

Polk County Public Schools

Maynard A Traviss Technical Academy School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

| | |
|--|-----------|
| SIP Authority and Purpose | 3 |
| I. School Information | 6 |
| II. Needs Assessment/Data Review | 9 |
| III. Planning for Improvement | 14 |
| IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review | 21 |
| V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence | 21 |
| VI. Title I Requirements | 23 |
| VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus | 24 |

Maynard A Traviss Technical Academy

3225 WINTER LAKE RD, Lakeland, FL 33803

<http://www.polkedpathways.com/traviss-technical-college/>

SIP Authority

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

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

Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)

A school not identified for CSI or TSI, but has one or more subgroups with a Federal Index below 41%.

Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)

A school not identified as CSI that has at least one consistently underperforming subgroup with a Federal Index below 32% for three consecutive years.

Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)

A school can be identified as CSI in any of the following four ways:

1. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%;
2. Have a graduation rate at or below 67%;
3. Have a school grade of D or F; or
4. Have a Federal Index below 41% in the same subgroup(s) for 6 consecutive years.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

I. School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

To educate and prepare students for success in a changing workplace.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Traviss Technical Academy leads and challenges students by: 1) providing accredited, affordable, career education; 2) evaluating and revising curriculum to reflect the changing needs of business; 3) offering training and job placement for Polk County's workforce; 4) promoting articulation and dual enrollment in select programs among high schools and colleges; 5) fostering continuing education for the faculty and staff.

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 |
|------------------|---------------------|--|
| Wiggs, David | Principal | Director plans, organizes, manages, and directs all activities and functions of the Technical College/Academy |
| Perpilus, Angela | Assistant Principal | Assistance Director--Assists the technical college/academy Director in all areas of administration and operation |
| Epperson, Tammy | Assistant Principal | Assistance Director--Assists the technical college/academy Director in all areas of administration and operation |
| Hendrix, Jason | Assistant Principal | Assistance Director--Assists the technical college/academy Director in all areas of administration and operation |

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.

Stakeholder involvement is critical to the success of all students and technical programs at Traviss. Each stakeholder group's contribution is critical to the improvements in school programs, culture, environment and student success. Our student stakeholder group provides feedback for program improvements through school and program surveys. School leadership and teachers participates in all aspects of the school improvement plan through analysis of student and school data, participation in

program and school advisory councils, development and implementation of school improvement goals and strategies, monitoring successes and revise plan as necessary. The school staff provides input and participates in the collection and review of data related to the school improvement plan within their areas of responsibility. The business and community partners participate in program and school advisory meetings providing feedback on program and school and are included in the review of the school improvement plan each year.

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 goals of the school improvement plan will be regularly monitored in quarterly meetings with a plan-do-check-act approach by the leadership team made up of administration, support staff leaders, and teacher leaders evaluating and adjusting improvement plan based on progress data. Adjustments to the strategies and action steps in the improvement plan will be revised as determined by the leadership team.

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) | Combination School PK, 6-12 |
| Primary Service Type (per MSID File) | Alternative Education |
| 2022-23 Title I School Status | No |
| 2022-23 Minority Rate | 62% |
| 2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate | 97% |
| Charter School | No |
| RAISE School | No |
| ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024 | CSI |
| 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) | Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)* |
| School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline. | |
| School Improvement Rating History | 2021-22: COMMENDABLE 2018-19: COMMENDABLE |
| 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 | 1 | 1 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| 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 | 1 | 1 |
| | 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 | 1 | 1 |

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 | 0 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 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 |
|---|-------------|-------|
| Absent 10% or more school days | | |
| One or more suspensions | | |
| Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA) | | |
| Course failure in Math | | |
| Level 1 on statewide FSA ELA assessment | | |
| Level 1 on statewide FSA Math assessment | | |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C. | | |

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

| Indicator | Grade Level | Total |
|--|-------------|-------|
| Students with two or more indicators | | |
| The number of students identified retained: | | |
| Indicator | Grade Level | Total |
| Retained Students: Current Year | | |
| Students retained two or more times | | |

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 school 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 FSA ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Level 1 on statewide FSA 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 |

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 | 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 | 0 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 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* | 18 | 48 | 53 | | 51 | 55 | | | |
| ELA Learning Gains | | | | | | | | | |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | | | | | | |
| Math Achievement* | 10 | 49 | 55 | 6 | 37 | 42 | 8 | | |
| Math Learning Gains | | | | 38 | | | | | |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | | | | | | |
| Science Achievement* | | 47 | 52 | 20 | 48 | 54 | | | |
| Social Studies Achievement* | 45 | 68 | 68 | 38 | 53 | 59 | 32 | | |
| Middle School Acceleration | | 61 | 70 | | 43 | 51 | | | |
| Graduation Rate | | 54 | 74 | | 46 | 50 | | | |
| College and Career Acceleration | | 39 | 53 | | 71 | 70 | | | |
| ELP Progress | | 50 | 55 | | 55 | 70 | | | |

