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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;
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](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.

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

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 all students by using effective systems that promote lifelong learning

Provide the school's vision statement.
To provide a learning environment where all students successfully complete an accelerated pathway that results in a graduation rate of 100% each year

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.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position Title</th>
<th>Job Duties and Responsibilities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Patterson, Teresa</td>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>Instructional leader and visionary for the school</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Berry, Sharon   | Assistant Principal | Assistant Principal of Curriculum  
                          Instructional leader of the Math department  
                          Supervises and supports teachers  
                          Ensures appropriate curriculum is being taught and utilized  
                          Monitors 10th and 12th grade students and provides academic support and guidance                                                |
| Larson, Jeff    | Assistant Principal | Center for Wellness & Medical Professions Program  
                          Coordinator (CWMP) Supervises and supports all CWMP teachers  
                          Instructional leader for the Science Department  
                          Monitors and supports all CWMP students  
                          Ensures appropriate medical curriculum is being taught and utilized  
                          Monitors 9th grade PHUHS students and provides academic support and guidance                                                |
| Striblen, Evette | Assistant Principal | International Baccalaureate Program Coordinator (IB)  
                          Instructional leader for the English/Reading department  
                          Supervises and supports all IB teachers  
                          Monitors and supports all IB students  
                          Ensures appropriate IB curriculum is being taught and utilized  
                          Monitors 9th grade PHUHS students and provides academic support and guidance                                                    |
| Woodside, Mason | Assistant Principal | Assistant Principal of Athletics and Facilities  
                          Cambridge AICE Program Coordinator  
                          Instructional leader for the Social Studies department  
                          Supervises and supports all teachers  
                          Monitors and supports 10th & 11th grade students  
                          Ensures appropriate curriculum is being taught and utilized  
                          Monitors 10th & 11th grade PHUHS students and provides academic support and guidance                                      |

**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-based leadership team works with District Content Specialists to analyze data, identify trends and areas of focus and rationale. In addition, reflection on past systems lead to the identification of action steps to adjust current systems in order to support increased student achievement. A plan to monitor progress toward these goals based on data captured from common formative assessments is also developed. A School Advisory Council made up of staff, student, parents and community members...
review the School Improvement plan and ensure that the plan represents commitments to action to increase student achievement and accomplish school improvement goals.

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

The school-based leadership team works with District Content Specialists to support teachers to engage in the process of reflection of system implementation and impact on increasing student achievement. Common formative assessments will provide data from Professional Learning communities intentionally plan to respond and differentiate instruction to support all students towards standards/benchmark-based PROFICIENCY.

### Demographic Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2023-24 Status (per MSID File)</th>
<th>Active</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>School Type and Grades Served</strong> (per MSID File)</td>
<td>High School 9-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Primary Service Type</strong> (per MSID File)</td>
<td>K-12 General Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2022-23 Title I School Status</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2022-23 Minority Rate</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charter School</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAISE School</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2021-22 ESSA Identification</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented**
(subgroups with 10 or more students)
(subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)

- Students With Disabilities (SWD)
- English Language Learners (ELL)
- Asian Students (ASN)
- Black/African American Students (BLK)
- Hispanic Students (HSP)
- Multiracial Students (MUL)
- White Students (WHT)
- Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)

**School Grades History**

- 2021-22: A
- 2019-20: A
- 2018-19: A
- 2017-18: A

**School Improvement Rating History**

**DJJ Accountability Rating History**

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

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

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:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Grade Level</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students with two or more indicators</td>
<td>K 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Grade Level</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Retained Students: Current Year</td>
<td>K 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students retained two or more times</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

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

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Grade Level</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students with two or more indicators</td>
<td>K 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Grade Level</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Retained Students: Current Year</td>
<td>K 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students retained two or more times</td>
<td>K 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 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:

