

St. Johns County School District

Pedro Menendez 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	8
III. Planning for Improvement	13
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	22
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	0
VI. Title I Requirements	0
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

Pedro Menendez High School

600 STATE ROAD 206 W, St Augustine, FL 32086

<http://www-pmhs.stjohns.k12.fl.us/>

SIP Authority

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

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

Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)

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

Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)

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

Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

I. School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

"Not for school, but for life, we learn." Non scholae sed vitae discimus.

Provide the school's vision statement.

To prepare our students to be college/career-ready as well as to be successful in high school and beyond through teaching the standards in a rigorous manner, adjusting instruction to obtain desired results, using data coupled to genuine Professional Learning Community protocols to guide instruction as well as professional development, providing opportunities for student leadership, and continuing our school's unique emphasis on accessibility and inclusivity by encouraging and welcoming students of various levels and abilities to participate in higher level programs of study.

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
Banton, Ted	Principal	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - School Vision and Administration - Assessment of administrative team - School Data Review - Direct all professional learning. - Administer annual budget aligned to learning goals. - Acquire highly qualified staff - Reading achievement - Academies, Programs of Choice and Supplemental programs
Bedford, Brandon	Assistant Principal	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - ESE programming - School Events - Community programming - Mathematics
Hensley, Angela	Assistant Principal	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Master schedule - Guidance services - Assessment
Kasting, Troy	Assistant Principal	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - MTSS - Discipline - School Safety
Smith, Yanetta	Dean	Attendance, Tardiness and Truancy
Willis, Erica	Teacher, K-12	SAC Chair

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 school improvement plan was developed by reviewing the past three years' of data for PMHS. Qualitative data was gathered in May of 2023 with by interviewing over 80 employees of the school. Meetings were held with multiple community stakeholders including SAC members, booster organizations, community partners and individual parents. The draft of the SIP was shared for feedback with the School Advisory Council in August of 2023 and feedback was used to adjust SIP.

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))

As part of the continuous improvement process, the goals and formative data will be reviewed monthly at SAC meetings, through the Literacy Leadership Team, Weekly administrative meetings and monthly faculty leadership meetings. As data points are collected, including state assessment data, attendance data, behavioral data and walk through data, the leadership team will adjust professional learning, coach individually and on the aggregate and modify targets for improvement.

Demographic Data

Only ESSA identification and school grade history updated 3/11/2024

2023-24 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	High School 9-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	26%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	42%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	ATSI
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD)* English Language Learners (ELL) Black/African American Students (BLK)* Hispanic Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: B 2019-20: B 2018-19: B 2017-18: B
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review

ESSA School, District and State Comparison (pre-populated)

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

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

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	54	71	50	59	74	51	54		
ELA Learning Gains				58			51		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				41			47		
Math Achievement*	32	61	38	41	50	38	31		
Math Learning Gains				39			24		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				37			25		
Science Achievement*	64	86	64	59	70	40	58		
Social Studies Achievement*	65	82	66	71	59	48	71		
Middle School Acceleration					47	44			
Graduation Rate	86	94	89	88	84	61	89		
College and Career Acceleration	58	64	65	63	86	67	60		
ELP Progress		51	45						

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

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

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	60
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	359
Total Components for the Federal Index	6
Percent Tested	95
Graduation Rate	86

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	56

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index

OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	556
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	98
Graduation Rate	88

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	36	Yes	4	
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	41			
HSP	59			
MUL	52			
PAC				
WHT	62			
FRL	52			

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	35	Yes	3	
ELL	50			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	40	Yes	1	
HSP	58			

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	55			
PAC				
WHT	58			
FRL	49			

Accountability Components by Subgroup

Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school. (pre-populated)

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS

Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2021-22	C & C Accel 2021-22	ELP Progress
All Students	54			32			64	65		86	58	
SWD	22			17			40	40		16	6	
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	25			17			37	33		42	6	
HSP	52			44			68	58		50	6	
MUL	59			31			68	50			4	
PAC												
WHT	57			32			66	71		61	6	
FRL	43			25			59	58		46	6	

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	59	58	41	41	39	37	59	71		88	63	
SWD	22	35	32	20	34	35	22	47		82	16	
ELL		50										
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	27	43	32	13	28	35	27	69		93	29	
HSP	65	63	33	47	41		50	59		89	79	
MUL	56	57		33	40	20	67			93	77	
PAC												
WHT	62	60	45	44	41	41	64	72		87	64	
FRL	50	52	42	32	34	36	47	61		84	56	