* 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 | 24 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students | Yes |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 2 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 73 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 3 |
| Percent Tested | 93 |
| Graduation Rate | |

| 2021-22 ESSA Federal Index | |
|--------------------------------------|-----|
| ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI) | CSI |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students | 26 |

| 2021-22 ESSA Federal Index | |
|--|-----|
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students | Yes |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 1 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 102 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 4 |
| Percent Tested | 100 |
| Graduation Rate | |

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 | | | | |
| ELL | | | | |
| AMI | | | | |
| ASN | | | | |
| BLK | | | | |
| HSP | 26 | Yes | 1 | 1 |
| MUL | | | | |
| PAC | | | | |
| WHT | | | | |
| FRL | 26 | Yes | 2 | 1 |

| 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 | | | | |
| ELL | | | | |
| AMI | | | | |
| ASN | | | | |
| BLK | | | | |
| HSP | | | | |

| 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 | | | | |
| PAC | | | | |
| WHT | | | | |
| FRL | 40 | Yes | 1 | |

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 | 18 | | | 10 | | | | 45 | | | | |
| SWD | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ELL | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| AMI | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ASN | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| BLK | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| HSP | | | | 9 | | | | 43 | | | 2 | |
| MUL | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| PAC | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WHT | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| FRL | | | | 15 | | | | 36 | | | 2 | |

| 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 | | | | 6 | 38 | | 20 | 38 | | | | |
| SWD | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ELL | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| AMI | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ASN | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| 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 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| HSP | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| MUL | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| PAC | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WHT | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| FRL | | | | | | | | 40 | | | | |

| 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 | | | | 8 | | | | 32 | | | | |
| SWD | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ELL | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| AMI | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ASN | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| BLK | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| HSP | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| MUL | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| PAC | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WHT | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| FRL | | | | | | | | 40 | | | | |

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 | 23% | 40% | -17% | 50% | -27% |
| 09 | 2023 - Spring | * | 39% | * | 48% | * |

| ALGEBRA | | | | | | |
|---------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| N/A | 2023 - Spring | 22% | 37% | -15% | 50% | -28% |

| GEOMETRY | | | | | | |
|----------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| N/A | 2023 - Spring | 17% | 37% | -20% | 48% | -31% |

| BIOLOGY | | | | | | |
|---------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| N/A | 2023 - Spring | 33% | 50% | -17% | 63% | -30% |

| HISTORY | | | | | | |
|---------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| N/A | 2023 - Spring | 40% | 49% | -9% | 63% | -23% |

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.

Based on state assessment data, student performance in math demonstrates the greatest need for improvement. Algebra 1 students earning AL 3-5 was 24% compared to state with 50% and district with 37%. Geometry students earning AL 3-5 was 17% compared to state with 48% and district with 37%. Contributing factors could include the attendance of the 10th grade students enrolled in the Algebra 1 course. Another contributing factor could include the new test design for both tests as well as the use of progress monitoring data in planning for instruction. Patterns noted include weak performance in the area of congruency, similarity, and construction in Geometry and expressions, functions, and data analysis and non-linear relationships in Algebra 1.

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

The greatest decline from prior year includes the number of students demonstrating proficiency in US History. Students scoring AL3-5 in SY 21-22 was 39% and the number of students scoring AL3-5 in SY22-23 was 34%. Student data indicates lack of understanding in global, military, and economic

challenges. Contributing factors could include the use of progress monitoring data in planning for instruction.

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 greatest data component gap in state average compared to school average would be in Geometry with 17% proficient for the school and the state proficient 48%. Though student performance increased from 0% proficient in SY2021-22 to 17% proficient in SY2022-23, the state had 16% level 2 and the school had 44% level 2. Contribution to this gap could include the lack of proficiency in congruency, similarities, and construction. Use of progress monitoring data in planning for instruction may have factored in contributing to the gap in performance.

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

Based on state assessments, the most improved data component would be in Geometry. Last year student performance of AL 3-5 was 0% and this year AL 3-5 was 17%. New actions include the instructor utilizing district curriculum resources and scope and sequence.

Based on progress monitoring data in Inzata, student attendance has improved from school year 21-22 to school year 22-23. In SY21-22, the percent of students with less than 90% school attendance was 78%. In SY22-23, the percent of students with less than 90% school attendance was 86% resulting in a 9% improvement and a 14% total percentage of students with less than 90% school attendance exceeding the SY21-22 SIP goal of 19%.

