
Table of Contents

| | |
|--|-----------|
| SIP Authority and Purpose | 3 |
| I. School Information | 6 |
| II. Needs Assessment/Data Review | 7 |
| III. Planning for Improvement | 12 |
| IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review | 33 |
| V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence | 33 |
| VI. Title I Requirements | 35 |
| VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus | 37 |

Clearwater High School

1951 GULF TO BAY BOULEVARD, Clearwater, FL 33764

<http://www.clearwater-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.

The mission of Clearwater High School is to build relationships with our students that allow us to provide a rigorous and relevant educational experience that allows for college and career experiences, that truly prepares them for post-secondary life.

Provide the school's vision statement.

100% Student Success – Clearwater High School students will graduate college and career ready.

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 |
|-------------------|---------------------|---------------------------------|
| Krause, Eric | Principal | |
| Chenier, Jennifer | Assistant Principal | |
| Denton , Russell | Assistant Principal | |
| Hopkins, Leslie | Assistant Principal | |
| Watkins, Janeen | Assistant Principal | |

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.

CHS utilizes input from multiple stakeholders including the SBLT, teachers, students, and parents to develop the school improvement plan. Data is shared regularly, stakeholder feedback is analyzed, and through several collaborative summer planning sessions, the CHS SIP is developed.

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 monitored for effective implementation and impact thorough various measured data points. We will utilize quarterly district assessments results (Cycle), State progress monitoring (PM1 & PM2), as well as teacher walkthrough data to identify and address learning and achievement gaps. Utilizing quarterly data chats in core tested areas and through family parent engagement events, CHS

will work to ensure data is not only monitored but ensure all stakeholders are informed and a part of the implementation.

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 | 66% |
| 2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate | 100% |
| 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 | |

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* | 31 | 47 | 50 | 35 | 51 | 51 | 36 | | |
| ELA Learning Gains | | | | 40 | | | 38 | | |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | 37 | | | 27 | | |
| Math Achievement* | 25 | 36 | 38 | 34 | 38 | 38 | 29 | | |
| Math Learning Gains | | | | 45 | | | 34 | | |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | 35 | | | 39 | | |
| Science Achievement* | 54 | 61 | 64 | 54 | 42 | 40 | 50 | | |
| Social Studies Achievement* | 46 | 63 | 66 | 59 | 47 | 48 | 48 | | |
| Middle School Acceleration | | | | | 45 | 44 | | | |
| Graduation Rate | 95 | 92 | 89 | 96 | 61 | 61 | 98 | | |
| College and Career Acceleration | 88 | 69 | 65 | 93 | 70 | 67 | 84 | | |
| ELP Progress | 33 | 47 | 45 | | | | 45 | | |

* In cases where a school does not test 95% of students in a subject, the achievement component will be different in the Federal Percent of Points Index (FPPI) than in school grades calculation.

See [Florida School Grades, School Improvement Ratings and DJJ Accountability Ratings](#).

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

| 2021-22 ESSA Federal Index | |
|--|------|
| ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI) | ATSI |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students | 53 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students | No |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 2 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 372 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 7 |
| Percent Tested | 96 |
| Graduation Rate | 95 |

| 2021-22 ESSA Federal Index | |
|--------------------------------------|------|
| ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI) | ATSI |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students | 53 |

| 2021-22 ESSA Federal Index | |
|--|-----|
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students | No |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 2 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 528 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 10 |
| 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 | 34 | Yes | 4 | |
| ELL | 40 | Yes | 4 | |
| AMI | | | | |
| ASN | 45 | | | |
| BLK | 46 | | | |
| HSP | 49 | | | |
| MUL | 51 | | | |
| PAC | | | | |
| WHT | 68 | | | |
| 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 | 38 | Yes | 3 | |
| ELL | 38 | Yes | 3 | |
| AMI | | | | |
| ASN | 73 | | | |
| BLK | 47 | | | |
| HSP | 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% |
| MUL | 50 | | | |
| PAC | | | | |
| WHT | 60 | | | |
| FRL | 49 | | | |