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Grade Level</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students with two or more indicators</td>
<td>K 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### The number of students identified retained:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Grade Level</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Retained Students: Current Year</td>
<td>K 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students retained two or more times</td>
<td>K 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ELA Achievement*</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELA Learning Gains</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELA Lowest 25th Percentile</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math Achievement*</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math Learning Gains</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math Lowest 25th Percentile</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science Achievement*</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Studies Achievement*</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle School Acceleration Graduation Rate</td>
<td>99</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>99</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College and Career Acceleration</td>
<td>78</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>77</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELP Progress</td>
<td>39</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>56</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* 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)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2021-22 ESSA Federal Index</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OVERALL Federal Index – All Students</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Points Earned for the Federal Index</td>
<td>725</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Components for the Federal Index</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Tested</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 2021-22 ESSA Federal Index

| Graduation Rate | 99 |

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ESSA Subgroup</th>
<th>2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Federal Percent of Points Index</td>
<td>Subgroup Below 41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWD</td>
<td>45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELL</td>
<td>53</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASN</td>
<td>90</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BLK</td>
<td>70</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HSP</td>
<td>65</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MUL</td>
<td>77</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WHT</td>
<td>65</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRL</td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Students</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>39</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWD</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELL</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>39</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMI</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>57</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>97</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASN</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>87</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>67</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BLK</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HSP</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>86</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## 2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WHT</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRL</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## 2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Students</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWD</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>47</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELL</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASN</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>91</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BLK</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HSP</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MUL</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>82</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WHT</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRL</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## 2018-19 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Students</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWD</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>55</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELL</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>56</td>
<td></td>
<td>89</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASN</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>98</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>98</td>
<td>90</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BLK</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>45</td>
<td></td>
<td>67</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HSP</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>82</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MUL</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td>96</td>
<td>74</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WHT</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRL</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>School</th>
<th>District</th>
<th>School-District Comparison</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>School-State Comparison</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>2023 - Spring</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09</td>
<td>2023 - Spring</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### ALGEBRA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>School</th>
<th>District</th>
<th>School-District Comparison</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>School-State Comparison</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>2023 - Spring</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>-11%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>-8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### GEOMETRY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>School</th>
<th>District</th>
<th>School-District Comparison</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>School-State Comparison</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>2023 - Spring</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### BIOLOGY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>School</th>
<th>District</th>
<th>School-District Comparison</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>School-State Comparison</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>2023 - Spring</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### HISTORY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>School</th>
<th>District</th>
<th>School-District Comparison</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>School-State Comparison</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>2023 - Spring</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 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.
Student achievement on the Algebra 1 assessment remains the lowest performing tested subject at PHUHS. Only 42% of the 288 students tested achieved proficiency of the new B.E.S.T. standards. This is a 2% increase from 2021-22.

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

Our school continues to trend above district and state levels for English Language Arts. However, the achievement decreased significantly in 2023 in both 9th and 10 grades. In additional, acceleration from 2020-21 to 2021-22 dropped by 11%. These two areas of student achievement represent our areas of greatest decline from the previous 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.**

Our Geometry student achievement (66%) on the EOC was 21% higher than that of students across the state (48%). The standards-based grading systems utilizing common assessments is a PLC model that we hope to employ schoolwide in the future.

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

Student achievement in Geometry showed the most improvement from 2021-22 (62%) to 67% in 2022-23. In additional geometry student achievement improved 12% from 2020-21. The effective transition to standards-based grading practices and common assessments deepening the effectiveness of PLC's have been identified as actions to diffuse throughout all departments due to their positive impact on student achievement.

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

Although EWS data applies to grades k-8 we see similar trends in grades 9-12. Administration will strategically schedule level 1 readers in intensive reading classes. In addition, ELL students who are also level 1 or are placed in a specialized English language development class to support reading skills with bi-lingual assistant support.

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

- Continuation of implementation of standards-based grading practiced to adequately determine progress towards the proficiency of standards/benchmarks.
- Professional Learning communities will use data to intentionally plan to respond and differentiate instruction to support all students towards standards/benchmark-based proficiency.
- Develop and utilize common assessments to deepen the effectiveness of PLC's

---

**Area of Focus**

(Identified key Area of Focus that addresses the school’s highest priority based on any/all relevant data sources)
#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

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

Our school continues to trend above district and state levels for English Language Arts. However, the achievement decreased significantly in 2023 in both 9th and 10 grades.

