Poinciana High School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Poinciana High School

2300 S POINCIANA BLVD, Kissimmee, FL 34758

www.osceolaschools.net

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Osceola County School Board on 10/10/2023.

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.

Engaging all stakeholders in respectful communication and productive collaboration for post-secondary success.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Poinciana High School will serve every student in an environment of college and career readiness by delivering a rigorous curriculum and promoting a culture of no excuses.

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
Schwartz, Jeff	Principal	
Farrell, Crystal	Assistant Principal	
Woechan, Jaime	Assistant Principal	
Vincutonis, Sina	Assistant Principal	
Duran, Carlos	Science Coach	
Hendricks, Sarah	Reading Coach	

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.

Poinciana High School utilizes their School Advisory Council (SAC) to help in the development of the School Improvement Plan (SIP). The PHS SAC members consist of stakeholders that include the school leadership team, teachers and school staff, parents, students and families, and business or community leaders.

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

We will monitor the schoolwide SIP monthly at Monday leadership meetings as well as at Stocktake meetings. A SIP one pager will be created and utilized to help ensure all action steps are continuously

addressed. The SIP will be revised at the Mid Year Reflection in January based upon progress monitoring data and reflection on the success of the action steps to that point.

Demographic Data	
2023-24 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	High School 9-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	Yes
2022-23 Minority Rate	87%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	100%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
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)	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: C 2019-20: C 2018-19: C 2017-18: C
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review

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

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

Accountability Component	2022			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	32	45	52	42	57	56
ELA Learning Gains	38	48	52	44	48	51
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	33	40	41	36	43	42
Math Achievement*	17	32	41	28	46	51
Math Learning Gains	27	39	48	35	41	48
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	44	44	49	34	46	45
Science Achievement*	44	54	61	60	69	68
Social Studies Achievement*	51	61	68	52	70	73
Middle School Acceleration						
Graduation Rate	93			93		
College and Career Acceleration	49			37		
ELP Progress	51			44		

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	44
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	4
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	479
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	98
Graduation Rate	93

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	34	Yes	3	
ELL	39	Yes	3	
AMI				
ASN	50			
BLK	44			
HSP	43			
MUL	33	Yes	1	
PAC				
WHT	42			
FRL	40	Yes	1	

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

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	32	38	33	17	27	44	44	51		93	49	51
SWD	19	34	31	16	35	44	18	32		87	17	43
ELL	20	35	31	14	27	51	30	38		89	47	51
AMI												
ASN	40	50		57	38		64	50				
BLK	28	39	33	14	36	54	45	52		94	46	
HSP	31	37	32	16	26	42	42	49		94	50	50
MUL	26	33		9	28		50	54				
PAC												
WHT	38	38	24	22	20	33	50	58		91	49	
FRL	29	36	29	15	27	45	39	48		86	31	51

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	32	44	40	24	32	43	48	52		93	42	31
SWD	14	34	32	22	29	33	21	44		89	10	4
ELL	16	39	41	17	30	36	33	39		91	41	31
AMI												
ASN	44	44		33	43			62				
BLK	34	51	51	23	34	50	50	43		97	31	36
HSP	27	40	39	23	30	37	46	52		93	41	29
MUL	53	43		33			40					
PAC												
WHT	46	54	33	31	35	68	60	63		87	68	64
FRL	28	40	37	22	29	39	42	48		92	40	29

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	42	44	36	28	35	34	60	52		93	37	44
SWD	22	39	33	16	32	37	33	15		88	10	24
ELL	14	32	36	16	29	24	49	29		88	35	44
AMI												
ASN	53	39		33	29		71	55				
BLK	38	44	44	24	34	29	46	49		99	28	
HSP	38	42	33	25	35	33	59	48		91	36	44
MUL	69	67		40	31			82		100	50	
PAC												
WHT	56	53	50	45	38		80	72		97	45	
FRL	34	40	34	25	34	33	55	48		94	34	40

Grade Level Data Review– State Assessments (pre-populated)
The data are raw data and include ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.
The percentages shown here represent ALL students who received a score of 3 or higher on the statewide assessments.