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 | 31 | | | 25 | | | 54 | 46 | | 95 | 88 | 33 |
| SWD | 7 | | | 14 | | | 22 | 18 | | 75 | 7 | 8 |
| ELL | 10 | | | 18 | | | 35 | 14 | | 80 | 7 | 33 |
| AMI | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ASN | 45 | | | | | | | | | | 1 | |
| BLK | 12 | | | 10 | | | 36 | 34 | | 87 | 6 | |
| HSP | 24 | | | 22 | | | 48 | 38 | | 89 | 7 | 28 |
| MUL | 31 | | | 20 | | | 59 | 25 | | 72 | 6 | |
| PAC | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 50 | | | 39 | | | 69 | 65 | | 92 | 6 | |
| FRL | 26 | | | 22 | | | 47 | 39 | | 86 | 7 | 38 |

| 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 | 35 | 40 | 37 | 34 | 45 | 35 | 54 | 59 | | 96 | 93 | |
| SWD | 7 | 25 | 27 | 18 | | | 24 | 35 | | 88 | 83 | |
| ELL | 7 | 33 | 35 | 15 | 27 | 18 | 13 | 44 | | 96 | 96 | |
| AMI | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ASN | 57 | 36 | | | | | | | | 100 | 100 | |

| 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 | 25 | 43 | 50 | 24 | 40 | 30 | 37 | 40 | | 96 | 84 | |
| HSP | 29 | 37 | 31 | 31 | 41 | 42 | 44 | 57 | | 95 | 92 | |
| MUL | 33 | 29 | 30 | 24 | 27 | | 42 | 78 | | 92 | 92 | |
| PAC | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 46 | 44 | 32 | 46 | 53 | 38 | 76 | 68 | | 97 | 95 | |
| FRL | 31 | 40 | 38 | 28 | 37 | 28 | 48 | 58 | | 95 | 90 | |

| 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 | 36 | 38 | 27 | 29 | 34 | 39 | 50 | 48 | | 98 | 84 | 45 |
| SWD | 11 | 32 | 38 | 11 | 32 | 36 | 16 | 19 | | 91 | 65 | 29 |
| ELL | 7 | 21 | 18 | 18 | 31 | 42 | 27 | 11 | | 99 | 76 | 45 |
| AMI | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ASN | 75 | 73 | | | | | | | | 100 | 93 | |
| BLK | 18 | 36 | 32 | 13 | 27 | 30 | 28 | 28 | | 94 | 75 | |
| HSP | 28 | 30 | 20 | 29 | 35 | 47 | 45 | 36 | | 99 | 80 | 44 |
| MUL | 37 | 33 | | 15 | 24 | | 56 | 43 | | 100 | 84 | |
| PAC | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 49 | 47 | 34 | 41 | 37 | 46 | 66 | 72 | | 99 | 90 | 60 |
| FRL | 26 | 32 | 23 | 23 | 31 | 35 | 44 | 34 | | 97 | 82 | 37 |

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

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

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

| Grade | Year | ELA | | | | |
|-------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| | | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 10 | 2023 - Spring | 37% | 48% | -11% | 50% | -13% |
| 09 | 2023 - Spring | 27% | 46% | -19% | 48% | -21% |

| ALGEBRA | | | | | | |
|---------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| N/A | 2023 - Spring | 25% | 53% | -28% | 50% | -25% |

| GEOMETRY | | | | | | |
|----------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| N/A | 2023 - Spring | 30% | 46% | -16% | 48% | -18% |

| BIOLOGY | | | | | | |
|---------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| N/A | 2023 - Spring | 55% | 59% | -4% | 63% | -8% |

| HISTORY | | | | | | |
|---------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| N/A | 2023 - Spring | 46% | 59% | -13% | 63% | -17% |

III. Planning for Improvement

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

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

The data component that showed the lowest performance was our Mathematics achievement. Contributing factors to last year's performance were a combination of new teachers to the subject area for our school as well as the roll out of a new test administration and new standards.

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

The data component that showed the greatest decline from the prior year was our Social Studies achievement, which had a drop of thirteen points. Some contributing factors include a need for increased intensity in PLC's concerning data analysis with greater emphasis on differentiated instruction and remediation for students identified as needing improvement in the various data components.

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 data component that had the greatest gap when compared to the state average was our 9th grade achievement. Factors and trends that we feel contributed to the gap was a combination of new construction (students had a 12 min walk from one side of the campus to the other), new standards, new assessment, and new teachers to English 1.

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

The data component that showed the most improvement was Biology. The actions we took in this area were quarterly data chats and implementation of a weekly Biology boot camp review with students based on deficient standards from cycle assessments and common teacher assessments.

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.

