

Polk County Public Schools

Tenoroc High School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	10
III. Planning for Improvement	15
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	23
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	0
VI. Title I Requirements	23
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

Tenoroc High School

4905 SADDLE CREEK RD, Lakeland, FL 33801

schools.polk-fl.net/tenoroc

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 Tenoroc High School is to provide each student with a diverse education that promotes self-discipline, motivation, and excellence in learning.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Tenoroc High School, in collaboration with parents and community partnerships, will strive to challenge and enrich students' lives by providing equitable access to a rigorous, high quality education. This education will assist students in attaining post-secondary success in the areas of education, occupation, and holistic well-being.

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
Wright-Gayner, Ave'	Principal	Principal, School wide operations and oversees all parts of the school
Guarasci, Chrystal	Assistant Principal	Curriculum, Scheduling and FTE, Reading and Social Studies
smith, travian	Assistant Principal	Head of Program CTE- Oversee Academies and certifications of each academy, Science, ESE, secretarial staff, custodians, Facilities
Hafer, Fatmeh	Assistant Principal	Head of Program- Cambridge and 3DE- Oversee all aspects of Cambridge and 3DE Programs, testing, scheduling
Jackson, Allison	Assistant Principal	Assistant Principal- English Department, Attendance, testing support

Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Development

Describe the process for involving stakeholders (including the school leadership team, teachers and school staff, parents, students (mandatory for secondary schools) and families, and business or community leaders) and how their input was used in the SIP development process. (ESSA 1114(b)(2))

Note: If a School Advisory Council is used to fulfill these requirements, it must include all required stakeholders.

The SAC committee will hold monthly meetings to ensure that the SIP goals are not only being monitored, but also followed. The SAC committee will hold student leaders, administrative members, community members, district staff and business partners. School data and progress will be shared to

ensure that all Stakeholders are aware of the progress of our goals and that we are monitoring these goals.

SIP Monitoring

Describe how the SIP will be regularly monitored for effective implementation and impact on increasing the achievement of students in meeting the State's academic standards, particularly for those students with the greatest achievement gap. Describe how the school will revise the plan, as necessary, to ensure continuous improvement. (ESSA 1114(b)(3))

The SIP will be regularly monitored monthly during administrative meetings while reviewing both summative and formative data. Administrators and coaches will work with teachers to identify students with the greatest achievement gaps based on data and devise a plan that will ensure that the achievement gap will be closed. State assessments will be pulled to identify students that need extra support and school interventionists will be utilized to help with working with these students for additional support. If RTD is available, we will utilize pulling students for additional support using that as well. Student data will be monitored weekly by coaches and administrators to make sure no student is overlooked and extra support is provided to the student and the teachers as needed.

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	Yes
2022-23 Minority Rate	62%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	100%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	CSI
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	Yes
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)* 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: D 2018-19: D 2017-18: C
School Improvement Rating History	

DJJ Accountability Rating History	
--	--

Early Warning Systems

Using 2022-23 data, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:

Indicator	Grade Level										Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that have two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Prior Year (2022-23) As Initially Reported (pre-populated)

The number of students by grade level that exhibited each early warning indicator:

Indicator	Grade Level										Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	396	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	291	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	222	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	210	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	513	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	307	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	48	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	520

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	202
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	40

Prior Year (2022-23) Updated (pre-populated)

Section 3 includes data tables that are pre-populated based off information submitted in prior year's SIP.

The number of students by grade level that exhibited each early warning indicator:

Indicator	Grade Level										Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review**ESSA School, District and State Comparison (pre-populated)**

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

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

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	25	38	50	24	41	51	24		
ELA Learning Gains				36			33		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				34			39		
Math Achievement*	16	24	38	16	35	38	12		
Math Learning Gains				40			20		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				52			42		
Science Achievement*	52	50	64	42	26	40	33		
Social Studies Achievement*	51	50	66	45	39	48	48		
Middle School Acceleration					41	44			
Graduation Rate	67	84	89	81	52	61	81		
College and Career Acceleration	48	54	65	44	55	67	47		
ELP Progress	58	40	45	31			33		

