

Martin County School District

Jensen Beach High School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	8
III. Planning for Improvement	13
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	0
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	0
VI. Title I Requirements	0
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

Jensen Beach High School

2875 NW GOLDENROD RD, Jensen Beach, FL 34957

martinschools.org/o/jbhs

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Martin County School Board on 9/19/2023.

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.

Jensen Beach High School believes that 100% of our students can and will graduate. Upon graduation all of our students will be college, workplace, or military ready. We believe in our school's mission which is " Empowering All Students for Success." We have systems in place to monitor and assist students with attendance, behavior and emotional problems that may interfere with the learning process. When students enter our building, we meet them where they are and keep moving forward to our final goal of graduation.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Every person on our campus is committed to the success of our students and our staff. We live and breathe our vision statement, "A Collaborative Community Committed to Success," daily. Every student on our campus is treated as an individual. Our Student Services PLC team, which includes all of our administrators, school counselors, graduation coaches and our IPS coaches, meets twice a week to review student data. We begin to monitor our ninth graders during their first few weeks of school to ensure they have the supports they need to be successful. We monitor all students for four years to make sure they meet state graduation requirements and to ensure they have opportunities to succeed in their chosen future endeavors.

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
Vogel, Lori	Principal	Establishing culture of excellence in all aspects of academics and extra curriculars. Hiring and retaining highly qualified staff. Maintaining a safe and orderly campus.
Graff, Lauren	Assistant Principal	In charge of in-state testing such as EOC, FAST, and PM's. Discipline and safety for 10-12th grade students. Teacher evaluations and campus security.
Costello, Ronald	Assistant Principal	In charge of athletics; compliance, staffing, safety, and fields/ equipment. Teacher evaluations and campus security.
Hockensmith, Alyssa	SAC Member	Lead organizer of school SAC program. Teacher-leader for instruction with classes and mentorship of new teachers on campus.
Connolly, Andrew	Assistant Principal	Assistant Principal for Curriculum and instruction. Works with new teachers and teachers new to JBHS .

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.

Jensen Beach High School utilizes multiple methods of involving stakeholders in our continuous improvement. We utilize a Team Leader structure and a School Advisory Council (SAC) to maintain communication with teachers. For students, parents, and community members, we utilize SAC and PTSA organizations to have regular, scheduled communication. We utilize a number of business partners throughout the year, such as The Googan Coffee Shop, Itali Bowls, and Michelina's Italian Restaurant. Our Career Technical Education programs each have an advisory board comprised of local businesses that provide insight into the needs of the local job market to keep our programs aligned. The flow of information from these various groups helps to inform the decision making for the School Improvement Plan, but also is shared to identify what our common goals are as they align to the actions on campus to support student learning and growth.

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 progress on the SIP goals and actions will take place quarterly with the teachers through our data chats with the tested groups (ELA 9, ELA 10, Algebra, Geometry, Biology, US History), We also participate in school-day data digs for each state assessment group.

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

2023-24 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	High School 9-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	36%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	37%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	N/A
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 *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: A 2019-20: A 2018-19: A 2017-18: A
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review

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

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

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	54	52	50	64	57	51	71		
ELA Learning Gains				58			60		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				41			49		
Math Achievement*	52	43	38	60	41	38	52		
Math Learning Gains				55			34		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				42			36		
Science Achievement*	80	74	64	70	44	40	80		
Social Studies Achievement*	74	69	66	83	47	48	75		
Middle School Acceleration					44	44			
Graduation Rate	98	94	89	98	66	61	95		
College and Career Acceleration	58	61	65	65	71	67	58		
ELP Progress	41	41	45	76			77		

* 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)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	65
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	457
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	98
Graduation Rate	98

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	65
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	712
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	96
Graduation Rate	98

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	43			
ELL	42			
AMI				
ASN	66			
BLK	48			
HSP	59			
MUL	73			
PAC				

2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
WHT	74			
FRL	57			

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	43			
ELL	50			
AMI				
ASN	64			
BLK	47			
HSP	60			
MUL	69			
PAC				
WHT	66			
FRL	58			

Accountability Components by Subgroup

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

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2021-22	C & C Accel 2021-22	ELP Progress
All Students	54			52			80	74		98	58	41
SWD	27			26			44	38		24	6	
ELL	13			15				60		31	6	41
AMI												
ASN	62			70							2	
BLK	31			25			61	46		32	6	
HSP	38			41			70	69		56	7	39