Outside of increasing achievement levels across all tested areas, here are our 5 priorities for this school year:

- 1) Collaborative strategies imbedded in classroom lessons
- 2) Utilization of Focused Notes process
- 3) Daily identification of Critical Content
- 4) Embedded literacy across all content areas
- 5) Utilization of HOT questions to increase opportunities for students to think critically

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 Algebra 1 proficiency component for school improvement indicates that our school was below the state average for proficiency by 6%.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Increase the percentage of students showing proficiency in Algebra by 7%, from 26% to 33% on the Algebra 1 EOC exam. Increase the percentage of students showing proficiency in Grade 10 on the Algebra 1 EOC by 8%, from 14% to 22%.

Monitoring:

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

This area of focus will be monitored with AP walk-throughs, common planning periods, bi-weekly PLC's, formative/cycle assessments and data chats, and professional development (Quarterly PD and DPP's).

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Russell Denton (dentonr@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.)

AP walkthroughs and professional development (quarterly PD and DPP alignment) will be utilized to monitor pacing and instruction to ensure alignment with standards and execution of curriculum. Teachers will have common planning and bi-weekly PLC's to plan for instruction and implementation of IXL, Imagine Math and ALEKS, and create common assessments aligned to the standards.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Evidence-based research supports the use of consistent monitoring, professional development, common planning periods, PLC's, common assessments and formative/cycle assessment tools to improve and align teaching and learning with the standards as well as allowing for differentiation and support.

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.

All Algebra 1 teachers will attend and participate in two DWT days, as well as quarterly district-facilitated PD, and bi-weekly PLC's and have common planning periods to plan and align lessons and instruction to the BEST standards, create common assessments to track student progress formatively and assist with planning for remediation of struggling standards as indicated on formative and cycle assessments.

Person Responsible: Russell Denton (dentonr@pcsb.org)

By When: DWT - 8/23 and 2/24 PD - Quarterly (dates TBD) PLC/Planning - Ongoing bi-weekly/daily

All Algebra 1 teachers will utilize district provided resources, such as IXL, Imagine Math and ALEKS, regularly to assist with instruction and support students towards mastery of the content and standards. Additionally, all Algebra 1 teachers will utilize the EOC Reference Sheet and a physical or digital calculator daily as instruction is delivered.

Person Responsible: Russell Denton (dentonr@pcsb.org)

By When: Ongoing from day to day and module to module.

All Algebra 1 teachers will utilize benchmark-based common assessments for each module, as well as formative/cycle assessments to continually measure student data, plan for remediation of struggling standards, and utilize data chats involve students in planning for their individual academic growth.

Person Responsible: Russell Denton (dentonr@pcsb.org)

By When: Assessments will be ongoing from module to module and quarter to quarter.

#2. 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 Geometry proficiency component for school improvement indicates that our school was below the state average for proficiency by 15%.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Increase the percentage of students showing proficiency in Geometry by 8%, from 30% to 38% on the Geometry EOC exam. Increase the percentage of students showing proficiency in Grade 11 in Geometry by 10% from 11% to 21%.

Monitoring:

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

This area of focus will be monitored with AP walk-throughs, common planning periods, bi-weekly PLC's, formative/cycle assessments and data chats, and professional development (Quarterly PD and DPP's).

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Russell Denton (dentonr@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.)

AP walkthroughs and professional development (quarterly PD and DPP alignment) will be utilized to monitor pacing and instruction to ensure alignment with standards and execution of curriculum. Teachers will have common planning and bi-weekly PLC's to plan for instruction and implementation of IXL and ALEKS, and create common assessments aligned to the standards.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Evidence-based research supports the use of consistent monitoring, professional development, common planning periods, PLC's, common assessments and formative/cycle assessment tools to improve and align teaching and learning with the standards as well as allowing for differentiation and support.

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.

All Geometry teachers will attend and participate in two DWT days, as well as quarterly district-facilitated PD, and bi-weekly PLC's and have common planning periods to plan and align lessons and instruction to the BEST standards, create common assessments to track student progress formatively and assist with planning for remediation of struggling standards as indicated on formative and cycle assessments.

Person Responsible: Russell Denton (dentonr@pcsb.org)

By When: DWT - 8/23 and 2/24 PD - Quarterly (dates TBD) PLC/Planning - Ongoing bi-weekly/daily

All Geometry teachers will utilize district provided resources, such as IXL and ALEKS, regularly to assist with instruction and support students towards mastery of the content and standards. Additionally, all Geometry teachers will utilize the EOC Reference Sheet and a physical or digital calculator daily as instruction is delivered.

