

Pinellas County Schools

Largo High School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	9
III. Planning for Improvement	13
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	27
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	27
VI. Title I Requirements	29
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	30

Largo High School

410 MISSOURI AVE N, Largo, FL 33770

<http://www.largo-hs.pinellas.k12.fl.us>

SIP Authority

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

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

Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)

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

Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)

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

Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

I. School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

PRIDE: Positive Rigorous Instruction Designed to Empower students' learning and success in post-secondary endeavors promoting community leadership, global understanding, and a respect for individuals and societies.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Prepare 100% of our students for post-secondary success by providing a quality education that values life-long learning and leadership.

School Leadership Team, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring

School Leadership Team

For each member of the school leadership team, select the employee name and email address from the dropdown. Identify the position title and job duties/responsibilities as it relates to SIP implementation for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Vragovic, Jennifer	Principal	
Ray, Linda	Assistant Principal	
Ortiz, Jennifer	Assistant Principal	
Vasallo, Michael		
Dolan, Diana	Assistant Principal	

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.

In the spring of 2023 the current year's SIP along with the newest data were shared with the School Advisory Council to begin the brainstorming process of developing the 2023-24 SIP. Areas of growth and areas of stagnation were identified along with potential next steps. That meeting included parents from all 3 demographics (ExCEL, Traditional and IB programs), teachers, community members and school staff.

The principal met with student leaders to present the same information that was shared with the School Advisory Council. Their input was sought for what they experience in classrooms daily that impact academic performance. Potential focuses were presented for their input.

The administrative team completed a book study in the spring focused on literacy in all content areas and classrooms. The strategies learned from that book were used to help refine the schoolwide instructional focuses to support growth in 2023-23.

All of this work was used to develop the School Improvement Plan that will be shared with all instructional staff during preschool for additional input as well as guiding expectations.

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 Improvement Plan will be reviewed monthly with the Schoolwide Leadership Team to complete reflection and refinement based on student data provided by department chairs. Monthly Department meetings will begin with data reflections connected to the SIP goals and their progress.

All SAC meetings are guided by the School Improvement Plan.

At each of these reflection points revisions will be reviewed to ensure a living plan that appropriately addresses the needs of the school as they evolve.

Demographic Data

2023-24 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Other School 9-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	54%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	58%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	<i>Data will be uploaded when available</i>
2021-22 ESSA Identification	ATSI
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	
School Grades History	2021-22: C 2020-21: B 2019-20: B 2018-19: B 2017-18: B
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The number of students identified retained:

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

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

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

District and State data will be uploaded when available.

Accountability Component	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	50			50			58		
ELA Learning Gains	48			41			55		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	33			32			45		
Math Achievement*	29			29			39		
Math Learning Gains	38			28			44		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	41			24			38		
Science Achievement*	57			64			64		
Social Studies Achievement*	62			63			70		
Middle School Acceleration									
Graduation Rate	97			94			91		
College and Career Acceleration	66			55			47		
ELP Progress	43			51			51		

* 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	51
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	564
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	97
Graduation Rate	97

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	31	Yes	3	2
ELL	36	Yes	1	
AMI				
ASN	78			
BLK	34	Yes	3	
HSP	46			
MUL	49			
PAC				
WHT	60			
FRL	44			

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	50	48	33	29	38	41	57	62		97	66	43
SWD	9	36	35	17	24		15	24		86	32	27
ELL	11	29	27	15	41	50	18	31		92	44	43
AMI												
ASN	78	67		47	58		91	94		100	89	
BLK	23	31	23	12	21	29	28	26		95	54	
HSP	41	42	29	24	37	38	50	55		96	52	47
MUL	52	47	33	25	27		57	45		95	61	
PAC												
WHT	59	54	43	42	43	52	66	72		97	71	
FRL	37	41	30	21	32	39	44	48		94	54	39

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	50	41	32	29	28	24	64	63		94	55	51
SWD	5	17	20	8	24	23	36	31		82	13	29
ELL	14	34	42	16	29	26	33	31		98	31	51
AMI												
ASN	76	56		35	42		79	79		100	75	
BLK	21	32	31	8	21	23	27	38		91	25	
HSP	40	37	37	23	25	32	61	54		97	45	47
MUL	57	33		41	38		64	74		96	46	
PAC												
WHT	59	44	29	41	30	18	73	71		93	68	
FRL	37	33	28	23	24	24	50	51		92	36	48

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	58	55	45	39	44	38	64	70		91	47	51
SWD	10	38	44	8	32	38	15	27		80	13	36
ELL	23	41	35	23	42	43	39	28		94	38	51
AMI												
ASN	86	60		65	47		92	86		100	86	
BLK	29	47	40	20	34	33	31	37		93	31	
HSP	44	52	43	34	45	44	49	62		92	39	53
MUL	50	43	47	31	39		68	59		100	27	
PAC												
WHT	69	58	51	51	47	41	79	83		88	49	
FRL	41	49	44	30	38	35	46	54		86	34	51

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.

