

Hillsborough County Public Schools

# Leto High School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

---

## Table of Contents

---

<b>SIP Authority and Purpose</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>I. School Information</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>II. Needs Assessment/Data Review</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>III. Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review</b>	<b>21</b>
<b>V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence</b>	<b>22</b>
<b>VI. Title I Requirements</b>	<b>23</b>
<b>VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus</b>	<b>0</b>

# Leto High School

4409 W SLIGH AVE, Tampa, FL 33614

[ no web address on file ]

## 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.**

We are a comprehensive community of lifelong learners who provide students with authentic academic and interpersonal experiences to prepare them for post-secondary success and life beyond Leto.

**Provide the school's vision statement.**

To be a catalyst for societal change by producing respectful citizens who are both competitive and marketable in an ever-changing world.

### 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.:

<b>Name</b>	<b>Position Title</b>	<b>Job Duties and Responsibilities</b>
McCoy-Mitti, Larissa	Principal	Implements the mission and vision of the school by serving as the lead learner and chief executive.
Hazlett, Scott	Assistant Principal	In charge of curriculum, instruction, and scheduling
Artabasy, Babita	Assistant Principal	Administration, Athletics, and Facilities
Graffeo, Andrea	Assistant Principal	Student Affairs, PBIS, and SEL
Cope, Libby	Parent Engagement Liaison	Media Specialist, Title 1 Coordinator
Gehrke, Drew	Assistant Principal	ILT/PLC Lead, Student Affairs, SAC Administrator
Scuillo, Francesca	Math Coach	Instructional support for math teachers
Sullivan-Jackson, Robyn	Reading Coach	Department Head for Reading; ILT; Instructional support for reading strategies
Palek, Lauren	Instructional Coach	Instructional support for writing; ILT
Silva, Cesarina	Graduation Coach	Success coach and SAC chair
Rivera Topke, Mirna	SAC Member	Classroom teacher and SAC Chair
Arena, Katherine	Teacher, K-12	Department Head for Career and Technical Education
Branch, Verity	Teacher, ESE	Department Head for Exceptional Student Education
Cannon, Linda	Teacher, K-12	Department Head for Business and Fine Arts
Crescenzi, Leesa	Teacher, K-12	Department Head for Math
Ewing, Holly	Teacher, K-12	Department Head for English
Judeh, Kelsey	Teacher, K-12	Department Head for Science
Machado, Belkis	Teacher, K-12	Department Head for World Languages
McBride, Kelly	Teacher, K-12	Department Head for General/PE

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Ward, Courtney	Teacher, K-12	Department Head for Social Studies

**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 Advisory Council provides input to the development of the SIP and will ultimately approve the SIP. The SIP was created in partnership with the Leto High School administrative team and instructional coaches. All plans were developed in conjunction with the Instructional Leadership Team, which is a committee of teachers across departments. Throughout the school year, the SAC committee will meet to discuss trends in data and monitor progress to adapt plans accordingly.

**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))

We will continually revisit the SIP and instructional strategies during administrative staff meetings, instructional coach meetings, department head meetings, and ILT meetings. We will progress monitor student achievement after each PM test for core subject area tests, midterm exams, and benchmark exams. Teachers will empower students to track their own data via data tracking cards and hold data chats with students during their classes. In addition, we will utilize the advisory period to empower students to track data monthly. Department Heads will monitor teacher implementation of student-driven data tracking.

