Seminole County Public Schools

Seminole High School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Seminole High School

2701 RIDGEWOOD AVE, Sanford, FL 32773

http://www.scps.k12.fl.us/schools/schoolinfopage.cfm?schoolnumber=0181

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Seminole County School Board on 10/24/2023.

SIP Authority

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

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

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

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

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

ESEA sections 1111(d) requires that each school identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI develop a support and improvement plan created in partnership with stakeholders (including principals and other school leaders, teachers and parent), is informed by all indicators in the State's accountability system, includes evidence-based interventions, is based on a school-level needs assessment, and identifies resource inequities to be

addressed through implementation of the plan. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as TSI, ATSI and non-Title I CSI must be approved and monitored by the school district. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as Title I, CSI must be approved by the school district and Department. The Department must monitor and periodically review implementation of each CSI plan after approval.

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

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

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

I. School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

Our mission is to cultivate the potential in every student to thrive as a global citizen by inspiring a love of learning, encouraging civic engagement, challenging and supporting every student to achieve academic excellence, while embracing the full richness and diversity of our community.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Every student will achieve at his or her maximum potential in an engaging, inspiring and challenging learning environment.

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
Pfeiffer, Michael	Principal	School Operations and Activities: Facilities, Instruction/Curriculum, Co-Curricular, Extra-Curricular, strategic planning and implementation: SCPS Strategic Plan, High School Goals, SHS SIP, Administrative Department and Athletic Director Oversight and Evaluations, Budget: AP, IB, CTE, Operating, Internal Accounts, Human Resources: Employee staffing/ Allocations/ Support Points/ Supplements, Personnel Oversight, Collaborative Improvement Team and SEA Contact, Restorative Practices, Interns: Instructional and Administrative, Community Liaison: Business Partners, Curriculum Partners, Southside Community Center.
Coleman, Barry	Assistant Principal	Reading, ELA, ESOL, IB, JROTC, MTSS (Academic Reading), Open House, Teacher of the Year and School Related Employee of the Year, Advanced Opportunities, and Induction Program.
DeCosta, Roy	Assistant Principal	Social Studies, Facilities/Keys, Master Schedule (Backup), Inventory, Discipline Lead, Security/Minga, Safe Team, Threat Assessment Team, Summer School Principal, Activities Calendar, Year End Checklist.
Jarzynka, Jakob	Assistant Principal	Science, Physical Education, World Languages, Discipline (Last name P-S), edMentum, Seminole Success, Operation Graduation, and Athletics.
Nelson, Cindy	Assistant Principal	Math, Guidance, TE, ESE, Master Schedule, Professional Development, Awards Night, Graduation, Certification, ESE Paraprofessionals, Bell/Exam Schedules, Bokey Blast, Dual Enrollment/SCVS Contact, Mental Health Student Training.
Prom, Shelly	Assistant Principal	Academy of Health Careers Director, CTE, Health Academy and CTE Business Partners, Accreditation, AP Testing, PSAT Testing, SAT Testing, ACT Testing, SAC Liaison, School Improvement Plan, Discipline (Last name T-Z), Premier ePathways Administrator, 5 Essentials Survey, First Aid/ CPR Training.
Doherty, Courtney	Administrative Support	Front Office Clerical, MTSS (Attendance), Assist with AP, PSAT, SAT, and ACT Testing, Safe Team/ Threat Assessment Team, NEST Lead, Student Activities, Honor Grad, PTSA Liaison, Dividends, Parking (White), Discipline (Last name L-O), Professional Development, Substitutes, Attendance, Latinos in Action.
VallWatt, Catherine	Administrative Support	FAST Testing, EOC Testing, Website and Social Media, Substitutes, Textbooks, Tech Support Team Lead, Professional Development.
Wynn, Sylvester	Administrative Support	Discipline (Last name A-K), Transportation, Black History Month, Grad Bash, Saturday School, Detention, Campus and Parking Lots Sweeps, Young Men of Excellence, Young Women of Excellence.

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.

SHS regularly solicits feedback from parents and community members. Our students and parent have constant (and nearly immediate) access to our school principal. Parents take an annual Snapshot Survey. Moreover, parents are very active on our school social media platforms; we have an award winning PTSA, a very well attended School Advisory Council. The SIP is reviewed with members of the SAC committee and broken down into manageable bits using non educational lingo for easier understanding.

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 Literacy teams and administrations will meet regularly to review data from Progress Monitoring assessments.
• The team will review relevant student achievement and recommend instructional strategies to address specific skill deficits.
• Departments will work together in PLC's to evaluate student growth, stagnation and regression and implement revisions accordingly.
• MTSS process will be used to evaluate individual's student needs and to identify and implement appropriate interventions.