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2021-22	C & C Accel 2021-22	ELP Progress
MUL	50			59			79	92		55	6	
PAC												
WHT	63			61			85	77		59	6	
FRL	38			40			71	66		42	7	45

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	64	58	41	60	55	42	70	83		98	65	76
SWD	30	38	30	40	45	39	28	50		98	33	
ELL	19	24	11	61	65		67			94	29	76
AMI												
ASN	73	55										
BLK	33	45	37	49	55	33	50	50		93	23	
HSP	52	45	17	66	63	50	64	79		97	61	71
MUL	59	65		67	67			73		100	53	
PAC												
WHT	70	62	49	59	52	40	72	87		99	70	
FRL	47	51	35	55	53	47	59	66		95	50	79

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	71	60	49	52	34	36	80	75		95	58	77
SWD	32	30	26	23	38	28	55	46		93	25	
ELL	36	47	38	23	31		50	36		73	27	77
AMI												
ASN	86	82										
BLK	46	50	35	21	37	43	57	40		97	14	
HSP	66	65	39	42	32	10	70	75		89	59	74
MUL	81	69		47	38		73					
PAC												
WHT	74	59	53	59	33	43	85	78		96	63	

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
FRL	55	55	44	40	40	38	67	62		93	44	72

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	57%	51%	6%	50%	7%
09	2023 - Spring	49%	50%	-1%	48%	1%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	43%	55%	-12%	50%	-7%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	63%	51%	12%	48%	15%

BIOLOGY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	78%	69%	9%	63%	15%

HISTORY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	75%	67%	8%	63%	12%

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.

Our ninth grade English students were 49% proficient on the FAST ELA final test in May. While we had increases in levels 3,4, and 5, there are still many students entering grade 10 who will need support. The factors that contributed to the low scores in ninth grade are: staffing shortage, new teachers, and a change in district boundaries, which increased our English Language Learner population. While we were aware of the boundary changes, we did not have sufficient staff or systems in place for ELL students.

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

Algebra showed the greatest decline from 2022 to 2023. We attempted to place all students needing Algebra for their graduation requirement in a single, fifty-minute period with the Algebra teacher of record. The students requiring extra support had an additional math remediation class with a different teacher to support them. Algebra 1A/1B had been successful on our campus for many years and we changed it to try a new model. This new model may have contributed to the decline from 2022 to 2023. We have adjusted to the previous model to determine whether it is still a successful intervention strategy. The Algebra proficiency scores dropped from 59% total proficiency in 2022 to 43% total proficiency for a drop in 16 percentage points.

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.

We were 6 points below the state average in Algebra with a school proficiency of 43% and a state average of 49%. The factors that contributed to this is the Algebra progression within our county. In addition, we had a course progression change and a new textbook that may have contributed to lower than previous results.

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

Our Biology students had the highest gains in our school last year, their scores increased from 70% proficiency in 2022 to 78% proficiency in 2023. Our Biology PLC team met weekly to review summative and formative data. The data determined what standards the students were. 80% proficient in and what standards needed to be re-taught. We offered after school tutoring in Biology with certified teaches from January until the Biology EOC in May. Many students took advantage of the tutoring.

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

Student Daily Attendance is an area of concern on our campus.
Teacher Retention is an area of concern on our campus.

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

School Culture
Student Engagement

Algebra

ELA 9/10

Create a Program with structures and systems to address the needs of our ELL students (this is a newer subgroup at our school) that has increase due to boundary changes.

Area of Focus

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

#1. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to 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.

Jensen Beach High School is in its 19th year of existence. After covid and in the past few years we struggled with a positive culture and became complacent. We are committed to making our school number one in the state by improving our culture. We started our year addressing culture with all of our staff. We learned culture is the heart of the school. We will be working to improve instruction by creating a positive culture. We are recalibrating our school culture to ensure everyone on our campus knows we care about them and are here to support them,

Measurable Outcome:

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

Staff, Teacher and Staff satisfaction Survey 5E Survey

Staff, Teacher and Staff attendance data

Teacher and Staff retention data

Monitor % of students with F's

Monitor % of students with D's

90% Student Attendance for all grade levels

PMT Data Comparisons

ELA Grades 9 and 10 overall proficiency expected above 74%

Biology and US History PMT's overall proficiency expected above 75% and 88% respectively

Algebra and Geometry PMT's overall proficiency expected above 60% and 70% respectively

Monitoring:

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

We will support our students and staff with our PBIS initiatives. We will meet once a month as a Falcon Family to have breakfast and celebrate our wins small ones and big ones. We will monitor attendance of our staff and students. We will address the staff and students concerns identified in our 2022-2023 surveys. We will celebrate fabulous falcons, student of the quarter., teacher, staff member and coach of the month.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Lori Vogel (vogell@martinschools.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.)