Demographic Data	
<b>2023-24 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	High School 9-12
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2022-23 Title I School Status</b>	Yes
<b>2022-23 Minority Rate</b>	91%
<b>2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b>	100%
<b>Charter School</b>	No
<b>RAISE School</b>	No
<b>2021-22 ESSA Identification</b>	ATSI
<b>Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)</b>	No
<b>2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD)* English Language Learners (ELL) Asian Students (ASN) Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP)



	Multiracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
<b>School Grades History</b>	2021-22: B 2019-20: C 2018-19: C 2017-18: C
<b>School Improvement Rating History</b>	
<b>DJJ Accountability Rating History</b>	

**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
	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	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	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
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	754
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	367
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	116
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	100
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	72
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	318
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	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	

**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	
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	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	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	
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	
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	2022			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	40	52	52	49	56	56
ELA Learning Gains	49	52	52	50	54	51
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	40	41	41	39	41	42
Math Achievement*	39	47	41	47	49	51

Accountability Component	2022			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
Math Learning Gains	48	49	48	51	48	48
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	37	44	49	37	45	45
Science Achievement*	66	65	61	63	69	68
Social Studies Achievement*	64	72	68	56	75	73
Middle School Acceleration						
Graduation Rate	96			90		
College and Career Acceleration	59			44		
ELP Progress	31			53		

\* 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	52
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	569
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	96
Graduation Rate	96

**ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)**

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	36	Yes	3	
ELL	43			

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%
AMI				
ASN	65			
BLK	56			
HSP	51			
MUL	63			
PAC				
WHT	58			
FRL	51			

**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)

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	40	49	40	39	48	37	66	64		96	59	31
SWD	16	37	32	24	44	25	45	35		94	32	17
ELL	19	42	40	28	45	43	32	37		96	60	30
AMI												
ASN	52	55		50	62		55			100	79	
BLK	36	60	54	35	48		72	57		100	41	
HSP	38	47	40	38	47	34	64	64		96	61	32
MUL	69	71						50				
PAC												
WHT	47	51	30	45	46		78	74		100	54	
FRL	37	47	41	38	48	38	63	64		96	59	29

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	43	44	35	35	28	27	47	64		93	50	37

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
SWD	16	34	33	12	24	22	32	29		89	24	27
ELL	22	39	38	19	26	27	36	46		89	46	37
AMI												
ASN	71	54		42	33			84				
BLK	30	30	38	19	24	33	33	59		89	50	
HSP	41	44	36	34	29	26	47	62		93	50	37
MUL	65	41		56	31		60					
PAC												
WHT	56	45	33	47	21		58	77		87	46	
FRL	41	43	35	34	27	27	46	63		92	48	37

2018-19 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 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18	ELP Progress
All Students	49	50	39	47	51	37	63	56		90	44	53
SWD	15	33	35	32	48	33	23	29		86	20	
ELL	25	46	40	34	44	34	42	27		87	46	53
AMI												
ASN	65	40		75	67		71			94	59	
BLK	39	56	53	35	54	40	56	51		95	33	
HSP	48	51	38	46	49	36	62	54		90	44	53
MUL	43	38								82		
PAC												
WHT	56	48		54	60		74	60		89	44	
FRL	47	51	41	45	50	33	60	54		90	43	54

**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	35%	50%	-15%	50%	-15%
09	2023 - Spring	33%	48%	-15%	48%	-15%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	22%	55%	-33%	50%	-28%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	41%	49%	-8%	48%	-7%

BIOLOGY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	55%	62%	-7%	63%	-8%

HISTORY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	59%	65%	-6%	63%	-4%

### III. Planning for Improvement

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

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

The data component that showed the lowest performance for the 2022-2023 school year was Algebra 1. 353 students took the PM3 exam for Algebra 1 and 74 students scored a level 3 or higher. The total percentage was 21% for Algebra 1. This is nearly the same number of students year over year from 2021-2022, when we tested 354 students. However, in 2021-2022, students scored 26%. The same three teachers taught the Algebra benchmark courses between the two school years. In 2021-2022, Algebra 1B was not offered and all students were placed in Algebra 1. In 2022-2023, we offered Algebra 1B again. Possibly the greatest contributing factor was the change to new state standards and new

assessments. This year was the first year of new standards, so there was a significant learning curve for both teachers and students to acclimate to the changes effectively. In addition, students struggle with foundational math skills which was exacerbated by the effects of the COVID pandemic.