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	54	51	47	31	24	25	58	71		89	60	
SWD	24	38	36	22	29	29	42	51		76	24	
ELL												
AMI												
ASN	64											
BLK	24	30	25	21	29	34	41	37		97	34	
HSP	57	58	41	35	22	21	63	57		92	61	
MUL	36	35		24	17					100	40	
PAC												
WHT	58	53	53	33	23	23	59	78		87	65	
FRL	41	47	47	29	22	22	58	62		82	52	

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	58%	73%	-15%	50%	8%
09	2023 - Spring	55%	70%	-15%	48%	7%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	32%	78%	-46%	50%	-18%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	38%	67%	-29%	48%	-10%

BIOLOGY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	67%	86%	-19%	63%	4%

HISTORY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	65%	82%	-17%	63%	2%

III. Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis/Reflection

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

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

In review of multi-year data, PMHS has experienced a decrease in the percentage of students demonstrating learning gains in the lowest quartile. PMHS overall reading performance was 57% proficient, which exceeds state rates but 14 percentage points below the district average.

Based upon anecdotal data, the school experienced shifts in reading intervention teachers over the past three years. Furthermore, the baseline proficiency of students matriculating to the school has decreased, requiring a shift in the focus of instructional personnel and a reallocation of some instructional personnel and resources. In further review of data, an inordinate amount of students missed more than 10% of the school year (33% of students), this has a tremendous impact on students in the lowest quartile.

We have also seen, in looking at mathematics EOC data, that there is sharp decline in results. It is evident that the instructional staff is mostly new and are in need of consistent support for learning to both increase student performance and increase teacher retention rates. Current data shows only 32 % of students who took the Algebra 1 End of Course exam demonstrated proficiency. Current data shows only 38 % of students who took the Geometry End of Course exam demonstrated proficiency.

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

Upon review of the 2022 data and prior year data, the learning gains of the lowest quartile in reading demonstrated a decline from the prior year (47%) to (41%).

There are a number of possible factors including increased absentee rates, changes in instructional personnel, and shifts in reading intervention guidance. Furthermore, it appears that there was an increase in total number of students entering the school needing reading intervention. This trend has continued for the 23-24 school year.

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.

Students with Disabilities and African American students show the greatest needs for improvement. African American students demonstrated marginal improvement in 2022. Students with disabilities demonstrated a stark decrease in performance. Generally speaking, proficiency rates are higher than state averages, but are still not commiserate with the potential of student and staff ability.

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

No improvement noted.

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

Based upon a review of EWS-like data, attendance data from 2022 showed that over 30% of the student population missed 18 or more days of school (10% or more). Low attendance rates have a direct and substantial correlation to student achievement. For the 2023- 2024 school year, PMHS will be focused on reducing absenteeism by dedicating personnel whose primary focus is to increase attendance rates. Our goal is to see that over 75% of students miss less than 18 days of school during the 2023- 2024 school year.

It is the belief at PMHS that an increase of attendance rates at PMHS will lead to an increase in academic proficiency rates and a decrease in the number of students receiving a D or F in English or Mathematics.

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

For the 2023- 2024 school year PMHS has identified the following priorities for student performance.

1. Increasing Reading proficiency and learning gains of Statewide assessments
2. Increasing proficiency on Algebra 1 and Geometry State End of Course Exams
3. Increase student aggregate performance related to the ESSA federal index for Students with Disabilities and African- American students. Specific focus will be made to improve reading performance and mathematics performance (mathematics especially for African American students)
4. Decreasing the percentage of students who are absent 10 percent or more of the school year
5. Developing a single school culture focused on increasing student performance, attendance, positive behaviors and a consistent measurement for success

Area of Focus

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

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

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed.

One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Students with Disabilities did not perform consistent with other sub-groups or the aggregate of the school. Students with disabilities scored almost 40 percentage points below the school average in all core subject areas on statewide assessments.

Measurable Outcome:

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

To increase reading proficiency rates for students with disabilities from 22 percent to 32 percent in the 23-24 school year and increase percent with gains from 35 to 45 percent.