** 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)	CSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	45
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	317
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	97
Graduation Rate	67

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	CSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	40
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	Yes
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	6
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	445
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	93
Graduation Rate	81

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	25	Yes	4	3
ELL	35	Yes	4	
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	35	Yes	4	
HSP	44			
MUL	50			
PAC				

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%
WHT	49			
FRL	42			

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	27	Yes	3	2
ELL	40	Yes	3	
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	37	Yes	3	
HSP	40	Yes	2	
MUL	40	Yes	2	
PAC				
WHT	44			
FRL	37	Yes	2	

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	25			16			52	51		67	48	58
SWD	8			10			14	22		19	6	
ELL	15			9			24	48		20	7	58
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	21			10			35	35		37	6	
HSP	22			12			45	58		42	7	55

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
MUL	50										1	
PAC												
WHT	28			21			66	52		63	6	
FRL	21			12			44	51		48	7	56

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	24	36	34	16	40	52	42	45		81	44	31
SWD	10	26	25	11	34	38	19	23		73	14	
ELL	13	32	30	19	60	70	39	26		84	31	31
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	18	38	33	13	33		33	33		93	37	
HSP	24	36	29	16	47	52	42	44		84	40	31
MUL				40								
PAC												
WHT	27	36	42	16	39	50	47	53		74	51	
FRL	20	33	33	14	36	42	38	44		80	45	27

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	24	33	39	12	20	42	33	48		81	47	33
SWD	12	32	43	7	24	47	16	23		74	26	
ELL	8	44	57	3	15		25	27		90	49	33
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	17	19	29	9	31	60	22	24		79	29	
HSP	22	42	48	10	21	42	37	55		88	44	33
MUL	38	36		9						64		
PAC												
WHT	29	31	33	15	14	29	34	53		77	58	

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
FRL	22	32	33	11	22	48	31	42		77	48	24

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	25%	40%	-15%	50%	-25%
09	2023 - Spring	26%	39%	-13%	48%	-22%

ALGEBRA

Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	14%	37%	-23%	50%	-36%

GEOMETRY

Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	21%	37%	-16%	48%	-27%

BIOLOGY

Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	52%	50%	2%	63%	-11%

HISTORY

Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	49%	49%	0%	63%	-14%

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.

Our lowest data component was in Algebra at 14% proficiency. The contributing factor was a lack of consistency within instruction. Students did not have a stable learning environment, but we did end up seeing an increase in proficiency from the previous year.

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

We saw an increase in data across the board from the previous year. Acceleration points need to increase but low percentages were due to a lack of college and AP courses offered.

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.

Algebra 1 had the biggest gap. 70% of students who took the Algebra 1 EOC scored a level 1, 16% scored a level 2. A large group of students that tested did not have consistent instruction the first of half the school year and went through a schedule change to provide better instruction. Even though our proficiency is low, we did see an increase in data.

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

Our science scores showed the greatest improvement, going from 33% proficiency to 52% proficiency. Constant monitoring of data and RTD helped close the gap in student achievement.

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

EWS has not been populated, however, based on analyzing our school data, two areas of concern are ELA and Algebra 1.

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

Graduation Rate
Attendance
ELA-9th and 10th
Algebra 1
Acceleration

Area of Focus

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

#1. 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.

Identifying students in high risk of not graduating with the cohort year and addressing any needs those students have. Correctly scheduling students in courses needed for graduation, state tests still needed to pass, provide tutoring and other levels of support in order to ensure that students are set to graduate.

Measurable Outcome:

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

We will increase the school graduation rate to 80% in the 2023-2024 school year. Success coach, guidance counselors and APC will meet with seniors identified as at risk of not graduating and monitoring them throughout the school year by pulling FOCUS reports to show who has met requirements and who hasn't as well as the BOY report to ensure that students are taking the required courses. Scheduling students for retakes and ACT and keeping track on an excel for who has met requirements and who hasn't. Students who have not met the required scores will be offered additional tutoring. Meeting with students consistently to monitor grades, assessments passed and GPA. APC, Success Coach and guidance counselors will monitor the percentage of students who are still at risk and reassess each quarter to ensure that graduation rate is increasing and students are meeting state requirements.