An asterisk (*) in any cell indicates the data has been suppressed due to fewer than 10 students tested, or all tested students scoring the same.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
10	2023 - Spring	42%	47%	-5%	50%	-8%
09	2023 - Spring	36%	43%	-7%	48%	-12%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	20%	40%	-20%	50%	-30%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	23%	36%	-13%	48%	-25%

BIOLOGY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	60%	65%	-5%	63%	-3%

HISTORY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	49%	57%	-8%	63%	-14%

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.

For the 22-23 school year, our students' proficiency levels on the Algebra 1 EOC came in at 20%.
This was a 3% increase from the previous year.
Some contributing factors could include; turn over in Algebra teachers, first year teachers, and students entering high school with large skill gaps in Math.

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

For the 22-23 school year, our students' proficiency levels on the Geometry EOC declined by 10 percentage points to 23%.
Some factors could include; turn over in Geometry teachers, first year teachers, students going directly into Geometry from Algebra.

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.

1. Our students' proficiency levels on the Geometry EOC were 22% below the state average.
2. Our students' proficiency levels on the FAST Grade 9 (ELA) were 13% below the state average.
Some factors for both areas could include; turn over in teachers, first year teachers, and change in testing format.

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

For the 22-23 school year, our students' proficiency levels on the Biology EOC increased by 16 percentage points from a 44% to 60%.
This school year Biology teachers worked collaboratively in their PLC and implemented new strategies for vocabulary retention and improving reading skills. Teachers were veteran Biology teachers. The Science coach worked on developing departmental community, encouraging common assessments, and looking at data to improve instruction.

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

Academically, student scoring level 1 on the FAST PM3 and Math EOCs are areas of concern.
Also, student attendance (having 90% attendance) is far below the state average.

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

1. Geometry proficiency
2. ELA grade 9 and 10 proficiency
3. Algebra 1 proficiency
4. US History EOC proficiency
5. Improve student attendance

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 Differentiation

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.

Reviewing data from assessments, teacher observations, and informal walk-throughs, a lack of instructional differentiation appears to be impeding the learning and proficiency of our students. According to the Corwin Visible Learning Meta, the Scaffolded and Situated Learning the stoplight strategy provides has an effect size of .52 and Robustness Index of 4.

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

ELA 9: Reading proficiency rates will increase to meet or exceed the state average of 48%, including all subgroups. (+13%)
ELA 10: Reading proficiency rates will increase to meet or exceed the state average of 50%, including all subgroups. (+6%)
Math: Algebra 1 proficiency rate will increase to meet or exceed the state average of 32%, including all subgroups. (+12%)
Math: Geometry proficiency rates will increase to meet or exceed the state average of 45%, including all subgroups. (+22%)
Science: Biology proficiency rates will increase to meet or exceed the state average of 63%, including all subgroups. (+3%)
Social Studies: US History proficiency rates will increase to meet or exceed the state average of 62%, including all subgroups. (+13%)

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

This area of focus will be monitored by observation data, walk-through data, and student/teacher engagement surveys. Overall testing proficiency rates will be looked at to see if an increased is made due to improving the tier 1 instructional methods for all students. Monitoring data will come from STAR testing and PM 1-3.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jeff Schwartz (jeffrey.schwartz@osceolaschools.net)

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

School wide implementation of the "Stoplight Method" to instruction. This strategy uses formative assessment or self-assessment to categorize students into instructional groups. This system is fluid and adjusts as needed for student success. Teachers work with students in the "red" groups, while collaborative structures are used in the "yellow" and "green" groups with tasks that are appropriate for their understanding. The "red" group is working on learning, understand, and retention content with the teacher's assistance. The "yellow" group is working on solidifying grade level content. The "green" group is working towards enrichment. Other evidence based interventions include ALEKS in math, Achieve 3000 and Study Sync in Reading, and Khan Academy.