Person Responsible: Russell Denton (dentonr@pcsb.org)

By When: Ongoing from day to day and module to module.

All Geometry teachers will utilize benchmark-based common assessments for each module, as well as formative/cycle assessments to continually measure student data, plan for remediation of struggling standards, and utilize data chats involve students in planning for their individual academic growth.

Person Responsible: Russell Denton (dentonr@pcsb.org)

By When: Assessments will be ongoing from module to module and quarter to quarter.

#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 US History EOC results indicate that we had 46% of our students meeting high standards on the US History EOC. This was a decrease of 13% points as compared to last year.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Increase the percentage of students meeting high standards in US History to 55% by May 2024 as measured by the US History EOC.

Monitoring:

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

This area of focus will be monitored through PLC engagement, cycle assessment data analysis, observational walkthrough data, spiral reviews with ticket out the door, and we will make sure common planning is in place for all instructors.

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.)

Strengthen staff ability to engage students in complex tasks. Strengthen staff practice to utilize questions stems and paired passages to help students elaborate on content. 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.

Our US History results indicate that we are currently performing below our school district and state. We will utilize complex assignments and projects to assist our students in better elaborating on content. We will also engage our teachers in strategic conversations with students and parents regarding performance data throughout the year. We will strive to meet the needs of each student through the strategic use of student performance data on cycle 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.

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

#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.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Clearwater High School's Biology EOC data indicates that 55% of test takers achieved proficiency on the Biology EOC. By the end of the 23/24 school year, CHS will increase the achievement level to 60% as measured by the end of year State assessment.

Monitoring:

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

This area of focus will be monitored through collaborative PLC engagement, observational walkthrough feedback data, cycle assessment and formative assessment data as well as the implementation of differentiated instruction.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Janeen Watkins (watkinsja@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 will utilize data to organize students to interact with critical content and engage in cognitively complex tasks related to rigorous standards. Teachers will differentiate/scaffolds instruction to meet the needs of each student. Administration will support staff in utilizing 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.

Our staff will engage the students by scaffolding support and following standards-based instruction (provided by the district). Data will be utilized using both informal and formal assessments to identify deficiencies to meet the needs of each student.

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. Ensuring that all Biology teachers can access common assessment data. Teachers will analyze the data to collaboratively plan in PLC groups for students to engage in complex tasks that are aligned to appropriate rigorous science standards. Teachers implement continuous progress monitoring to plan interventions, monitor and celebrate learning gains of individual students.

Person Responsible: Janeen Watkins (watkinsja@pcsb.org)

By When:

Teachers and administrators 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. Teachers will incorporate the AVID strategy of the month. Administrators frequently observe classrooms for effective use of WICOR strategies, provide constructive feedback to teachers and collaborate to determine next steps.

Person Responsible: Janeen Watkins (watkinsja@pcsb.org)

By When:

Teachers will use District resources to deliver lessons aligned to critical content, at the appropriate level of rigor, using the district pacing calendar.

Person Responsible: Janeen Watkins (watkinsja@pcsb.org)

By When:

Teachers conduct quarterly data chats with students to offer support for achievement and individualized goal setting based on cycle assessment data. Data chats will be used to give feedback and set goals with students and connect them to ELP or HSSC resources followed by reassessments to determine success of reteaching and inform next steps.

Person Responsible: Janeen Watkins (watkinsja@pcsb.org)

By When:

The administration will engage the staff in leadership walks as well as promote fishbowl lessons to allow teachers to view and reflect on the level of rigor and effective implementation of complex tasks aligned to standards. Administrator will frequently visit science classes to observe rigor of student tasks, provide constructive feedback and collaborate to determine next steps.

Person Responsible: Janeen Watkins (watkinsja@pcsb.org)

By When:

#5. 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.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Monitoring:

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

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

[no one identified]

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

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

ELA teachers will utilize PLC protocol engagement that continues to drive FAST PM instructional shift initiatives.

Person Responsible: Jennifer Chenier (chenierje@pcsb.org)

By When: 2023-2024 school year

Leadership walks with ELA staff to identify, monitor, and support best practices.