**Grade Level Data:**

2023 ELA 9th Grade – 63% (District 45%, State 47%)  
2023 ELA 10th Grade – 62% (District 48%, State 49%)  
2022 ELA 9th Grade - 71% (District 50%, State 51%)  
2022 ELA 10th Grade - 74% (District 48%, State 49%)  
2021 ELA 9th Grade - 72% (District 54%, State 55%)  
2021 ELA 10th Grade - 71% (District 53%, State 53%)  
2019 ELA 9th Grade - 69% (District 54%, State 55%)  
2019 ELA 10th Grade - 73% (District 53%, State 53%)  
2018 ELA 9th Grade - 68% (District 53%, State 53%)  
2018 ELA 10th Grade - 73% (District 54%, State 53%)

PHUHS’s current level of performance is 63% in grade 9 and 62% in grade 10, as evidenced in the 2023 FAST results. The problem is increasing understanding of the B.E.S.T. standards expectations and aligning tasks, both formative and summative to the expectations of the standards. If teachers plan backwards using common texts to intentionally sequence questions and tasks aligned to the B.E.S.T. standards, students can practice higher order thinking in both independent reading of complex grade level texts and in their discussions and writing. In addition, intentionally planned systems to monitor student achievement will be implemented to inform instruction.

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

The percentage of all students achieving proficiency in English Language Arts will increase from the 62nd percentile in 10th grade and 63rd percentile in 9th grade to the 80th percentile in both grade levels by the spring of 2024.

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

If teachers plan backwards using common texts to intentionally sequence questions and tasks aligned to the B.E.S.T. standards, students can practice higher order thinking in both independent reading of complex grade level texts and in their discussions and writing. In addition, intentionally planned systems to monitor student achievement data will be implemented to intentionally plan to respond and differentiate instruction to support all students towards standards/benchmark-based mastery.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**
Evette Striblen (striblene@pcsb.org)

**Evidence-based Intervention:**
Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)
Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

1- English teachers will plan and implement instruction at the level of rigor appropriate for the standard.
2- English teachers will utilize timely formative and summative assessment data to inform instruction and spiral reteaching throughout the course.

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- Teachers will use common texts from the district pacing guide, including B.E.S.T. texts to create graphic organizers with questions aligned to the F.A.S.T.

Teachers will create Anchor charts based on the B.E.S.T. standards for students to use as a classroom resource.

Teachers will use B.E.S.T. question stems to plan intentionally sequenced questions and tasks for students to respond to as they read complex grade level texts.

Teachers will bring student work samples to PLCs to discuss task-to-standard alignment. Teachers will provide feedback on how to strengthen the lesson for increased rigor.

Administrators will frequently visit English classes to observe tasks, texts and questioning, provide constructive feedback and collaborate to determine next steps

2- Teachers will create common formative assessments with their PLCs to collect data to determine student progress towards standards mastery

Teachers will use student data to plan for reteaching for the whole class, in small groups, and with individual students.

Teachers will support students with data chats where students track and monitor their own progress and reflect on their learning.

Teachers will meet monthly in PLC’s to review student data and plan action steps related to identified areas of strength or areas identified as needing improvement.

Teachers will be provided with release time to create common formative assessments aligned to the B.E.S.T. and to calibrate their questioning, tasks, and scoring.

Administrators monitor and support the use of data as teachers develop lessons and plan for instruction.

Person Responsible: Evette Striblen (striblene@pcsb.org)

By When:
Step 1

We will continue to increase staff understanding of the critical content of the B.E.S.T. standards by using common texts from the district pacing guide, including B.E.S.T. texts to create common formative assessments using guidance from district provided graphic organizers with questions aligned to the F.A.S.T. and creating anchor charts created in PLCs to support student learning.