School, District and State data will be uploaded when available.

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.

Students with Disabilities ELA Achievement was the lowest performing category. The ELA department had multiple teachers who's strengths were misaligned with their content this past year as well as long term substitute teachers. The ELA supports were moved to other content areas to help students access those academic texts.

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

Our black students achievement in Social Studies showed the greatest decline from the prior year. The US History lead teacher that had been at Largo High for multiple decades retired this past year. The new teacher lead was an intern under his leadership and we expect that this will quickly turn around with additional experience.

Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends.

The greatest gap was students with disabilities in ELA. The ELA department had multiple teachers who's strengths were misaligned with their content this past year as well as long term substitute teachers. The ELA supports were moved to other content areas to help students access those academic texts.

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

The L25 subgroup showed the most improvement in Math. Largo High brought on a strong Algebra lead teacher with experience supporting this particular population. The teacher collaboration was strong and led by a meticulous administrator with a strong math background. Multiple teachers attended additional training focused on the standards.

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

- English achievement across all categories is concerning. This will also negatively impact every other category as students struggle with accessing academic texts as well as meeting graduation requirements.

- Students with disabilities are not performing at an acceptable level in any content. This is historically an area of strength at Largo High School but with a very new team, better supports are needed.

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

- Increase literacy instruction across all contents to strengthen skills for all.
- Ensure instructional time is maximized daily.
- Use AVID strategies with fidelity.

- Communicate daily learning intentions and success criteria for all stakeholders.

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 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.

LHS scholars are performing below both state and district levels in math.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Our current level of proficiency in math is 31% as evidenced on the state assessments. We expect our performance level to reach 40% by the end of the 2023-2024 school year.

Currently, 25% of our juniors and seniors are missing their graduation math score. We expect to reduce this to 10% by the end of the school year.

Monitoring:

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

1. Common administrative walkthrough tool with immediate feedback and data.
2. Review of common formative/summative assessment data and content PLC's throughout the year.
3. Review of IXL and Albert.io reports

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Diana Dolan (doland@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.)

Bell to Bell Academic Engagement

Clearly communicated learning intentions and success criteria

Consistent use of the complete Focused Note Taking cycle

Data-driven PLC's

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

These strategies are essential for helping teachers maximize their instructional impact. Helping teachers focus on driving instruction forward with consistent review of their formative and summative assessments and comparing this to cycle assessment data will increase their ability to fully engage every learner in the classroom. Use of learning intentions and success criteria will ensure students are aware of their learning goals and are able to appropriately take action to learn from bell to bell, maximizing their instructional time. Use of the complete cycle of focused notes will increase concept retention

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.

Provide professional development and expectations during pre-school

Person Responsible: Diana Dolan (doland@pcsb.org)

Consistent data-driven PLC's by content area

Person Responsible: Diana Dolan (doland@pcsb.org)

Consistent walkthroughs with feedback provided the same day to teachers

Person Responsible: Diana Dolan (doland@pcsb.org)

Ensure usage and monitoring of IXL/Albert.io programs to support student growth

Person Responsible: Diana Dolan (doland@pcsb.org)

#2. 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.

LHS scholars are performing below both state and district levels in ELA.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Our current level of proficiency in ELA is 48% as evidenced on the state assessments. We expect our performance level to reach 55% by the end of the 2023-2024 school year.

Monitoring:

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

1. Administrative walkthrough with immediate feedback and data.
2. Review of common formative/summative assessment data and content PLC's throughout the year.
3. Review of Lexia, Apple Routh, Albert.io, and PM 1& 2 reports

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jennifer Ortiz (ortizj@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.)

Bell to Bell Academic Engagement

Clearly communicated learning intentions and success criteria

Consistent use of the complete Focused Note Taking cycle

Data-driven PLC's

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

These strategies are essential for helping teachers maximize their instructional impact. Helping teachers focus on driving instruction forward with consistent review of their formative and summative assessments and comparing this to PM data will increase their ability to fully engage every learner in the classroom. Use of learning intentions and success criteria will ensure students are aware of their goals and are able to appropriately take action to learn from bell to bell, maximizing their instructional time. Use of the complete cycle of focused notes will increase concept retention.

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.

Provide professional development and expectations during pre-school

Person Responsible: Jennifer Ortiz (ortizj@pcsb.org)

Consistent data-driven PLC's by content area

Person Responsible: Jennifer Ortiz (ortizj@pcsb.org)

Consistent walkthroughs with feedback related to consistent use of anchor charts, the reading comprehension protocol, BEST texts, and benchmark tracking for reteaching and differentiation is provided the same day to teachers.