New actions implemented included additional attendance training to staff to include attendance monitoring reporting through teacher, school counselor, and attendance manager that includes contact with parent/guardian, reporting truancy as needed, and utilizing student attendance contracts.

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

According to state assessment and progress monitoring data, students with substantial reading deficiencies. Another concern based on progress monitoring data is the report review of quarterly assessment results from SY22-23 whereas student performance in quarterly assessments in Algebra 1 significantly lower than district average in quarter 3 administration and significantly lower in all three administrations of US History. According to the EWS data, attendance is an area of concern.

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

Improvements in the number of students with substantial reading deficiencies. Improvements in student's demonstrating proficiency in math. Improvements in the number of students demonstrating proficiency in US History. Attendance of students in 10th grade.

Area of Focus

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

#1. 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.

A critical area of focus is student attendance and accurate recording of daily student attendance. Student data indicator from district records report approximately 14% of the student population attended school less than 90% of the time. Though attendance improved from 23% in previous year and we did meet our goal of 19%, half of the 10th grade student population attended school less than 90% of the time having a negative impact on academic performance due to lack of exposure to instruction, exposure to course content, and collaboration with peers. In review of school attendance data, both student attendance and accurate attendance reporting with stakeholder communication and follow up needs to be consistent and needs to continue to improve.

Measurable Outcome:

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

The overall student population attending school less than 90% of the time will decrease from 14% to 9% for SY 2023-24 based on attendance records reported in teacher electronic gradebooks and electronic student services program and the 10th grade student population attending school less than 90% of the time will decrease from 50% to 40% based on attendance records in teacher electronic gradebooks and electronic student services program.

Monitoring:

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

Leadership will provide staff policy and training on schoolwide attendance policy. Attendance manager will review teacher attendance completion each day for class period attendance recording and report discrepancies to teachers and administrative lead. Teachers and school counselors will monitor student attendance, document interventions to include parent/guardian contact, and report student attendance concerns based on weekly reports and documentation to administrative lead to follow up with attendance conferences and contracts.

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.)

Utilizing the schoolwide attendance policy and stakeholder involvement/communication to facilitate:

- communication of attendance expectations/concerns to all stakeholders using various communication outlets
- implement system to consistently monitor student attendance that includes student, parent/guardian, teacher, school counselor, social worker, and administrator.
- develop school attendance incentives to motivate students school attendance and establish problem-solving teams for students with school attendance issues.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Regular student attendance is an integral part in student learning and, as a technical academy providing dual enrollment technical programs requiring specific clock hour attendance as part of student expectation for successful program completion, proper management and communication of student attendance is critical to student success. Though Traviss met the overall school improvement goal for attendance,

evidence indicates the 10th grade student population attendance is a focus of concern based on school data.

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.

Attendance and leadership team will revise schoolwide attendance management plan to include specific assigned intervention steps and communicate/train/support all stakeholders on the implementation of the plan to include documentation and monitoring steps as well as communication delivery systems and parties. Steps in plan will include running weekly attendance reports, distributing bi-monthly attendance letters to parent/guardians with referral to attendance team as necessary, conferring with students and parent/guardian, strategy implementation and monitoring steps.

Person Responsible: Jason Hendrix (jason.hendrix@polk-fl.net)

By When: Training will be conducted prior to first day of school followed by additional training to new staff as appropriate. Support and communication will occur throughout school year.

Administrative lead will establish a student attendance team consisting of administration, school counselor, attendance manager, teacher representative.

Person Responsible: Jason Hendrix (jason.hendrix@polk-fl.net)

By When: Team development and meeting schedule will be established within first 45 days of school. Meeting will be conducted throughout school year.

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Benchmark-aligned Instruction

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.

In review of the progress monitoring and state assessment data, student performance in Reading, Math, Biology, and US History is consistently below proficient. State assessment data on civics literacy indicate majority of students performing below proficient. A critical area of focus is student exposure to grade level content aligned to content area benchmarks in instruction and the use of progress monitoring data in planning for instruction.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Specific measurable outcomes the school plans to achieve include an increase in the number of students proficient in Reading as reported in state assessments AL3-5 from 23% to 28%, proficiency in Algebra 1 from 24% to 29%, proficiency in Geometry from 17% to 22%, proficiency in Biology from 34% to 39%, proficiency in US History from 34% to 39%, and passing percent in FCLE from 31% to 36%.

Monitoring:

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

All academic content area teachers will implement benchmark-aligned lessons with grade-level exposure to content, administer district progress monitoring assessments according to district directive and timeline, and utilize the data results to address the learning needs of all students. Leadership team will monitor through use of district data collection platforms (SBI Walks, Performance Matters, FRS), teacher common planning, teacher observations and data chats, review of lesson planning and gradebook documents.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Tammy Epperson (tammy.epperson@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.)