Person Responsible: Jennifer Chenier (chenierje@pcsb.org)

By When: 2023-2024 school year

9th and 10th grade ELA teachers will utilize resources provided in the HS ELA and Reading Notebook and consistently incorporate classroom visible anchor charts, graphic organizers, and critical reading protocols to support independent reading and ensure students are continually in productive struggle with complex texts and complex questions like the questions they will encounter on FAST PM.

Person Responsible: Jennifer Chenier (chenierje@pcsb.org)

By When: 2023-2024 school year

ELA teachers will utilize required BEST texts from the State's BEST list provided in the curriculum pacing guide.

Person Responsible: Jennifer Chenier (chenierje@pcsb.org)

By When: 2023-2024 school year

ELA teachers will construct and utilize a BEST benchmarks tracking system to continually note, track and monitor each individual student's progress and mastery of each BEST benchmark which incorporates collaboration between teacher and student that supports student ownership of their progress.

Person Responsible: Jennifer Chenier (chenierje@pcsb.org)

By When: 2023-2024 school year

ELA teachers will monitor data from FAST PM, ThinkCerca, AppleRouth, Lexia PowerUp, and Albert IO to gauge progress in BEST standards. Teachers will conduct individual data chats with students to analyze data and formulate specific strategies that drive student improvement.

ELA and Reading administrators will also monitor progress and provide feedback to teachers and students.

Person Responsible: Jennifer Chenier (chenierje@pcsb.org)

By When: 2023-2024

#6. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Intervention**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 Reading component for school improvement indicates that Clearwater High School has not demonstrated adequate yearly progress with 9th and 10th grade reading intervention students. The Reading goal will focus on increasing overall achievement in word study (phonics), grammar, and comprehension for Clearwater High School students.

Measurable Outcome:

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

The specific measurable outcome is to increase student proficiency in oral reading fluency by May 2024 as measured by quarterly ORF testing.

Monitoring:

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

This area of focus will be monitored through common PLC protocol engagement that continues to drive and analyze oral reading fluency data on students in reading intervention courses.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Eric Krause (krausee@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.)

The Reading staff will engage in common PLC protocol, as well as utilize Focused Note Taking in all Reading classes. Utilizing the Focused Note Taking process, teachers and students will collaborate to create classroom anchor charts related to fluency, word study, and grammar.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The rationale for selecting this specific strategy is based on research based best practices to support our struggling readers at Clearwater High School. We have a large portion of 9th and 10th grade students that are not reading on grade level and based on the data received, comprehension has been identified as an area of critical need for our students.

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.

Reading teachers will utilize a PLC protocol engagement that continues to drive instructional shift initiatives with an emphasis on monitoring with feedback regarding student fluency and comprehension.

Person Responsible: Eric Krause (krausee@pcsb.org)

By When:

Reading teachers will utilize resources provided in the HS ELA and Reading Notebook and consistently incorporate classroom visible anchor charts, graphic organizers, and critical reading protocols to ensure students are continually in productive struggle with complex texts and complex questions like the questions they will encounter on FAST.

Person Responsible: Eric Krause (krausee@pcsb.org)

By When:

Reading teachers will utilize required BEST texts from the State's BEST list provided in the curriculum pacing guide.

Person Responsible: Eric Krause (krausee@pcsb.org)

By When:

Reading teachers will participate in professional development training provided by the district office focusing on ORF testing, data analysis and next steps.

Person Responsible: Eric Krause (krausee@pcsb.org)

By When:

Reading teachers will utilize a PLC protocol engagement that continues to drive instructional shift initiatives with an emphasis on monitoring with feedback regarding student fluency and comprehension.

Person Responsible: Eric Krause (krausee@pcsb.org)

By When:

Reading teachers will utilize resources provided in the HS ELA and Reading Notebook and consistently incorporate classroom visible anchor charts, graphic organizers, and critical reading protocols to ensure students are continually in productive struggle with complex texts and complex questions like the questions they will encounter on FAST.

Person Responsible: Eric Krause (krausee@pcsb.org)

By When:

Reading teachers will utilize required BEST texts from the State's BEST list provided in the curriculum pacing guide.

Person Responsible: Eric Krause (krausee@pcsb.org)

By When:

Reading teachers will participate in professional development training provided by the district office focusing on ORF testing, data analysis and next steps.