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

Biology was the greatest decline from the previous year with an 11% decline. A factor that contributed to this was an increase in student enrollment in regular Biology rather than Environmental Science and Honors Biology. The year prior, many English language learners completed Environmental Science prior to taking Biology this year. In the 21-22 school year we had 7 sections Honors Biology and 3 sections regular Biology; whereas in the 22-23 school year we had 8 sections Honors Biology and 11 sections regular Biology. 259 students tested in 2022 and 493 tested in 2023.

**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.**

Though the state averages are not available at this time, Algebra 1 and ELA likely represent the greatest gaps when compared to the state average. Contributing factors include student attendance, new state standards, new state assessments, new district curriculum, COVID learning loss, instructional design flaws, uneven implementation of WICOR strategies, and uneven implementation of vertical articulation between content areas across grade levels. ELL students generally require more time and attention to demonstrate knowledge of content-area vocabulary. Being more intentional about implementing strategies to benefit language development will likely benefit all students in all content areas.

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

Our College and Career Acceleration rate showed the most improvement in 2022-2023. Our College and Career Acceleration was 59% in 2021-2022 and increased to 68% in 2022-2023. We expanded our offerings of dual enrollment classes to as many students as possible and were more intentional about communicating the role of College and Career Acceleration to all teachers during Pre-Planning and throughout the school year. We expanded opportunities via a more robust Automotive program and a new Entrepreneurship certification. Throughout, we intentionally tracked students that had not yet earned a certification and scheduled them accordingly to expand access. We anticipate the College and Career Acceleration rate to increase even more in subsequent years as a result of our implementation of AICE courses.

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

Reflecting on the EWS data, our number of students below a 90% attendance rate increased from 648 in 2021-2022 to 868 in 2022-2023. Our 11th grade students led in the most absences, with 234 students missing over 10% of the school days throughout the year. Another area of concern is course failures, specifically for 9th grade students. Though they may have attended school slightly more, they earned 77 course failures in ELA and 155 course failures in math.

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

- Increase overall student attendance to 90% by reducing the number of students that miss 10% or more school days.
- Increase student achievement by 4% across the board for all subgroups in all content areas.
- Streamline student and teacher data tracking, data analysis, and data chats.



**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.

Data from 22-23 showed that attendance declined in every grade level from the prior year. Our yearly school attendance average declined from 89.6% in 21-22 to 88.0% in 22-23 and we had 1352 students with 10 or more absences. Additionally, our monthly attendance average was below both district and district high school-only monthly averages for every month last school year except for one. 90% of all school absences were unexcused.

### Measurable Outcome:

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

The number of students with 10+ absences will decrease from 1352 to under 500 students.  
The number of unexcused absences will decrease from 90% to 50% of all total absences.  
Increase overall student daily attendance to 90%

### Monitoring:

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

This Area of Focus will be monitored in several ways. First, out attendance will now be taken in 1st period rather than 2nd period to alert parents sooner if students are not in attendance. Success coaches will track attendance for negative trends and unexcused absences and share EWS reports with teachers for students having 3 unexcused absences within 20 days. Teachers will attempt to contact home for students on their report. Success coaches will meet with students, contact parents, meet with guidance counselors to continually monitor student attendance trends and needs.

### Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Babita Artabasy (babita.artabasy@hcps.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.)

During pre-planning, faculty and staff will conduct home visits to meet parents in the community and increase parent involvement and engage in a deep dive of attendance data to build their understanding of student attendance trends. New success coaches will be introduced and will explain their role in the process of monitoring attendance across classes and expectations for communication across teams. We will host campus previews that are more differentiated and informative than traditional open houses. We will follow up with parent universities throughout the school year that empower parents and families to take more ownership over their students' success and attendance. During the school year, success coaches will meet with PBIS, ILT, and grade-level teams to update teams on attendance data trends and leverage positive school culture and family connections to increase attendance. The success coaches will also implement positive attendance incentives and leverage our PBIS system.

### Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Students cannot learn if they are not in the building. The staggering rate of unexcused absences suggests that families are unaware of the majority of student absences, and we need streamlined systems in place for family engagement, communication and support. The hiring of two additional success coaches will help us achieve this end by clearly defining the role of the teacher, MTSS/PBIS teams, and administration in communicating with families and tracking attendance trends in real-time in order to increase student attendance month over month.

### **Tier of Evidence-based Intervention**

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

### **Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?**

No

### **Action Steps to Implement**

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

1. Present 22-23 attendance data to staff (ILT) and discuss role of success coach in supporting teachers and families to increase student attendance (Admin/SC)

**Person Responsible:** Scott Hazlett (scott.hazlett@hcps.net)

**By When:** Pre-Planning 8/3/23

Facilitate home visits to make positive connections with families (Parent Liaison)

**Person Responsible:** Libby Cope (libby.cope@hcps.net)

**By When:** Pre-Planning 8/3

3. Implement attendance tracking by identifying students who missed 3 or more days in a 20-day period (DHs/Teachers)

**Person Responsible:** Scott Hazlett (scott.hazlett@hcps.net)

**By When:** Continuous

4. Contact family and pull student for one-on-one conversation, coordinate with teacher for attendance plan and monitoring (success coach)

**Person Responsible:** Babita Artabasy (babita.artabasy@hcps.net)

**By When:** After first 20 days of school 9/15/23

5. Continuously review school attendance trends, parent contacts and PBIS strategies in place (Admin/success coach/PBIS teams/Parent liaison)

Continue tracking student attendance trends, contact home, refer to success coach for decline in attendance/increase of unexcused absences (teachers)

**Person Responsible:** Andrea Graffeo (andrea.graffeo@hcps.net)

**By When:** Continuously

## #2. 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.

Based on teacher observation data, classroom walkthroughs, teacher-created common assessments, and 2023 district and state assessment data, we can see that our school needs to focus on the implementation of reading and writing strategies (WICOR) across all content areas to improve student literacy for ELL and ESE students. This will help to increase the number of students meeting proficiency in Biology EOC, US History EOC, Geometry EOC, Algebra 1 EOC, and Reading FAST, which were all areas of decline for our school and specifically for our ELL and ESE subgroups.

### Measurable Outcome:

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

Students across all subgroups will show positive growth of at least 4% on the Biology EOC, US History EOC, Geometry EOC, Algebra 1 EOC, and Reading FAST. Proficiency data for students with disabilities will more closely match proficiency for all students as a whole.

Teachers and students will work in unison to employ reading and writing strategies (WICOR) across all content areas and the use of common terminology across all subjects in order to enhance student motivation, by establishing academic goals, setting high expectations for deep engagement, and creating authentic assessments that increase critical thinking skills, problem-solving skills, and reading and writing skills.

### Monitoring:

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

This area of focus will be monitored through the implementation of classroom walkthroughs, teacher observations, formative assessments, summative assessments, and the fidelity of teachers' active participation in the whole-group PLC protocol and PD.

### Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Larissa McCoy-Mitti (larissa.mccoymitti@hcps.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.)

Faculty and staff will engage in a deep dive of our school-wide data results with a specific focus on our most vulnerable populations, and instructional staff will create plans to close gaps in assessment outcomes between subgroups. Teachers will also participate in a Professional Development (PD). Teachers will take part in frequent whole group PLCs, "Differentiated PD" (3x per year), and "Strategically Focused Learning Walks" (3x per year). The Focused Learning Walks will give teachers the opportunity to see a model of an implemented strategy or lesson in the classroom and then debrief on how they can use this strategy or lesson in their classroom in order to increase student engagement or high expectations in order to positively impact student learning. Instructional coaches will work with specific content areas in order to facilitate implementation of literacy strategies and scaffolds appropriate for each subgroup.

### Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

We want to provide our teachers with the tools and support needed to enable students to meet or exceed academic success. Student proficiency in English Language Arts (ELA), Math, Science, and Social Studies is something we want to continue to work on as a school so that our students can continue to soar high and break academic barriers. Our Instructional Leadership Team (ILT) will meet periodically to look at

progress monitoring data and determine next steps of support needed for our teachers (Ed camps, instructional trainings, etc.).