Monitoring:

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

Monthly reports pulled by Success Coach, APC and guidance to monitoring student progress, finding students to make sure that students are on track or get on track for graduation.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Chrystal Guarasci (chrystal.guarasci@polk-fl.net)

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.)

Intervention included would be monthly meetings with success coach and guidance counselors to ensure students are on track, administering exams, provided tutoring (RTD) and meeting with teachers to ensure that students have all resources available to be successful and graduate on time. We will utilize remediation and recovery using Uniseg and Title 1 funding. We will also have oppotunities for enrichment to ensure our high performing students are addressed as well.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

These interventions make sure each student in the graduating cohort are being monitored and are given every resource available for 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.

Identify students not on schedule to graduate with their cohort. Students that are identified will have schedules re-evaluated to ensure they are in the correct courses and/or each student needing additional credits is in a credit recovery course with daily check-ins by the success coach to ensure they are completing the work. Students missing testing requirements- Success Coach, Robert Goff, APC, Chrystal Guarasci and Senior Counselor, Pricia Mitchell, will pull report of students missing testing requirements and register students for the appropriate exam for graduation. Success coach and APC will work to pull grades of seniors and Edgenuity reports weekly. Students falling behind will have meetings to review what is needed and have individual student plans created to reach goals by the Success Coach. Additional support during school with tutoring by Reading Interventionist and Success Coach for ACT/SAT readiness. Extended learning and ACT/SAT test prep materials will be used.

Person Responsible: Chrystal Guarasci (chrystal.guarasci@polk-fl.net)

By When: Monthly

Pulling students/finding missing students to devise an individual plan for each student on how to close the gap and graduate with their cohort.

Person Responsible: Chrystal Guarasci (chrystal.guarasci@polk-fl.net)

By When: Monthly check in- all students should be on track to graduate no later than December 2023.

#2. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Teacher Attendance**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.

Building a positive culture for Tenoroc is very important and starts from within. We plan to support our students with incentives to encourage them and also reward them for going above and beyond. We plan to do this with our PBIS system that was started last year with tickets students can accumulate and earn rewards with. We plan to support our teachers with teacher of the month, opportunities to collaborate and being supportive to them inside the classroom.

Tenoroc's positive culture also begins with building relationships with stakeholders. We know the importance of continuing and improving our relationship building.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Monitoring teacher attendance through AESOP and SAP platforms and providing incentives for teachers.

Monitoring:

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

This will be monitored through AESOP and SAP platforms.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Allison Jackson (allison.jackson@pol-fl.net)

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.)

Monthly faculty meetings highlighting teachers and what they are doing in the classroom. This could be coach or admin choice. Gift cards were donated and will be raffled off during faculty meetings.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

This will be used because teachers get a chance to hear great things other teachers are doing and gives staff an opportunity to hear how strategies are used in different classrooms and why they work well for those 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?

Yes

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.

Teacher incentives for attendance- raffle

Meeting with teachers one-on-one missing more than their allocated days

Meeting with teachers that are no call-no show

Teachers who miss no days at the end of each semester go into a raffle for a free lunch

Teachers who miss no days and are not late for each quarter will go into a raffle and winner will have a free period.

Person Responsible: Chrystal Guarasci (chrystal.guarasci@polk-fl.net)

By When: Monthly

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

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

Using data tracking and reflection should drive standards-based collaborative planning to ensure that students are receiving rigorous instruction in Math. We must ensure that students are grasping the standards and are able to apply their knowledge on both the Geometry EOC and Algebra 1 EOC. This will be tracked through common formative and summative assessments and classroom walkthroughs.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Increase Math proficiency 14 percentage points in Algebra 1 and 7 percentage points in Geometry.
10% increase in bottom 25% LG.
10% increase in LG.