Person Responsible: Eric Krause (krausee@pcsb.org)

By When:

#7. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Early Warning System**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

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

CHS will focus on increased parental involvement and communication surrounding student attendance. Research indicates that if student attendance is high, student achievement will increase. An area of concern is attendance due to skipping class and school.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Clearwater High School will communicate and explicitly teach the expectations as well as the Master Discipline Plan with Restorative Practices to the students. Students will also be informed of the PBIS action plan along with the incentives for attending classes. With the teaching of expectations and Master Discipline Plan with Restorative Practices as well as the PBIS action plan, the percentage of absences due to skipping classes should decrease.

Monitoring:

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

This area of focus will be monitored by school leadership and instructional staff utilizing discipline referral and attendance data. Collaborative discussions will be held in SBLT, CST, and PLC meetings.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Janeen Watkins (watkinsja@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.)

Providing support to students through clearly defined, communicated, and implemented behavior expectations regarding attending classes. Data will be collected and reviewed in the child study team meetings. Implementation of Tier 2 and 3 will be used with students that are identified as needing additional supports.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

With the area of skipping classes as a concern, the implementation of Tier 2 and Tier 3 interventions individually addresses the students' needs and barriers. This process monitors students closely and allows for revisions if necessary.

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 Attendance taking process and school wide strategies for positive attendance with all staff.

Person Responsible: Janeen Watkins (watkinsja@pcsb.org)

By When:

Increase communication to parents in native languages to improve accessibility of all families both to inform of expectations and ask for support of not meeting those expectations.

Person Responsible: Janeen Watkins (watkinsja@pcsb.org)

By When:

PBIS student committee, Student Ambassador and TV Production classes will emphasize student attendance, remaining on campus, and being in class while reinforcing academic behaviors.

Person Responsible: Janeen Watkins (watkinsja@pcsb.org)

By When:

Develop and implement attendance incentive programs and competitions.

Person Responsible: Janeen Watkins (watkinsja@pcsb.org)

By When:

#8. 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 94%, as evidenced in 2022-2023 FLDOE graduation rate.
2. We expect our performance level to be 96% by the end of the 2023-2024 school year.

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 meeting on-time graduation requirements will increase from 94% to 96%, as measured by the FLDOE graduation rate.

Monitoring:

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

This area of focus will be monitored weekly in SBLT and School Counselor meetings.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Eric Krause (krausee@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. Strengthen staff ability to engage students for on-track promotion throughout high school.
2. Ensure reading remediation support and credit recovery are embedded into the school day for students as needed.
3. Routinely reach out to students/families who were previously withdrawn for non- attendance to re-engage or update withdrawal codes.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

These strategies are needed to assist students by ensuring they complete all graduation requirements for on-time graduation.

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. School Counselors will conduct senior seminars for all seniors and offer additional support for students who are at risk of meeting graduation requirements.
2. Ensure all students receive remediation if needed and provide with additional opportunities during the school day as well as after school.
3. Provide multiple graduation required assessment opportunities during the summer and school year.

Person Responsible: Russell Denton (dentonr@pcsb.org)

By When:

#9. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

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

The current level of ELA proficiency indicates the 9th and 10th grade ESE students are 12% proficient as measured by the FAST PM3. Teachers will increase collaborative planning in PLCs between ESE support facilitators and general education teachers. Teachers will utilize monthly PLCs that focus on student data and how assure they monitor and differentiate instructions. The support within the ELA classes should increase the ELA proficiency rate to 22% for ESE students.

Measurable Outcome:

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

ESE support teachers will work alongside the general education teacher as a collaborative unit to utilize data and implement instructional decisions to improve the proficiency rate from 12% to 22%.

Monitoring:

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

This area of focus will be monitored by administration, the ESE team, and the school counselors. All will utilize the Progress Monitoring (FAST) assessments, common classroom assessments and teacher/student conferences.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Janeen Watkins (watkinsja@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.)

The ESE and general education teachers will use the Progress Monitoring Assessments (FAST) as well as common classroom assessments to implement and support meeting the students IEP and learning goals in the least restrictive environment. The teachers will conference with students to check for understanding. Teachers will attend PLCs and confer with administration about student progress.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Gathering input from all stakeholders to assure each ESE student is receiving all the support necessary as well as all IEP goals are being maximized. Multiple strategies will be incorporated 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

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.

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: [no one identified]

By When:

ESE support teachers will assist students with literacy skills, math skills, organizational skills, and AVID strategies within the general education courses.