**Person Responsible:** Evette Striblen (striblene@pcsb.org)

**By When:**

Step 2

Provide opportunities for teachers to collaborate to create and analyze task alignment to the critical content through time in PLCs and release time for calibration of creating questions and tasks and scoring reading and writing common formative and summative assessments.

**Person Responsible:** Evette Striblen (striblene@pcsb.org)

**By When:** Step 3 Teachers will use the district created tracking document for students to track their progress within a unit on the standards and/or create system for tracking student growth/reflection.
#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science

**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.

Our school continues to trend above district and state levels for English Language Arts. However, the achievement decreased significantly in 2023:

- 2023 Biology EOC - 75% (District 59%, State 63%)
- 2022 Biology EOC - 78% (District 60%, State 61%)
- 2021 Biology EOC - 86% (District 61%, State 61%)
- 2019 Biology EOC - 77% (District 62%, State 67%)
- 2018 Biology EOC - 79% (District 63%, State 65%)

PHUHS’s current level of performance is 75%, as evidenced in the 2023 NGSSS Bio EOC results. This is a decrease of 3% from the student achievement for the previous year. The problem/gap is the achievement of our SWD (35%), ELL (48%) and Black (54%) students are not achieving 75% or higher. If teachers backwards plan lessons and they use intentional and effective opportunities to pause, process and practice the learning and ask Higher Order Thinking Questions in such a way to engage ALL students in thinking, discussing and/or writing responses and personalized instruction based on cycle assessment data and formative assessments are implemented, then student groups can be created for differentiated instruction and achievement will increase. Additionally, intentionally planned systems to monitor the effectiveness of this data informed instruction will be implemented and inform instruction moving forward.

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

Percent proficient on the NGSSS Biology End of Course Exam will increase from 75% to 90%.

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

If teachers backwards plan lessons and they use Intentional and effective opportunities to pause, process and practice the learning and ask Higher Order Thinking Questions in such a way to engage ALL students in thinking, discussing and/or writing responses and personalized instruction based on cycle assessment data and formative assessments are implemented, then student groups can be created for differentiated instruction and achievement will increase. Additionally, intentionally planned systems to monitor the effectiveness of this data informed instruction will be implemented and inform instruction moving forward.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**
Jeff Larson (larsonje@pcsb.org)

**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.)

Science teachers will plan and implement student-centered instruction at the level of rigor appropriate for the standard.
Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

By scaffolding support for students and following standards-based instruction (provided by the district) we can ensure that there are many opportunities for intentional practice and skill development thus student growth can be tracked using Cycle Assessments and inform instruction moving forward. Assessment checkpoint will be quarterly.

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.

Teachers backwards plan lessons to include learning tasks where students are scaffolded to demonstrate achievement of the learning target.

Person Responsible: Jeff Larson (larsonje@pcsb.org)

By When: Weekly

Teachers will bring student work samples to PLCs to discuss task-to-target alignment and provide feedback on how to strengthen the lesson for increased rigor.

Person Responsible: Jeff Larson (larsonje@pcsb.org)

By When: Monthly

Teachers use a 10-2-2 or gradual release model to ensure the frequent release of learning to students. Intentional and effective opportunities to pause, process and practice the learning will be included in daily lessons.

Person Responsible: Jeff Larson (larsonje@pcsb.org)

By When: Daily

Teachers will write into lesson plans and ask Higher Order Thinking Questions in such a way to engage ALL students in thinking, discussing and/or writing responses.

Person Responsible: [no one identified]

By When: Daily

Administrators will frequently visit science classes to observe rigor of student tasks, provide constructive feedback and collaborate to determine next steps.

Person Responsible: Jeff Larson (larsonje@pcsb.org)

By When: Bi-Weekly
#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Social Studies

**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.

Our school is trending above district and state levels for U.S. History. However, the achievement on the U.S. History EOC at PHUHS decreased in 2023 to 78% from 85% in 2022.