Monitoring:

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

Monitoring will occur through the use of summative data tools, progress monitoring, state assessments, district common summative assessments, classroom observations, literacy leadership team monthly reviews, observation of PLC processes and state assessment data.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Ted Banton (ted.banton@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Intervention:

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

Hattie and Dietrichson indicate that consistent small group instruction has positive learning outcomes especially for students in need; and Dufour and Eaker leads educators towards instruction developed and monitored by a team of teachers is more effective for all learners. These strategies will be incorporated into classroom instruction through a reinvigorated support-facilitation model and reading intervention programming.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Pedro Menendez High School is comprised of multiple levels of students from various backgrounds. Based on 22-23 qualitative data as well as state data sets above-described strategies our school will focus on the educational foundation of Professional Learning Communities coupled with high effect instructional pedagogy.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

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

Review Annual assessment data, EWS data, discipline data, attendance data.
Share data and set targets with faculty leadership team.
Development of school-wide professional learning plan.

Person Responsible: Ted Banton (ted.banton@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

By When: August 2023

Review student course placement data

Person Responsible: Angela Hensley (angela.hensley@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

By When: August 2023

Share data and professional learning plan with all faculty, staff, and SAC

Person Responsible: Ted Banton (ted.banton@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

By When: August 2023

Bimonthly professional learning sessions on PLC process, small group instructional methods and pedagogy for support

Person Responsible: Ted Banton (ted.banton@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

By When: September- May 2024

Monthly professional learning sessions on PLC process, small group instructional methods and pedagogy for support facilitation.

Monthly review of SWD data.

Monthly review of subgroup data.

Person Responsible: Brandon Bedford (brandon.bedford@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

By When: September- May 2024

Literacy leadership team observations weekly with monthly debriefs on pedagogical trends and concerns. Conduct teacher observations through EEE

Person Responsible: Ted Banton (ted.banton@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

By When: September- May 2024

FAST PM 1 Administration and data review

Person Responsible: Angela Hensley (angela.hensley@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

By When: September 2023

FAST PM 2 Administration and data review.

Person Responsible: Angela Hensley (angela.hensley@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

By When: January 2024

Review of student data to make course and support adjustments

Person Responsible: Brandon Bedford (brandon.bedford@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

By When: January 2024

Administration of Spring FAST and review of data patterns and trends for SWD

Person Responsible: Ted Banton (ted.banton@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

By When: June 2024

#2. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Other**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed.

One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Pedro Menendez High School has experienced high rates of student absenteeism over the prior years. It is an imperative for the 23-24 school year that PMHS takes actionable steps to increase student attendance and overall pride in attending PMHS. Low attendance rates is disproportionately impacting our Students with Disabilities and African-American students.

Pedro Menendez High School will increase student attendance and create a positive school culture through its Positive Behavior Interventions and Support program, attendance systems, Academies, AVID, International Baccalaureate Diploma Programme, and School Advisory Council (SAC). Throughout the year PMHS will invite students, parents, and other stakeholders to attend events to highlight the many strengths of PMHS; IB Cultural Fair, Homecoming Parade, Victory Day, Art performances, Academy Night, and many other Menendez traditions. These activities will strengthen school to home connections, increase student engagement and improve attendance.

All stakeholders have access to information about our school events, programs, and meetings via our weekly Menendez Message, school website, and multiple social media platforms. Curriculum and assessment information is shared by teachers at Open House, during parent teacher conferences, and through digital platforms. Increasing school to home/community communication will include methods and tools for the parents and community to increase student attendance.

Measurable Outcome:

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

In 2022, almost 33 percent of students missed 18 or more days of school. For the 2023- 2024 school year, PMHS will reduce this rate by 8 percentage points to at maximum 25 percent of students.

Monitoring:

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

The school will pull monthly attendance data reports. By the second semester, these reports will be pulled and reviewed bi weekly.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Ted Banton (ted.banton@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Intervention:

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

PMHS will use technology and resources to accurately identify student with high absentee rates, and will develop positive behavioral incentives for targeted students via the MTSS process.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Students with high absentee rates are typically disconnected from the school. By creating positive behavioral interventions focused on attendance issues, students will be better engaged in their own learning (student efficacy and agency).

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 4 - Demonstrates a Rationale

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 student with high absentee rates from the 22- 23 school year.

Person Responsible: Yanetta Smith (yanetta.smith@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

By When: September 2023

Develop individual positive behavior support plans as students are identified at attendance at-risk (8 absences)

Person Responsible: Yanetta Smith (yanetta.smith@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

By When: Ongoing through May 2024

Monthly, via school leadership team and MTSS core team, review students at risk for attendance and on plans. Gauge effectiveness of intervention plans and modify plans based upon student response to intervention.