**Tier of Evidence-based Intervention**

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

**Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?**

No

**Action Steps to Implement**

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

1. Present school data and conduct deep-dive analysis, especially the achievement data for students with disabilities.

**Person Responsible:** Drew Gehrke (drew.gehrke@hcps.net)

**By When:** Pre-planning 8/2/23-8/9/23

2. Plan and facilitate targeted PD based on subgroup needs, PLCs, and strategic learning walks. Implement a specific PD based on how to differentiate instruction for students with disabilities and utilize an IEP.

**Person Responsible:** Drew Gehrke (drew.gehrke@hcps.net)

**By When:** Pre-Planning 8/2/23-8-9/23 IEP Training for All Teachers to Better Reach Students with Disabilities - 8/28/23

Teachers will attend PD and PLC opportunities offered by the school, plan collaboratively with content-area teams and instructional coaches, and self-reflect on their support of subgroups. Teachers will complete a chart that requires them to record the goals, accommodations, strengths, and notes for each student in their class that has an IEP. This will empower teachers to more closely align instruction for their students with disabilities.

**Person Responsible:** Drew Gehrke (drew.gehrke@hcps.net)

**By When:** IEP Chart for Students with Disabilities Exploration Chart due on 9/15/23.

Increase student readiness for the public postsecondary level by enhancing rigor across all classrooms, increasing field trips to colleges and postsecondary institutions, and including targeted curriculum for college and career readiness during Wednesday advisories.

**Person Responsible:** Larissa McCoy-Mitti (larissa.mccoymitti@hcps.net)

**By When:** Ongoing PLCs, ongoing walkthroughs, open access field trips throughout the fall, one weekly advisory per month. Advisory planning meeting - 8/31/23 Advisory check-in - 10/24/23

**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).

We are intentional that the personnel hired through this funding directly support student populations and subject areas identified in our needs assessment (success coaches to support student academic growth and family engagement, instructional coaches to support teacher implementation of effective strategies for student learning, ESOL resource teachers to support ELL student success). Instructional materials are also

purchased equitably across content in order to ultimately close the opportunity gap for all students. The process for reviewing school improvement funding involves teachers, department heads, ILT and administrative feedback.

## 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.

We will generate a SIP summary sheet and disseminate that document, along with the full SIP, to all teachers during pre-planning week. It will also be reviewed by the SAC. Once approved by all stakeholders, we will post the summary and SIP to our website <https://www.hillsboroughschools.org/Domain/118> and have additional copies available for distribution in the offices. In addition, we will distribute the SIP summary via ParentLink and provide additional copies during our campus preview and parent university events. We host an in-person Title 1 meeting at the beginning of the year to discuss the SIP with the shareholders. Meetings held in both English and Spanish.

**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))

We plan to bolster ongoing two-way communication between parents, families, and other community stakeholders. This will be via regular ParentLink messages including our weekly calendar, home visits to 9th grade families at the beginning of the school year, ongoing one-on-one phone calls and text messages, and specific outreach events such as campus previews and parent universities. We host a parent meeting during the year with our vulnerable populations to share academic goals and connect to community services. Meetings held in both English and Spanish.

**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)**

By fostering collective ownership between all stakeholders, we expect to see attendance increase and student achievement increase in every category. The more students are present at school and engaged in their classes, the more they will achieve. In addition, as teachers plan and implement lessons strategically with a focus on vulnerable student populations, student achievement will also increase. Additionally, we provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum by offering open-access to AICE, AP, dual enrollment courses and industry certifications.

**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))**

Our school offers free lunch to all students regardless of free and reduced lunch status. This is to provide all students with a nutritional foundation to bolster intellectual engagement and overall health. We also foster a partnership with our adult school on campus, which helps provide additional resources to families and closes caps in credits to increase graduation rates for students. Our areas of focus on attendance and increased achievement will also lead to continued student success in their CTE courses and prepare more students for life after Leto.