Demographic Data Only ESSA identification and school grade history updated 3/11/2024	
2023-24 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	High School PK, 9-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	70%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	57%
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: B
	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*	48	55	50	51	57	51	51		
ELA Learning Gains				50			52		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				33			44		
Math Achievement*	30	39	38	37	40	38	35		
Math Learning Gains				48			31		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				50			28		
Science Achievement*	63	69	64	61	48	40	55		
Social Studies Achievement*	64	70	66	60	51	48	66		
Middle School Acceleration					48	44			
Graduation Rate	90	94	89	91	70	61	88		
College and Career Acceleration	55	60	65	60	71	67	61		
ELP Progress	55	59	45	65			59		

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	58
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	405
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	92
Graduation Rate	90

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	55
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	606
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	95
Graduation Rate	91

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	37	Yes	4	
AMI				
ASN	85			
BLK	42			
HSP	54			

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%
MUL	63			
PAC				
WHT	70			
FRL	47			

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	34	Yes	3	
ELL	40	Yes	3	
AMI				
ASN	82			
BLK	43			
HSP	51			
MUL	54			
PAC				
WHT	65			
FRL	47			

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	48			30			63	64		90	55	55
SWD	18			14			24	27		22	7	48
ELL	12			10			34	31		45	7	55
AMI												
ASN	83			67			91	76		97	6	

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
BLK	30			17			43	50		29	6	
HSP	37			28			57	64		47	7	55
MUL	51			29			61	89		55	6	
PAC												
WHT	62			45			77	73		68	7	73
FRL	33			21			48	55		39	7	51

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	51	50	33	37	48	50	61	60		91	60	65
SWD	15	29	24	20	38	44	18	28		77	27	50
ELL	18	47	42	10	31	43	26	35		84	43	65
AMI												
ASN	91	79	67	65	62		94	89		100	92	
BLK	33	39	32	24	42	44	42	46		89	37	
HSP	41	44	35	32	47	50	50	59		89	54	61
MUL	46	46		28	47		58	59		96	54	
PAC												
WHT	63	53	30	53	52	63	77	72		91	73	86
FRL	36	41	32	26	42	50	46	51		87	44	62

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS

Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20	ELP Progress
All Students	51	52	44	35	31	28	55	66		88	61	59
SWD	15	37	37	17	26	27	22	43		73	19	30
ELL	22	44	41	17	31	35	30	34		81	45	59
AMI												
ASN	84	73	30	67	42		83	78		100	92	36
BLK	33	44	40	20	25	28	36	54		86	42	
HSP	43	46	46	29	27	27	48	58		88	54	58
MUL	59	53	64	28	30		57	79		94	83	

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
PAC												
WHT	62	57	49	53	38	27	68	77		87	70	74
FRL	35	44	42	25	26	26	42	56		85	44	58

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	49%	55%	-6%	50%	-1%
08	2023 - Spring	*	50%	*	47%	*
09	2023 - Spring	47%	54%	-7%	48%	-1%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	23%	54%	-31%	50%	-27%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	34%	53%	-19%	48%	-14%

BIOLOGY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	62%	68%	-6%	63%	-1%

HISTORY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	61%	69%	-8%	63%	-2%

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.

• Level 1: 36%
• Level 2: 40%
• Level 3: 23%
• Majority of students are not proficient on ELA 9 FAST Assessment

• Student attendance
• Low Reading Fluency

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

• New standards, new test, baseline year
• These are our focus- students with disabilities and ELL.

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.

Geometry EOC scores have the greatest gap when compared to the state average. Contributing factors include the low performance of students with disabilities and English language learners.

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

• Biology EOC achievement increased as a school 3% from 2022 to 2023.

• Stronger PLC's looking into Data Analysis and instructional feedback from administration.
• Emphasis on collaboration between teachers and students.
• BEST Standards and other PD's reinforced instruction.

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.

• Identifying students for targeted interventions at each tier.
• Ensure interventions align with standards based instructional practices.

- Literacy team will meet regularly to collect data and monitor students' instructional needs.
- Literacy team will revise interventions when needed.

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

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups

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.

Increasing academic achievement of students with disabilities and English language learners. ESSA Federal Percent of Points Index indicates this is a high priority need and focusing on the success of these students will reduce achievement gaps and prepare these students for future academic success.