Develop new plans for students to be seen at risk.

Person Responsible: Troy Kasting (troy.kasting@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

By When: Ongoing- May 2024

Mid year review of attendance intervention for the school. Compare to prior year data and calculate percent of students making attendance gain.

Revise school-wide plan based upon data and research.

Person Responsible: Ted Banton (ted.banton@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

By When: January 2024

Review school year data and revise based upon the results of the 23- 24 school year

Person Responsible: Troy Kasting (troy.kasting@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

By When: June 2024

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Professional Learning Communities**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.

PMHS has struggled to reinvigorate the PLC process post 2019 (COVID).

Measurable Outcome:

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

For the 2023- 2024 school year, PMHS will retool the PLC process to focus on the four essential questions. This will be measured by PLC observations by administration and coaches and student growth as measured by state assessments.

Monitoring:

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

Administration will consistently observe PLC processes through an internal accounting tool which collects data on PLC questions, engagement and frequency.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Ted Banton (ted.banton@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Intervention:

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

Professional Learning Communities

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Evidence from the work of Dufour, Eaker, et al. indicate that teacher efficacy and collaborative planning has a positive effect on teacher performance and student achievement.

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.

Introduction to PLC process training

Person Responsible: Troy Kasting (troy.kasting@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

By When: August 2023

Assessment of individual PLC processes and aggregate data trends of PLC implementation by course

Person Responsible: Ted Banton (ted.banton@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

By When: September 2023- May 2024

Provide monthly professional learning based upon PLC data review and student summative data trends.

Person Responsible: Troy Kasting (troy.kasting@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

By When: September 2023- May 2024

#4. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Black/African-American**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

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

African American students did not perform consistent with other sub-groups or the aggregate of the school.

African- America students scored approximately 30 percentage points below the school average in all core subject areas on state-wide assessments.

Measurable Outcome:

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

To increase proficiency rates for African- American students from 27 percent to 35 percent in the 23-24 school year and increase percent with gains from 43 percent to 50 percent.

Monitoring:

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

Monitoring will occur through the use of summative data tools, progress monitoring, state assessments, district common summative assessments, classroom observations, observation of PLC processes and state assessment data.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Ted Banton (ted.banton@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Intervention:

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

Hattie and Dietrichson indicate that consistent small group instruction has positive learning outcomes especially for students in need; and Dufour and Eaker leads educators towards instruction developed and monitored by a team of teachers is more effective for all learners. These strategies will be incorporated into classroom instruction.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Pedro Menendez High School is comprised of multiple levels of students from various backgrounds. Based on 22-23 qualitative data as well as state data sets above-described strategies our school will focus on the educational foundation of Professional Learning Communities coupled with high effect instructional pedagogy.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

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

Review Annual assessment data, EWS data, discipline data, attendance data.

Share data and set targets with faculty leadership team.

Share data and professional learning plan with all faculty, staff, and SAC.

Person Responsible: Ted Banton (ted.banton@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

By When: August 2023

Bimonthly professional learning sessions on PLC process, small group instructional methods and pedagogy.

Monthly review of AA data.

Monthly review of subgroup data.

Conduct coaching cycles for faculty with achievement disparities of students

Literacy leadership team observations weekly with monthly debriefs on pedagogical trends and concerns.

Conduct teacher observations through EEE

Person Responsible: Ted Banton (ted.banton@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

By When: September- April 2024

FAST PM 1 Administration and data review

Person Responsible: Angela Hensley (angela.hensley@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

By When: September 2023

FAST PM 2 Administration and data review

Person Responsible: Angela Hensley (angela.hensley@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

By When: December 2023/ January 2024

Review of student data to make course and support adjustments

Person Responsible: Ted Banton (ted.banton@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

By When: January 2024

Begin state-wide assessment administration and adjust SIP for 2024- 2025.

Review individual student course placements for 24/25

Person Responsible: Ted Banton (ted.banton@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

By When: April/ May 2024

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).

As a school identified in need of ATSI for students with disabilities, PMHS will allocate school improvement allocations to increase supports, interventions and resources to students with disabilities. This will take place in the form of ESE teachers, intensive reading teachers and tutors, all focused on increasing academic achievement for students with disabilities. Furthermore, resources needed for tutoring and intensive reading will, in part come from the school improvement allocation.