Monitoring:

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

The area of focus will be monitored through weekly common planning, classroom observations, and feedback. Feedback will be specific to what was planned (target/task) and what was observed.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Ave' Wright-Gayner (ave.wright-gayner@polk-fl.net)

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.)

Collaborative planning and PLC with data tracking and reflection to drive rigorous instruction (Data chats) Analyzing and monitoring progress monitoring assessments to identify benchmarks that need to be cycled through again.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Using data tracking and reflection should drive standards-based collaborative planning to ensure that students are receiving rigorous instruction. We must ensure that students are grasping the standards and are able to apply their knowledge on the Geometry and Algebra 1 EOC. This will be tracked through formative and summative assessments and classroom walkthroughs.

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.

In the area of Math, school Math coach and APC will be actively involved with collaborative planning, monitoring, supporting and providing feedback.

Collaborative planning groups will occur weekly with each tested subject.

- Algebra 1
- Geometry

Each of the collaborative sessions will focus on the information below.

- Target Task alignment (District Math Coach and school math coach)
- Data tracking through formative and summative assessments (administration and math coach)

Action Plan:

All Algebra and Geometry teachers will plan collaboratively with school based coach administrator at at least once per week. The ARC framework will be leveraged to ensure highly-aligned student tasks and instruction is planned with a goal of providing all students the appropriate equivalent experience. Student data will be monitored using formative and summative assessments as well as quarterlies given each 9 week. Data will be used in planning.

Instructional Supplies will be used to support student learning.

Person Responsible: Ave' Wright-Gayner (ave.wright-gayner@polk-fl.net)

By When: May 2024

#4. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

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

Increasing ELA proficiency to 35%

Measurable Outcome:

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

We will increase the ELA proficiency by a minimum of 10%

Monitoring:

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

Summative and formative assessments, using school interventionist and coaches to monitor student growth and identify our lowest 25% to provide additional support.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Allison Jackson (allison.jackson@pol-fl.net)

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.

ELA did increase in proficiency but our goal is to increase our proficiency rate and increase proficiency in our lowest 25%

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.

In the area of ELA, Administration and District coach will be actively involved with collaborative planning, monitoring, supporting and providing feedback.

Each of the collaborative sessions will focus on the information below.

- Target Task alignment
- Data tracking through formative/summative assessments

All core teachers will plan collaboratively with school based coach administrator at at least once per week. The ARC framework will be leveraged to ensure highly-aligned student tasks and instruction is planned with a goal of providing all students the appropriate equivalent experience. Standards-based instruction walk will be conducted a minimum of twice a week. Data from the walks will be used to adjust planning. Student data will be monitored using formative and summative assessments as well as quarterlies given each 9 week. Data will be used in planning.

Reading Interventionist will pull small groups for student remediation daily using student data to identify students in need.

Person Responsible: Allison Jackson (allison.jackson@pol-fl.net)

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)).

Admin was able to review funding based on the need for a reading interventionist, district instructional coaches for teacher support and funding for supplies to provide to students and teachers.

The reading interventionist is essential to pulling students for remediation after identifying students based on data. This data will include FAST PM 1 and 2, formative and summative assessments and teacher feedback during planning. The district Instructional support plays a vital role in supporting teachers with standards based instruction, aligning the task with the objective being taught and lesson planning to align with standards and objectives. District instructional coaches also provide support with extra planning days to ensure teachers are teaching to the depth of every standard.

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.

Reviewing and engaging stakeholders during SAC meetings in how the school is using funds for tutoring, college trips, student incentives, instructional materials and learning opportunities for both staff and students.

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))

Events that build parent and community involvement will include parent nights, FAFSA nights, open house, fall/winter festivals and SAC meetings focused on community and family will be held to ensure involvement with all our stakeholders and build a positive relationship/reputation within our community. Also building a relationship with our feeder schools, starting with elementary, so that our current students can help volunteer and build a positive relationship with future students.

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)

Providing teacher support through training for accelerated programs, project based learning with a focus in writing that centers on each area of learning. Student learning using Socratic Seminars, real life scenarios, and a hands on approach with student focused learning.

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))

Please complete