**Grade Level Data:**
- 2023 Social Studies 78%. (District 59% State 63%)
- 2022 Social Studies 85%. (District 67% State 65%)
- 2021 Social Studies 74%. (District 63.3% State 63%)
- 2019 History EOC - 87% (District 70%, State 70%)
- 2018 History EOC - 79% (District 70%, State 68%)

PHUHS’s current level of performance is 78% as evidenced in the 2023 U.S. History EOC.

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

Students enrolled in U.S. History at PHUHS will increase proficiency to 90% as measured by the U.S. History EOC. We will monitor our cycle and formative assessments to reveal trends within common learning standards which will lead to appropriate individualized and class review. Teachers will be implementing common standards within their formative assessments at the appropriate levels of rigor. The purpose of the data we receive from assessments will be used to inform instruction and include specific cognitive tasks.

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

Effective PLC’s will monitor and analyze performance matters data as well as common standards through formative assessments to inform instruction moving forward. Data will continue to be reviewed and monitored at each PLC meeting. Administration will also complete walkthroughs and provide meaningful feedback.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**
Mason Woodside (woodsidem@pcsb.org)

**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.)

Appropriately enhance teacher ability to identify critical content from common standards in alignment with district provided resources. Staff will be supported to utilize data to appropriately organize students to differentiate and scaffold instruction to meet the needs of each student to increase student achievement.

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

Increase teacher ability to effectively use data to align common standards at the appropriate level of rigor with the use of district resources to increase individual 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.

Ensure all U.S. History teachers can access and utilize student data to inform and guide instruction. Teachers will complete individual benchmark chats with all students.

**Person Responsible:** Mason Woodside (woodsidem@pcsb.org)

**By When:** Ongoing by unit and cycle assessments.

Teachers engage in district led professional learning opportunities and PLC’s to collaboratively ensure lessons are aligned appropriately with standard.

**Person Responsible:** Mason Woodside (woodsidem@pcsb.org)

**By When:** Reference PLC calendar and District PD opportunities.

Provide professional development opportunities to support teachers in engaging students in complex tasks.

**Person Responsible:** Mason Woodside (woodsidem@pcsb.org)

**By When:** Ongoing throughout the school year.

Teachers will use cycle and formative data to guide the development and implementation of remediation plans and spiraled instruction plans each quarter.

**Person Responsible:** Mason Woodside (woodsidem@pcsb.org)

**By When:** Ongoing by unit and cycle assessments.

Teachers will plan lessons intentionally to engage all students in cognitively complex tasks that are appropriately aligned with the standard.

**Person Responsible:** Mason Woodside (woodsidem@pcsb.org)

**By When:** Ongoing throughout the school year.
#4. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

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

Our school was trending above district and state levels for Algebra 1 End of Course Exam during 2021 (60%) and 2022 (40%), even though there was a significant drop between those 2 years. However, achievement on the Alg. 1 EOC increased by 6% (46%) for 2023 from 2022. This was higher than District (28%) and state (32%) proficiency. A deeper analysis of data shows that our 9th graders (55%) performed significantly better than our 10th graders (27%) taking the Alg. 1 EOC.

2023 Algebra EOC – 46% (District 28%, State 32%)
2022 Algebra EOC - 40% (District 26%, State 31%)
2021 Algebra EOC - 60% (District 36%, State 30%)
2019 Algebra EOC - 39% (District 55%, State 61%)
2018 Algebra EOC - 46% (District 57%, State 62%)

Our school continues to increase achievement for the Geometry EOC. There was a 4% increase in achievement over last year, and a 10% increase since 2021. PHUHS was 19% over the district and 18% over the State. Geometry continues to be above the district and State in achievement on the Geometry EOC.

2023 Geometry EOC – 66% (District 47%, State 48%)
2022 Geometry EOC - 62% (District 49%, State 44%)
2021 Geometry EOC - 55% (District 35%, State 40%)
2019 Geometry EOC - 64% (District 56%, State 57%)
2018 Geometry EOC - 76% (District 56%, State 56%)

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

The percent of student's achieving proficiency on the Algebra 1 End of Course Exam will increase from 46% - 60%. In addition, the proficiency of student achievement on the Algebra EOC for 10th grade students will increase achievement from 27% - 40%.
The percent of student's achieving proficiency on the Geometry End of Course Exam will increase from 66% - 75%.
Monitoring:
Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.
Intentionally planned systems to monitor the effectiveness of this data informed instruction will be implemented and inform instruction moving forward.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:
Sharon Berry (berrysh@pcsb.org)

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.)