Person Responsible: Jennifer Ortiz (ortizj@pcsb.org)

Ensure usage and monitoring of benchmark tracking through formative assessments, Lexia, Apple Routh and Albert.io programs to support student growth.

Person Responsible: Jennifer Ortiz (ortizj@pcsb.org)

#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.

LHS students are performing below state average in Social Studies.

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.

1. Common administrative walkthrough tool with immediate feedback and data.
2. Review of common formative/summative assessment data and content PLC's throughout the year.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jennifer Vragovic (vragovicj@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.)

Bell to Bell Academic Engagement
Clearly communicated learning intentions and success criteria
Consistent use of the complete Focused Note Taking cycle
Data-driven PLC's

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

These strategies are essential for helping teachers maximize their instructional impact. Helping teachers focus on driving instruction forward with consistent review of their formative and summative assessments and comparing this to PM data will increase their ability to fully engage every learner in the classroom. Use of learning intentions and success criteria will ensure students are aware of their goals and are able to appropriately take action to learn from bell to bell, maximizing their instructional time. Use of the complete cycle of focused notes will increase concept retention.

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.

Provide professional development and expectations during pre-school

Person Responsible: Jennifer Vragovic (vragovicj@pcsb.org)

Consistent data-driven PLC's by content area to include common assignments, resources and assessments

Person Responsible: Jennifer Vragovic (vragovicj@pcsb.org)

Consistent walkthroughs with feedback provided the same day to teachers

Person Responsible: Jennifer Vragovic (vragovicj@pcsb.org)

#4. 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 performance on the Biology EOC was below the state and district average.

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.

1. Common administrative walkthrough tool with immediate feedback and data.
2. Review of common formative/summative assessment data and content PLC's throughout the year.
3. Monitoring of attendance and parent contacts in regard to attendance.

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.)

Bell to Bell Academic Engagement
Clearly communicated learning intentions and success criteria
Consistent use of the complete Focused Note Taking cycle
Data-driven PLC's

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

These strategies are essential for helping teachers maximize their instructional impact. Helping teachers focus on driving instruction forward with consistent review of their formative and summative assessments and comparing this to cycle assessment data will increase their ability to fully engage every learner in the classroom. Use of learning intentions and success criteria will ensure students are aware of their learning goals and are able to appropriately take action to learn from bell to bell, maximizing their instructional time. Use of the complete cycle of focused notes will increase concept retention

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.

Provide professional development and expectations during pre-school

Person Responsible: Linda Ray (rayli@pcsb.org)

Consistent data-driven PLC's by content area to include common assignments, resources and assessments

Person Responsible: Linda Ray (rayli@pcsb.org)

Consistent walkthroughs with feedback provided the same day to teachers

Person Responsible: Linda Ray (rayli@pcsb.org)

#5. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Teacher Retention and Recruitment**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.

Largo High School had long-term substitute teachers in multiple tested areas during the 2022-23 school year. At the beginning of hiring season for 2023-24 the teacher needs in each area were as follows: English - 4, Science - 4, Math - 3. LHS experienced significant growth that led to the allocation of additional teaching units which greatly impacted these numbers.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Largo High School will begin the 2023-24 school year with 100% of the instructional positions filled by qualified teachers. We will retain 100% of the appropriate instructional staff through the school year.

Monitoring:

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

Weekly administrative review of teacher support needs.
Consistent classroom visits with immediate feedback and support by leadership team.
Robust mentoring program on site

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jennifer Vragovic (vragovicj@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.)

Refined mentoring program that directly aligns with the goals of the school
Tailored support to meet individual teacher needs.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

According to the Department of Education, mentoring within schools promotes teacher retention and consistency among educators. Mentoring programs not only increase job satisfaction and help teachers to emerge as leaders within their schools, but also have a positive effect on student achievement and engagement.

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.

Separate Welcome event for "new to campus" teachers prior to pre-school with a focus on giving them time to get acquainted with campus and our culture, meet each other, meet their mentors and feel appreciated for joining the team

Person Responsible: Jennifer Vragovic (vragovicj@pcsb.org)

Refined mentor program to meet the individual needs of new teachers as well as better align with the instructional and cultural focus on Largo High School.

Person Responsible: Diana Dolan (doland@pcsb.org)

#6. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Black/African-American

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

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

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

LHS black students have significant gaps in both ELA and Math compared to the whole school data with a 34% FPI.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Increase each measured category by 5% annually.

Monitoring:

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

1. Common administrator walkthrough tool with immediate feedback and data
2. Review of data at all leadership meetings and department PLCs.
3. District and State developed Cycle Assessments.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jennifer Vragovic (vragovicj@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.)