Person Responsible: [no one identified]

By When:

ESE support teachers and general education teachers will utilize PLC collaborative planning time to plan for standards-based instruction.

Person Responsible: [no one identified]

By When:

Collect data from Progress Monitoring (FAST) to monitor progress towards IEP goals and objectives and to make data-driven decisions to accommodations.

Person Responsible: [no one identified]

By When:

ESE teachers will integrate specially designed instruction into core content classes while monitoring mastery of standards and IEP goals.

Person Responsible: Janeen Watkins (watkinsja@pcsb.org)

By When:

#10. 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.

The current level of ELA proficiency indicates the 9th and 10th grade ESE students are 8% proficient as measured by the FAST PM3. Teachers will increase collaborative planning in PLCs between ELL support facilitators, ESOL teacher, and general education teachers. Teachers will utilize monthly PLCs that focus on student data and how assure they monitor and differentiate instructions. The support within the ELA classes should increase the ELA proficiency rate to 18% for ELL students.

Measurable Outcome:

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

ELL support teachers and ESOL teacher will work alongside the general education teacher as a collaborative unit to utilize data and implement instructional decisions to improve the proficiency rate from 8% to 18%.

Monitoring:

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

The ELL support teachers, ESOL teacher, and general education teachers will use the Progress Monitoring Assessments (FAST) as well as common classroom assessments to implement and support meeting the students stretch goals. The teachers will conference with students to check for understanding and all teachers will attend PLCs and confer with administration about student progress. CHS will host PM data chats with families at various information meetings throughout the year to collaborate with families.

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.)

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

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Gathering input from all stakeholders to assure each ELL student is receiving all the support necessary meet their stretch goals are being maximized. Multiple strategies will be incorporated to help teachers maximize their instructional impact on English Language Learners. The criteria used to make this determination is our ESSA Federal Index and input from our ESOL 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.

ELL support teachers will assist students with literacy skills, organizational skills, and AVID strategies within the ELA 1 and 2 courses.

Person Responsible: [no one identified]

By When:

Collect data from Progress Monitoring (FAST) to monitor progress towards stretch goals and objectives and to make data-driven decisions to accommodations.

Person Responsible: Jennifer Chenier (chenierje@pcsb.org)

By When:

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).

Clearwater High School has received Title 1 funds to support areas of critical need. Based on trending data, it shows that students identified as English Language Learners (ELL) and Exceptional Student Education (ESE) are performing under the expected Federal Index of 41%. We have utilized our support funds to add supports through a Math Coach and MTSS Specialist. Additionally, we have committed to hosting multiple parent engagement nights throughout the year focusing on our students of greatest need. Finally, we are also partnering with the City of Clearwater and the Hispanic Outreach Center to offer tutoring services in strategic locations in an effort to remove transportation barriers for our students and families.

Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE)

Area of Focus Description and Rationale

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

- The percentage of students below Level 3 on the 2022 statewide, standardized ELA assessment. Identification criteria must include each grade that has 50 percent or more students scoring below level 3 in grades 3-5 on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.
- The percentage of students in kindergarten through grade 3, based on 2021-2022 end of year screening and progress monitoring data, who are not on track to score Level 3 or above on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.
- Other forms of data that should be considered: formative, progress monitoring and diagnostic assessment data.

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

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

Measurable Outcomes

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

- Each grade K -3, using the coordinated screening and progress monitoring system, where 50 percent or more of the students are not on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment;
- Each grade 3-5 where 50 percent or more of its students scored below a Level 3 on the most recent statewide, standardized ELA assessment; and
- Grade 6 measurable outcomes may be included, as applicable.

Grades K-2 Measurable Outcomes**Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes****Monitoring****Monitoring**

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

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Evidence-based Practices/Programs**Description:**

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

- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs meet Florida's definition of evidence-based (strong, moderate or promising)?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align with the district's K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align to the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards?

Rationale:

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

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

Action Steps to Implement

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

- Literacy Leadership
- Literacy Coaching
- Assessment
- Professional Learning

| Action Step | Person Responsible for Monitoring |
|-------------|-----------------------------------|
|-------------|-----------------------------------|

Title I Requirements

Schoolwide Program Plan (SWP) Requirements

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

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

The strategies/ methods we will be implementing for SIP dissemination are as follows:
 CHS will host parent awareness and school support evenings targeting our gap subgroups and ESSA identified families. We will also diversify opportunities for parent information sessions and other community events to increase participation and opportunity (morning/ evening/ virtual). We will also continue to partner with district and community organizations to ensure students and families are wholly supported. We will also create a SIP one pager that will outline our school goals and priorities in a manner that is clear, concise, and relatable to our various stakeholders.

Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission, support the needs of students and keep parents informed of their child's progress.
 List the school's webpage* where the school's Family Engagement Plan is made publicly available. (ESSA 1116(b-g))

CHS will build positive relationships with parents, families, and other community stakeholders by hosting strategic information sessions with multiple opportunities to receive information. Additionally, we will invite families and provide meals for our families at these various family information events. Finally, CHS will utilize a electronic progress report process where families are provided updates regarding their students academic progress as well as available supports (i.e. ELP, tutoring, district supports, etc.).

Describe how the school plans to strengthen the academic program in the school, increase the amount and quality of learning time and help provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum. Include the Area of Focus if addressed in Part III of the SIP. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)ii)

Strategies that will be utilized to strengthen the academic program in the school are: professional growth in Universal Design for Learning and rigor through culturally responsive pedagogy and Equitable Grading practices with the goal of decreasing deficits while meeting the diverse needs of all students. CHS will look to provide needed professional development in the area of collaborative structures with accountable talk in an effort to leverage student engagement and understanding. This combined with common planning in core tested content areas and PLC discussions that analyze student work, common assessments, and routine student data analysis.

If appropriate and applicable, describe how this plan is developed in coordination and integration with other Federal, State, and local services, resources and programs, such as programs supported under ESSA, violence prevention programs, nutrition programs, housing programs, Head Start programs, adult education programs, career and technical education programs, and schools implementing CSI or TSI activities under section 1111(d). (ESSA 1114(b)(5))

N/A

Optional Component(s) of the Schoolwide Program Plan

Include descriptions for any additional strategies that will be incorporated into the plan.

Describe how the school ensures counseling, school-based mental health services, specialized support services, mentoring services, and other strategies to improve students' skills outside the academic subject areas. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(I))

All students have the ability to meet with all student support services at Clearwater High School (CHS). Our student support system consists of School Counselors, School Social Worker, School Psychologist, and a College and Career Center Specialist. Additionally, the school facilitates multiple school wide mental health sessions throughout the academic year where critical topics are discussed and students are reminded of school supports and students are provided discrete opportunities to request help or assistance with the support team. In an effort to improve students' skills outside of the academic subject areas, students can participate in mentoring programs such as 5000 Role Models, Girlfriends, CHS Ambassadors, and Peers as Partners to name a few.

Describe the preparation for and awareness of postsecondary opportunities and the workforce, which may include career and technical education programs and broadening secondary school students' access to coursework to earn postsecondary credit while still in high school. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(II))

For years, Clearwater High School has been at the forefront of providing postsecondary opportunities for the workforce through our Wall to Wall Academy Model system. CHS hosts multiple college and career fairs during the school year. Through these continued events, we have formed partnerships with multiple businesses, municipalities, and career tech programs. Students have the opportunities for internships, externships, and industry certifications to help prepare them for postsecondary life. Additionally, our students have the opportunity to be co-enrolled with Pinellas Technical College where they can choose between multiple career choices (<https://www.pcsb.org/myptc>). Additionally, through our partnership with the National Aviation Academy and Embry Riddle Aeronautical University, students can earn their various certifications and licenses towards a future in the aviation industry.

Describe the implementation of a schoolwide tiered model to prevent and address problem behavior, and early intervening services, coordinated with similar activities and services carried out under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. 20 U.S.C. 1400 et seq. and ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(III).

N/A

Describe the professional learning and other activities for teachers, paraprofessionals, and other school personnel to improve instruction and use of data from academic assessments, and to recruit and retain effective teachers, particularly in high need subjects. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(IV))

N/A

Describe the strategies the school employs to assist preschool children in the transition from early childhood education programs to local elementary school programs. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(V))

N/A

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: Math | \$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: Instructional Practice: ELA | \$0.00 |
| 6 | III.B. | Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Intervention | \$0.00 |
| 7 | III.B. | Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Early Warning System | \$0.00 |
| 8 | III.B. | Area of Focus: Graduation: Graduation | \$0.00 |
| 9 | III.B. | Area of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities | \$0.00 |
| 10 | III.B. | Area of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: English Language Learners | \$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