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

The "Stoplight Method" is a high-level impact strategy adapted from the Florida Network for School Improvement. It gives a manageable system through which teachers can meet the needs of each learner during daily instruction.

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.

During pre-planning, all teachers will be trained in the "Stoplight Method." The strategy will be defined and explained. Departments will be given relevant examples.

Person Responsible: Lisa Reaser (lisa.reaser@osceolaschools.net)

By When: August16, 2023

Within the first full month of the school year, all PLTs will watch a school created video or live PLT; of a PLT team planning for an upcoming week where the lesson will include the "Stoplight Method."

Person Responsible: Lisa Reaser (lisa.reaser@osceolaschools.net)

By When: September 30, 2023

Monthly, the Leadership Team will meet to review the data from the walk-through survey to ensure implementation and provide targeted help to teachers as needed.

Person Responsible: Jeff Schwartz (jeffrey.schwartz@osceolaschools.net)

By When: Monthly, starting after 9/30/23.

The Leadership Team will organize peer observations for PLTs to observe the strategy in practice.

Person Responsible: Jeff Schwartz (jeffrey.schwartz@osceolaschools.net)

By When: End of first semester.

Coaches and administrators attend PLTs to support with planning and implementation in assigned areas.

Person Responsible: Jeff Schwartz (jeffrey.schwartz@osceolaschools.net)

By When: On going.

Professional development for teachers that need assistance in basic lesson planning for tier 1 instruction.

Person Responsible: Crystal Farrell (crystal.farrell@osceolaschools.net)

By When: October 30, 2023

All ESE VE teachers and ESOL paras will be trained on the "Stop Light" in order to utilize it with all accommodated students.

Person Responsible: Jaime Woechan (jaime.woechan@osceolaschools.net)

By When: October 31, 2023

#2. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Other

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

Sense of Belonging was the lowest area on our student Panorama survey with an average score of 30%, 5% below the district average. On the Corwin Visible Learning Meta Global Research Database, Belonging influence had a .46 Effect Size and 3 Robustness Index.

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

Our Sense of Belonging score on this year's Panorama surveys will increase by at least 5%.

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

Fall and Spring Panorama surveys will be used to monitor the desired outcome. Teacher interactions with students will be monitored with data collection through Microsoft Forms during classroom walkthroughs.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jeff Schwartz (jeffrey.schwartz@osceolaschools.net)

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

Relational capacity strategies will be embedded in all Professional Development this year. AVID WICOR and Kagan collaborative structures that promote interactions between students and teachers are evidenced-based strategies. Trainings on developing student leadership will be implemented as well.

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

Relational Capacity strategies and collaborative structures promote that interaction from student to student as well as teacher to student to help students feel connected to the school. Student leadership development results in the positive peer pressure that holds students accountable for positive behaviors.

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.

Series of PD on collaborative strategies and relational capacity. Stoplight strategy in particular as a Tier 1 instructional model in which teachers work closely with students in greatest need to scaffold and build self-efficacy.

Person Responsible: Crystal Farrell (crystal.farrell@osceolaschools.net)

By When: August 16th, October 4th, January

PD on developing student leadership including front-load discipline, shadow experiences on modeling scaffolding for students, and strategic pairings with rotating roles to increase collaborative support and relationships.

Person Responsible: Jeff Schwartz (jeffrey.schwartz@osceolaschools.net)

By When: November 1st Faculty Meeting, post-observation meetings from September 2023 through May 2024

Club Rush, promote club sponsorship, and close collaboration with Student Government to push spirit events that all clubs take accountability in participating in.

Person Responsible: Jeff Schwartz (jeffrey.schwartz@osceolaschools.net)

By When: Club Rush 9/28, Student Government Meetings 2nd Thursday of each month

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).