Utilizing the Learning Arc in teacher instructional planning, teachers will work collaboratively towards improving instructional plans that align lesson, activities, and (formative/summative) assessments to benchmarks with grade level content. Utilizing the data collected during the standards walks (SBI Walks) and progress monitoring assessments, administrators will develop tiered support plans and interventions for teachers and teacher groups. Leaders and teachers will also collaborate with district instructional coaches for teacher support.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Based on student data, student reading performance remained similar to previous years with minimal gains. Geometry EOC state assessment performance level 2 is considerably higher than the state and district and level 3 performance is lower than state and district with congruency, similarity, and construction a focus. Algebra I EOC state assessment performance level 1 is considerably higher than the state and district and level 2 is considerably lower than the state and district with expressions, functions, and data analysis and non-linear relationships a focus. FCLE student performance similar to state and district for winter administration with higher less than proficient than state and district for spring administration. US History state assessment performance lower than state and district in achievement level 3 or more. Biology I EOC state assessment performance similar to district and slightly below state.

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 teachers in Math, US History, Science, Reading, and ELA will implement the steps of the district Learning Arc Framework to design and facilitate lessons aligned to content-area benchmarks utilizing district-provided content specific scope and sequence with district adopted curriculum resources exposing students daily to grade level content.

Person Responsible: Tammy Epperson (tammy.epperson@polk-fl.net)

By When: Throughout school year

All teachers will administer the district/state adopted progress monitoring assessments relevant to their content area assignment to evaluate student progress on content area standards. Teachers will review data results to adjust instruction to include differentiated instruction according to student learning needs providing documentation of progress monitoring assessment results and interventions/strategies based on student needs.

Person Responsible: Tammy Epperson (tammy.epperson@polk-fl.net)

By When: Throughout school year.

#3. 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.

In review ESSA subgroup data, the economically disadvantaged student subgroup federal percent of points index is below the 41% with 40% based one reportable subject (social Studies) with the student performance in that subgroup aligned to state and district. The economically disadvantaged population accounted for 80.7% of the school population in SY21-22 and 97% of the school population in SY22-23.

Measurable Outcome:

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

All ESSA subgroups will improve in academic performance meeting or exceeding the federal percent of points index and the overall federal index of all students will improve by 5% points.

Monitoring:

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

This area of focus will be monitored through review of student trend data, progress monitoring data, teacher records, and instructional lesson planning and administration.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Tammy Epperson (tammy.epperson@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.)

Students with reading deficiencies as identified through state assessment data will be scheduled into an intensive reading course to support their needs. The intensive reading instruction will utilize the Achieve curriculum in instruction to address student individual needs in reading comprehension. Students with deficiencies in math, science, and social students will be provided tutoring according to individual instructors tutoring schedule in addition to their progression appropriate scheduled math course. Students in all content areas will be provided tiered support within content areas based on review of progress monitoring data. Leaders and teachers will join content specific curriculum contact Schoology group and utilize resources and support in planning for instruction and working with students learning needs.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The intensive reading strategy was selected based on district scheduling guidelines. The tutoring strategy for math was selected based on student/teacher feedback. Tutoring was selected for social science and science based on assessment data. The student tiered support strategies was selected based on the MTSS model using progress monitoring data.

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.

School counselor will identify and schedule students with reading deficiencies based on assessment data into intensive reading on their school schedule. Academic teachers will share with students and parents/guardians course tutoring schedule. All teachers will join and utilize the district curriculum content area Schoology course and utilize the district Learning ARC Framework in their instructional design exposing and requiring student use and interaction with benchmark-aligned, grade level content. Teachers will develop formative and summative assessments aligned to course standards as well as district directed assessments to monitoring student learning and adjust instruction to the learning needs of their students.

Person Responsible: Tammy Epperson (tammy.epperson@polk-fl.net)

By When: First week of school

Teachers will observe and assess students and, using first progress monitoring data, will identify students demonstrating learning needs and develop a tiered plan of support for them making adjustments to support based on continued progress monitoring. Teachers will document implementation of plan and monitoring of student progress.

Person Responsible: Tammy Epperson (tammy.epperson@polk-fl.net)

By When: Throughout 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).

School Improvement Funding not available.

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.

n/a

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))

n/a

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)

n/a

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))

n/a

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))

n/a

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: Positive Culture and Environment: Early Warning System | \$0.00 |
| 2 | III.B. | Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Benchmark-aligned Instruction | \$0.00 |
| 3 | III.B. | Area of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups | \$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.

No