1. Bell to bell academic engagement daily
2. Communication of clear learning intentions and success criteria for all stakeholders.
3. Use of full cycle of Focused Note Taking System

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

According to observation data, these are the 3 biggest opportunities for growth that are impacting academic achievement across campus. The effect is seen in classes with higher populations of ESSA subgroups.

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.

Provide professional development schoolwide during Pre-school then differentiated by need throughout the school year.

Person Responsible: Jennifer Vragovic (vragovicj@pcsb.org)

#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.

Largo High School Students with Disabilities show a significant gap in data as apposed to their general education peers. This is reflected in a 31%FPI.

Measurable Outcome:

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

We will increase each category by 5% respectively annually.

Monitoring:

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

Monthly meetings with leadership team and ESE department leads to review progress and adjust plans as needed.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Linda Ray (rayli@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.)

The alignment of duties within the ESE department will be realigned to better fit strengths of members. LHS has brought in some district experts to join the team and improve compliance outcomes. Training with departments to better support students in each subject area.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Supports are needed to add depth to student learning. This will allow the students to receive direct instruction from the general education instructors along with specially designed instruction from the ESE instructors

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.

Districtwide and school based PD for ESE department and led by onsite team in their areas of expertise.

Person Responsible: Linda Ray (rayli@pcsb.org)

#8. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to English Language Learners**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.

LHS ELL students, while showing growth, are still achieving at a level below their native speaking peers. This gap is represented by a 36% FPI.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Largo High ELL students will increase their achievement levels by 5% in every category.

Monitoring:

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

1. Common administrator walkthrough tool with immediate feedback and data
2. Review of Data at all Leadership meetings and department PLCs
3. Common Cycle Assessment

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jennifer Ortiz (ortizj@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.)

- Purposeful scheduling of ELL students to increase testing supports
- Bell to bell academic engagement to maximize access to curriculum
- Clearly communicated learning intentions and success criteria daily
- Fidelity to the entire cycle of Focused Note Taking

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

When our students no longer struggle with understanding what is expected of them and can move to the work of learning, they are better able to meet goals.

ELL students thrive with the supports put in place for their first 2 years. By intentionally scheduling those that need it with that same instructor for testing focused programs, they continue to benefit from that expertise.

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.

Hand schedule the most struggling ELL students for best fit

Person Responsible: Jennifer Vragovic (vragovicj@pcsb.org)

Focused professional development throughout the year to personalize support teachers.

Person Responsible: Jennifer Ortiz (ortizj@pcsb.org)

Hand schedule the most struggling ELL students for best fit

Person Responsible: Jennifer Vragovic (vragovicj@pcsb.org)

Focused professional development throughout the year to personalize support teachers.

Person Responsible: Jennifer Ortiz (ortizj@pcsb.org)

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)).

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.

Website, School Enhancement Meetings, Staff Training, Parent Information Sessions

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 are not Title 1

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 II of the SIP. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)ii))

N/a

If appropriate and applicable, describe how this plan is developed in coordination and integration with other Federal, State, and local services, resources and programs, such as programs supported under ESSA, violence prevention programs, nutrition programs, housing programs, Head Start programs, adult education programs, career and technical education programs, and schools implementing CSI or TSI activities under section 1111(d). (ESSA 1114(b)(5))

N/A

Optional Component(s) of the Schoolwide Program Plan

Include descriptions for any additional strategies that will be incorporated into the plan.

Describe how the school ensures counseling, school-based mental health services, specialized support services, mentoring services, and other strategies to improve students' skills outside the academic subject areas. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(I))

Not Title 1

Describe the preparation for and awareness of postsecondary opportunities and the workforce, which may include career and technical education programs and broadening secondary school students' access to coursework to earn postsecondary credit while still in high school. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(II))

Not Title 1

Describe the implementation of a schoolwide tiered model to prevent and address problem behavior, and early intervening services, coordinated with similar activities and services carried out under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. 20 U.S.C. 1400 et seq. and ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(III).

Not Title 1

Describe the professional learning and other activities for teachers, paraprofessionals, and other school personnel to improve instruction and use of data from academic assessments, and to recruit and retain effective teachers, particularly in high need subjects. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(IV))

Not Title 1

Describe the strategies the school employs to assist preschool children in the transition from early childhood education programs to local elementary school programs. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(V))

Not Title 1

Budget to Support Areas of Focus

Part VII: Budget to Support Areas of Focus

The approved budget does not reflect any amendments submitted for this project.

1	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math	\$0.00
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	\$0.00
3	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Social Studies	\$0.00
4	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Science	\$0.00
5	III.B.	Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Teacher Retention and Recruitment	\$0.00
6	III.B.	Area of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Black/African-American	\$0.00
7	III.B.	Area of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities	\$0.00
8	III.B.	Area of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: English Language Learners	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00

Budget Approval

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

Yes