SIP funding allocations will be used to purchased appropriate researched based instructional materials to help in implementing our SIP goals to improve Tier 1 instruction and behavior supports school wide.

Title I funds are used to pay for math, science, graduation, and MTSS coaches. ESOL students are supported in core classrooms by ELL paraprofessionals paid out of Title III. ESE students receive support from VE teachers in core classrooms. Title Funds are used to provide intervention software like Delta Math, iXL, and PENDA to service our ESE, Multiracial, and Free Meal ESSA subgroups. Title funds are also used to provide supplies and Professional Development to help staff to learn how to differentiate instruction for all ESSA subgroups and the lowest quartile.

Title I Requirements

Schoolwide Program Plan (SWP) Requirements
This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A SWP and opts to use the SIP to satisfy the requirements of the SWP plan, as outlined in the ESSA, Public Law No. 114-95, § 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

Provide the methods for dissemination of this SIP, UniSIG budget and SWP to stakeholders (e.g., students, families, school staff and leadership and local businesses and organizations). Please articulate a plan or protocol for how this SIP and progress will be shared and disseminated and to the extent practicable, provided in a language a parent can understand. (ESSA 1114(b)(4))
List the school's webpage* where the SIP is made publicly available.

We use in-person SAC meetings to collect input and final approval of the SIP. Invitations to these meetings are through Remind that goes out to close to 10,000 people in our school community. Our Osceola Business Academy director uses advisory meetings both in personally and virtually to connect our business partners to our SIP goals and progress.

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 have surveyed parents for their needs and interest in outreach programs from how to support their student at home to college and career readiness. We use our leadership team, academic coaches, an guidance counselors to coordinate several parent involvement events using Title funds to support them. We are also offering parents brief virtual meetings with their teachers in the AM contract time before school starts using Sing Up Genius.

Describe how the school plans to strengthen the academic program in the school, increase the amount and quality of learning time and help provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum. Include the Area of Focus if addressed in Part III of the SIP. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)ii)

We are providing lots of PD on a Tier 1 differentiation strategy called Stoplight in which teachers vary the rigor of the learning tasks and provide that one on one support and confidence building to those in need the most and not holding the other students back with enrichment for them.

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))

Poinciana High School will coordinate the development of the School Improvement Plan alongside several federal, state, and local services, such as: Title I, Part A for the implementation of supplemental education for disadvantaged students; Title II, Part A for the implementation of various Professional Development opportunities to support teacher growth; Title III for the implementation of Multicultural services; Title IV, Part A for the implementation of student enrichment activities; Title IX for the implementation and support of students and families in transition; and Perkins Career and Technical Education for the implementation of post secondary opportunities and experiences.

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))

Surveys like Panorama are used to collect data on the other all mental health of the students. Xello is the guidance program used to help students in preparing for their specific career and college goals. Wellness topics are instructed school-wide 2x each month. Guidance counselors have mandatory check-ins with all students throughout the year. Threat Assessment protocol and monthly meetings are in place for extreme mental health issues.

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))

Xello is the program that had required metrics to complete for each grade level on all college and career topics from interest surveys to scholarships to resume building. We have a curriculum fair and CTE

showcase through Title funding to help educate the community on the options available. The counselors have had collaborative exchanges with the CTE teachers so each can better understand what happens in the classrooms and what options are available for further training through post-secondary.

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).

We use a PHS specific matrix for behavior infractions to promote consistency with high expectations. Interventions like reverse discipline for short term goal setting as well as restorative meetings are utilized as interventions. Re-entry meetings for students returning from serious discipline/legal situations are implemented as well.

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))

We offer at least 3 PD trainings every year aligned with our SIP goals as well as AVID WICOR as we are a National Demonstration School. This year's focus is on the Tier 1 differentiated Stoplight Strategy as well as a blueprint for the model lesson that serves as a crosswalk between Marzano evaluation best practices and AVID WICOR.

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

N/A at PHS