PBIS Initiatives

Grade reports for D's and F's

Student Attendance

Staff Attendance

Data from PMT testing

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Positive Behavior Supports work for adults and students. When positive behaviors and activities are recognized, behavior will improve. When behavior improves culture improves. When school culture is positive and engaging students' achievement and growth will improve,

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 2 - Moderate 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.

We will implement month PBIS calendars for our students and staff. We will continue our staff holiday baskets, and our staff Easter Egg Hunt.

Person Responsible: Corey Cooke (cookec@martinschools.org)

By When: Create monthly calendar with PBIS initiatives for students and staff. Monitor student attendance. Quarterly Falcon Breakfast

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Student Engagement

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

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

Students need to be engaged in the learning process and want to attend school. Learning must be fun and engaging.

Measurable Outcome:

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

PLC Summative and Formative Data monitored to show academic performance.
Students' attendance expected above 90% present
Students' grades with 0 students with Failing grades in core academic classes
Student assessments scores- monitoring student progress to reach our proficiency goals of
Algebra- 60%
Geometry- 70%
ELA 9- 74%
ELA 10- 74%
Biology- 75%
US History- 88%

Monitoring:

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

Data Dig Meetings
PLC Data and outcomes
Focus grades and attendance
MTSS meetings
Students Services PLC meetings to monitor all students to ensure they are on track for graduation.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Lori Vogel (vogell@martinschools.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.)

Additional PD training in engagement strategies using Kagan and AIVD cooperative structures.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Students need to be engaged in the learning process. Positive school culture and engagement will encourage students to be part of their own learning journey.

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 2 - Moderate 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.

Refresher training in Kagan Structures for teachers who have requested it.

Training for all new staff members in Kagan Structures.

Teachers will have the opportunity to participate in classroom walks to assist with learning engagement activities for all students to be successful. When there is a positive culture and students are engaged in the learning process academic success improves.

Person Responsible: Lori Vogel (vogell@martinschools.org)

By When: Initial training in first semester.

Refresher training in Kagan Structures for teachers who have requested it.

Training for all new staff members in Kagan Structures.

Teachers will have the opportunity to participate in classroom walks to assist with learning engagement activities for all students to be successful. When there is a positive culture and students are engaged in the learning process academic success improves.

Person Responsible: Lori Vogel (vogell@martinschools.org)

By When: Training Schedule for staff who have requested it by 9/28. Complete first round of training in first semester. Resurvey the staff to see who would needs training in semester. 2

Tier 3 intervention for SWD of incorporating a Unique Skills class to support the students with their on-campus executive functioning and academic progress.

Person Responsible: Lori Vogel (vogell@martinschools.org)

By When: Implementation began at the start of the school year.

#3. Graduation specifically relating to Graduation

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.

Increase graduation rate to ensure that all students are successful in being college or career ready.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Our goal is to have a 100% graduation rate.

Monitoring:

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

We will monitor this with weekly intervention meetings to identify at risk students. Implement tiered intervention strategies to support students. We have also implemented a Success Academy to support students needing a Tier 3 intervention in order to achieve their graduation.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Lori Vogel (vogell@martinschools.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.)

We have implemented a Success Academy to monitor and support our most at-risk students to be able to achieve a 100% graduation rate.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The rationale is that some of our students need more focused individual support, with more flexibility than the traditional school schedule for them to be able to successfully navigate their learning and personal needs in order to graduate.

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.

Weekly monitoring of at-risk students and assigning of tiered supports.

Person Responsible: Lori Vogel (vogell@martinschools.org)

By When: Weekly meetings with admin, guidance counselors, and graduation coaches to track student progress and assign interventions to students that are lacking.