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

Increase achievement and learning gains for students with disabilities and English language learners. Increase Geometry Proficiency Scores from 34% to 40%. Increase ELA Proficiency Scores from 52% to 60%.

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

This area of focus will be monitored through classroom walk throughs, review of progress monitoring data and through data chats with professional learning communities.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Michael Pfeiffer (michael_pfeiffer@scps.k12.fl.us)

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 following evidence-based interventions are available to high schools to help them support students based upon the area of need of the individual student: CAR-PD, Achieve 3000, Corrective Reading, and Reading Mastery.

Math - The following evidence-based interventions are available to middle schools to help them support students based upon the area of need of the individual student: DreamBox, Transition to Algebra, Seminole Numeracy Project.

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

A variety of interventions are available to the schools to allow them to meet the needs of individual students. This allows all the areas of reading to be addressed from foundations to comprehension across the K-12 continuum.
All of the listed interventions have been approved by Just Read, Florida through the vetting process for the K-12 Comprehensive Evidence- Based Reading Plan.

Math- All the listed interventions have research-based evidence for efficacy.
Standards based lessons differentiated to meet the needs of these specific student groups and data driven deliberate action planning will improve achievement and learning gains for our students. This strategy is aligned to having high expectations for all learners and 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.

Geometry
• After school tutoring.
• Embed literacy strategies through curriculum support by the literacy coach.
• Data chats through PLCs during dedicated common planning.
• Provide interventions for students with disabilities.
• Utilize the ESOL paraprofessionals to push in to support ELL students.
• Differentiated Instruction Reviews and Preps.

ELA
• After school tutoring will be offered to increase student achievement levels.
• Literacy Coach and AP will give PD to teachers to help align their curriculum and increase PLC leadership.
• Provide intervention services after school.
• Track student data on FAST OPMs and adjust interventions accordingly.
• Schedule students appropriately according to data in Reading Classes.
• Provide Support Facilitation services and interventions for SWDs.
• Provide interventions, tutoring, and support for ELL students.

Person Responsible: Michael Pfeiffer (michael_pfeiffer@scps.k12.fl.us)

By When: Ongoing throughout the school year`

#2. 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.

Students succeed when conditions for learning are optimized. A focus on campus safety, development of a culture where student voice and belonging are valued and sharing collective responsibility for the success of all students in the school increase student achievement.

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

Increase 5 Essentials Survey and SCPS Safety Survey results indicating a high degree of trust, collective responsibility and academic personalism.

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

Conditions for Learning monitoring will occur during classroom walk through, PLC meetings, attendance and discipline data reviews.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Michael Pfeiffer (michael_pfeiffer@scps.k12.fl.us)

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 Multi-Tiered Support System (MTSS) process is a team-based approach that relies on a strong collaboration between families and professionals from a variety of disciplines regardless of the level implemented. MTSS provides a positive and effective means to support student learning, attendance and behavior.

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

MTSS methods are research-based and proven to positively impact school climate and increase academic performance.

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.

Trust
• We need to continue to focus on Restorative Practices.
• Continue to focus on SHS's number 3 goal Building School Culture.
• Social emotional health programs such as Circle Up Club and Ali's Hope.
• Student Leadership Groups: SGA, YMWE, LiA, TRIBE.
• Hire Operation Grad Coach.

• Initial "frequent flier" meeting focused on building relationship and setting goals, supporting student to achieve these goals, tracking progress

Student Behavior
• Continue to reinforce fidelity to Restorative Practices.
• Implementation of a Discipline Committee to engage collaborative problem-solving, including various stakeholders.
• Continue to have school security guards roving the campus during classes, between classes, and during lunches.
• Communicating expectations to all students during opening day announcements and ongoing closed-circuit TV announcements.
• Communicating expectations to all families through social media, phone calls, and meetings.
• Ali's Hope
• Initial "frequent flier" meeting focused on building relationship and setting goals, supporting student to achieve these goals, tracking progress.

Person Responsible: Michael Pfeiffer (michael_pfeiffer@scps.k12.fl.us)

By When: Ongoing throughout the school year

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).

In collaboration with the Assistant Superintendent, school leaders identify and align resources to meet the needs of all students and maximize desired student outcomes. Evaluation of student achievement data and related early warning factors such as attendance and discipline referrals are at the core of this work. Principals review data with the school leadership team, staff, and other relevant stakeholders, then develop or modify goals and strategies to align with the school needs presented. These goals and strategies are then operationalized through action items within the annual School Improvement Plan. These specific interventions or activities are noted within the SIP, and funding resources are assigned (i.e., Title I, Part A, UniSIG).