies are necessary to help teacher maximize their instructional impact on ELL students. The data used to make this determination are our ESSA Federal Index and input from our ELL department.

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.

Review school-based data in a disaggregated manner and thoughtfully plan for remediation and enrichment interventions.

Person Responsible: Anthony Bryant (bryantan@pcsb.org)

By When:

Explicitly teach, develop and model high-level English language and content specific vocabulary strategies (i.e., IDEAS) throughout the school day by all staff.

Person Responsible: Anthony Bryant (bryantan@pcsb.org)

By When:

Provide learning opportunities for teachers on the use of WIDA Ellevation reports and Can Do Approach to support differentiated planning and instruction, based on student language proficiency languages.

Person Responsible: Anthony Bryant (bryantan@pcsb.org)

By When:

Utilize and monitor the implementation of Can Do Descriptors and Model Performance Indicators in the planning and practice within all classrooms to ensure instruction matches the needs of ELs and scaffolding provides an appropriate entry-point for grade-level content with ongoing support.

Person Responsible: [no one identified]

By When:

Monitor the LF student performance to ensure academic success or provide appropriate supports; monitor implementation of testing accommodations for LF students to ensure consistency school wide.

Person Responsible: Anthony Bryant (bryantan@pcsb.org)

By When:

Monitor fidelity of implementation of the EL Grading Policy school wide by utilizing the grading reports and follow up with individual teachers for each course failure for LY students.

Person Responsible: Anthony Bryant (bryantan@pcsb.org)

By When:

Create a schedule for the Bilingual Assistant(s) that directly supports standards-based instruction for ELs (provide support and PD and establish clear expectations with accountability).

Person Responsible: Anthony Bryant (bryantan@pcsb.org)

By When:

Have a school plan for meaningful communication with families via the website, newsletter, parent letters, phone calls, etc and ensure communication is available in languages spoken by ELs; utilize LionBridge interpretation phone services.

Person Responsible: Anthony Bryant (bryantan@pcsb.org)

By When:

#8. 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.

1. Our current level of performance is 32 percent achievement, as evidenced in the ESSA Federal Index (2023).
2. The gap is occurring due to the need for increased differentiation and support within the core classrooms.
3. If an increased model of support within Math classes and Reading classes specifically would occur, the performance would increase by 10 percent.

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

The percent of Students with Disabilities reaching proficiency will increase from 32% to 42% as measured by FAST and EOCs.

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

1. Progress Monitoring Assessment tests (FAST) and/or Pre-AP Classroom Assessments
2. Use of common classroom assessments
3. Teacher/student conferences and checks for understanding
4. PLC teacher/administrator meetings to discuss student progress
5. Monthly Pre-AP teacher districtwide PLC meetings

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Andrea Anderson (andersonand@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. ESE teachers to utilize data to organize students to interact with content in manners which differentiates/scaffolds instruction to meet the needs of each student.
2. Teachers provide positive reinforcement for students, showing that they have confidence in their students' abilities.
3. Students are fully engaged in their lessons.
4. Students are given a number of different ways to demonstrate their understanding of course material.
5. Students requiring ESE services work towards mastery of meaningful Individualized Education Plan (IEP) goals while learning the foundational skills they need to engage in rigorous, grade-level content in the Least Restrictive Environment (LRE).

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

These strategies are necessary to help teachers maximize their instructional impact on Students with Disabilities. The criteria used to make this determination is our ESSA Federal Index and input from our ESE department.

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

Utilize a process that places students requiring ESE services into the master schedule first to best optimize their service delivery. Use of support facilitation teacher model for instruction.

Person Responsible: Andrea Anderson (andersonand@pcsb.org)

By When:

Teachers will review school-based data in a disaggregated manner and thoughtfully plan and implement for remediation and enrichment interventions.

Person Responsible: Andrea Anderson (andersonand@pcsb.org)

By When:

Teachers receive professional development around inclusion WICOR strategies that include movement, collaboration and accountable talk strategies that can be implemented and modified to meet the needs of diverse learners.

Person Responsible: Andrea Anderson (andersonand@pcsb.org)

By When:

Ensure that all ESE teachers are co-planning with the subject area teachers during PLCs to better provide meaningful services for students with disabilities. Incorporate WICOR strategies in all lesson plans with an emphasis on Focused Note Taking.

Person Responsible: Andrea Anderson (andersonand@pcsb.org)

By When:

ESE teachers implementing specially designed instruction.

Person Responsible: Andrea Anderson (andersonand@pcsb.org)

By When:

Provide professional development around the topic of equitable grading practices. Work with teachers PLC groups to monitor grades throughout the grading periods for fidelity of this.

Person Responsible: Andrea Anderson (andersonand@pcsb.org)

By When:

#9. 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.

Community engagement is key to ensuring our students are college and career-ready. Evidence shows that students and staff benefit from increased engagement. St. Petersburg High has a rich history of community support to build from.

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

5% increase in documented volunteers from 2023-2024 school year.
5% increase in enrollment in PTSA/SAC
5% increase in community visitation/tours to our campus

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

Monitoring of organizational enrollment
Monitoring of registered volunteers
Monitoring of the number of campus tours by alumni, the school and the community

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Darlene Lebo (lebod@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. Increase stakeholder voice in events.
2. Increase the flexibility of involvement options and modes of access.
3. Building a positive, welcoming environment

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

We have been diligently working to welcome families and the community to our campus to visit and see us in ation. This is an opportunity to use lessons learned regarding innovative strategies for engagement as well as reimage the way we interact with the community.

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 2 - Moderate 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).

Our administrative team along with our School Based Leadership Team have analyzed all of our state data to determine the best way to allocate school improvement funding in an effort to close learning gaps and build capacity. Monitoring will continue through our SBLT and through our weekly PLCs dedicated to each of our core subject areas.