Math teachers will plan and implement student-centered instruction at the level of rigor appropriate for the standard utilizing all district resources.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.
The rationale would be for teachers to work together to help prepare students for the higher order thinking questions that are utilized on the End of Course exams. Student-centered so that the planning incorporates the diversity of learning styles of all students. And, with the idea that if a student changes classes, the teachers are doing the same as the others.

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.

Teachers will bring student work samples to PLCs to discuss task-to-target alignment. Teachers will provide feedback on how to strengthen the lesson for increased rigor. Teachers will also attend all quarterly district PLC meetings.

Person Responsible: Sharon Berry (berrysh@pcsb.org)
By When: Expectation will be for teachers to bring examples each PLC meeting ongoing throughout the year so as to best determine best practices to ensure lessons are at the appropriate level.

Teachers will use intentional and effective opportunities to pause, process and practice the learning that will be included in daily lessons. Teachers will utilize district planning documents.

Person Responsible: Sharon Berry (berrysh@pcsb.org)
By When: Expectation is that teachers do this throughout the school year to ensure that students are understanding and comprehending the content so that skills learned are able to be incorporated on all assessments.

Teachers will write into lesson plans and ask Higher Order Thinking Questions in such a way to engage ALL students in thinking, discussing and/or writing responses.

Person Responsible: Sharon Berry (berrysh@pcsb.org)
By When: Expectation is that teachers incorporate this throughout the school year to ensure students are prepared for the End of Course exam.

Administrators will frequently visit math classes to observe rigor of student tasks, provide constructive feedback and collaborate to determine next steps.
Person Responsible: Teresa Patterson (pattersont@pcsb.org)

By When: Throughout the school year to ensure that teachers are continuously supported in teaching at the appropriate rigor for all students to be successful on their End of Course exam.
#5. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

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

Our school was trending above district and state levels for Algebra 1 End of Course Exam during 2021(60%) and 2022(40%), even though there was a significant drop between those 2 years. However, achievement on the Alg. 1 EOC increased by 6% (46%) for 2023 from 2022. This was higher than District (28%) and state (32%) proficiency. A deeper analysis of data shows that our 9th graders (55%) performed significantly better than our 10th graders (27%) taking the Alg. 1 EOC.

2023 Algebra EOC – 46% (District 28%, State 32%)
2022 Algebra EOC - 40% (District 26%, State 31%)
2021 Algebra EOC - 60% (District 36%, State 30%)
2019 Algebra EOC - 39% (District 55%, State 61%)
2018 Algebra EOC - 46% (District 57%, State 62%)

Our school continues to increase achievement for the Geometry EOC. There was a 4% increase in achievement over last year, and a 10% increase since 2021. PHUHS was 19% over the district and 18% over the State. Geometry continues to be above the district and State in achievement on the Geometry EOC.

2023 Geometry EOC – 66% (District 47%, State 48%)
2022 Geometry EOC - 62% (District 49%, State 44%)
2021 Geometry EOC - 55% (District 35%, State 40%)
2019 Geometry EOC - 64% (District 56%, State 57%)
2018 Geometry EOC - 76% (District 56%, State 56%)

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

The percent of student's achieving proficiency on the Algebra 1 End of Course Exam will increase from 46% - 60%. In addition, the proficiency of student achievement on the Algebra EOC for 10th grade students will increase achievement from 27% - 40%.

The percent of student's achieving proficiency on the Geometry End of Course Exam will increase from 66% - 75%.

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

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**
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.)
Math teachers will utilize timely formative and summative assessment data to inform spiral reteaching throughout the course.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.
To help increase the Math achievement proficiency with all students, teachers will utilize to organize students to interact with content in manners which differentiates/scaffolds instruction to meet the needs of each student. Identify critical content from the standards in alignment with District resources. Engage students in complex tasks. Strengthen staff ability to meet the educational needs of SWD and ELL students and provide appropriate supports in the classrooms to ensure all our subgroup students are meeting standards and making gains.

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.

Teachers utilize common formative assessments and use the collected data to gauge student progress toward mastery of the course content.

Person Responsible: Sharon Berry (berrysh@pcsb.org)
By When:

Teachers use student data to plan small group instruction and station rotations.

Person Responsible: Sharon Berry (berrysh@pcsb.org)
By When:

Teachers use benchmark-level data to plan reteaching opportunities for whole-class, small group and individual students based on trends. Teachers support students with data chats where students are guided to standards-based resources for reteaching followed by reassessments to determine success of reteaching and inform next steps.

Person Responsible: Sharon Berry (berrysh@pcsb.org)
By When:

Teachers meet in monthly PLC’s to review student data (collected from multiple sources, including common assessment and/or quarterly district progress monitoring assessments) and plan action steps related to identified areas of strength or areas identified as needing improvement.

Person Responsible: Sharon Berry (berrysh@pcsb.org)
By When:

Teachers will use Level-Up, District Challenges, IXL (Alg. 1/Geo) and Imagine Math (Alg. 1A) to enhance their classroom instruction.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Person Responsible:</th>
<th>Sharon Berry (<a href="mailto:berrysh@pcsb.org">berrysh@pcsb.org</a>)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>By When:</td>
<td>Administrators monitor and support the use of data as teachers develop lessons and plan for small group instruction and station rotations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person Responsible:</td>
<td>Teresa Patterson (<a href="mailto:pattersont@pcsb.org">pattersont@pcsb.org</a>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By When:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
#6. 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.

Our acceleration rate for 2021-22 fell from 78% to 67% of students successfully completing an accelerated pathway. Our school vision is to provide a learning environment where all students successfully complete an accelerated pathway that results in a graduation rate of 100% each year.

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

100% of students will successfully complete an accelerated pathway through Advanced Placement, Dual Enrollment or AICE course or earn an industry certification which aligns with their passion while earning their diploma.

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

Intentionally planned systems to open access to accelerated coursework and support students to explore opportunities based on their interests (passion) and goals (purpose) after graduation.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**
Teresa Patterson (pattersont@pcsb.org)

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

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

Our mission is to educate all students by using effective systems that promote lifelong learning.

**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.

Implement a PBIS system that engages and supports students to determine their accelerated pathway.

**Person Responsible:** Jeff Larson (larsonje@pcsb.org)

**By When:**
Utilize AP potential data to identify and recruit students to register for AP courses who have yet to do so.

**Person Responsible:** Teresa Patterson (pattersont@pcsb.org)

**By When:**
Cohort data will be utilized to identify students who benefit from access to on campus Dual Enrollment course opportunities

**Person Responsible:** Sharon Berry (berrysh@pcsb.org)
By When: Pre-school and end of semester 1

#7. 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.

The achievement of the Student with Disabilities in ELA and Science are areas of focus.

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

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

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.)

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

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.

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

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).

The district allocates SIP funds to each school as prescribed by the legislature. Principals present to the School Advisory Council the amount of their SIP Funds, their SIP, and how the SIP funds will support the plan. The SAC reviews and votes on approval of the SIP and use of SIP funds. The SIP funds are spent in alignment with the SIP, and reviewed by the SAC throughout the year. Expenditures that deviate from the approved SIP are presented to the SAC, which votes to approve or deny the expense.
The approved budget does not reflect any amendments submitted for this project.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>III.B.</th>
<th>Area of Focus: Instructional Practice</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>ELA</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>Science</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>Social Studies</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>Math</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>Math</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>Positive Culture and Environment: Other</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total: $0.00

Budget Approval

Check if this school is eligible and opting out of UniSIG funds for the 2023-24 school year.

No