

Clay County Schools

# Fleming Island High School



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

---

## Table of Contents

---

<b>School Demographics</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>Positive Culture &amp; Environment</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>0</b>

# Fleming Island High School

2233 VILLAGE SQUARE PKWY, Orange Park, FL 32003

<http://fih.oneclay.net>

## Demographics

**Principal: Thomas Pittman**

Start Date for this Principal: 8/19/2020

<b>2019-20 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	High School PK, 9-12
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2019-20 Title I School</b>	No
<b>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	23%
<b>2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities English Language Learners Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
<b>School Grades History</b>	2018-19: A (66%) 2017-18: A (69%) 2016-17: A (69%) 2015-16: A (68%)
<b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>	
<b>SI Region</b>	Northeast
<b>Regional Executive Director</b>	<a href="#">Cassandra Brusca</a>
<b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>	N/A
<b>Year</b>	
<b>Support Tier</b>	
<b>ESSA Status</b>	TS&I

\* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, [click here](#).

## School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Clay County School Board.

## SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F. This plan is also a requirement for Targeted Support and Improvement (TS&I) and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CS&I) schools pursuant to 1008.33 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

To be designated as TS&I, a school must have one or more ESSA subgroup(s) with a Federal Index below 41%. This plan shall be approved by the district. There are three ways a school can be designated as CS&I:

1. have a school grade of D or F
2. have a graduation rate of 67% or lower
3. have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

For these schools, the SIP shall be approved by the district as well as the Bureau of School Improvement.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F, or a graduation rate 67% or less. Districts may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing for schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at [www.floridacims.org](http://www.floridacims.org).

## 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 Florida Department of Education 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.

---

## Table of Contents

---

<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>Title I Requirements</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>0</b>

# Fleming Island High School

2233 VILLAGE SQUARE PKWY, Orange Park, FL 32003

<http://fih.oneclay.net>

## School Demographics

<p><b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">High School PK, 9-12</p>	<p><b>2019-20 Title I School</b></p> <p>No</p>	<p><b>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p>16%</p>
<p><b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">K-12 General Education</p>	<p><b>Charter School</b></p> <p>No</p>	<p><b>2018-19 Minority Rate</b> (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p>28%</p>

## School Grades History

Year	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17
Grade	A	A	A	A

## School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Clay County School Board.

## SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a school improvement plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F (see page 4). For schools receiving a grade of A, B, or C, the district may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at <https://www.floridacims.org>.

## 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 Florida Department of Education 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.

## Part I: School Information

### School Mission and Vision

#### Provide the school's mission statement.

Fleming Island High School provides excellence in education by preparing tomorrow's leaders to be determined, passionate, dedicated, and accountable through providing opportunities to soar in scholarship and leadership.

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

We are releasing the eagle within each student to soar to limitless heights academically, socially, emotionally and physically.

### School Leadership Team

#### Membership

Identify the name, email address, position title, and job duties/responsibilities for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Pittman, Tom	Principal	Thomas Pittman, principal, oversees policies and procedures of the daily functions at Fleming Island High School.
Knight, Rex	Assistant Principal	Scheduling, discipline, classroom walkthroughs, Math administrator,
Duhon, Christy	School Counselor	Scheduling, AP Coordinator, Counselor
Coburn, Laurie	Assistant Principal	Professional development, classroom walk-through's, ELA Administrator, OCO Administrator, discipline,
Moriarity, Micheala	Dean	Daily discipline, assist school leadership team accomplish daily goals

### Demographic Information

#### Principal start date

Wednesday 8/19/2020, Thomas Pittman

**Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective.** *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

3

**Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective.** *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

5

**Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school**

107

**Demographic Data**

<b>2020-21 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	High School PK, 9-12
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2019-20 Title I School</b>	No
<b>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	23%
<b>2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities English Language Learners Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
<b>School Grades History</b>	2018-19: A (66%) 2017-18: A (69%) 2016-17: A (69%) 2015-16: A (68%)
<b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>	
<b>SI Region</b>	Northeast
<b>Regional Executive Director</b>	<a href="#">Cassandra Brusca</a>
<b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>	N/A
<b>Year</b>	
<b>Support Tier</b>	
<b>ESSA Status</b>	TS&I
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, <a href="#">click here</a> .	

**Early Warning Systems****Current Year**



**The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:**

Indicator	Grade Level													Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12		
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	495	446	472	550	1963
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	49	43	52	46	190
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	37	34	25	37	133
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

**The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:**

Indicator	Grade Level													Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12		
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

**The number of students identified as retainees:**

Indicator	Grade Level													Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12		
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

**Date this data was collected or last updated**

Wednesday 8/19/2020

**Prior Year - As Reported**

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12		
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	454	489	564	515	2022
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	53	85	88	103	329
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	8	13	5	42
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	34	38	26	9	107
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	38	83	120	75	316

**The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:**

Indicator	Grade Level													Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12		
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

**The number of students identified as retainees:**

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

**Prior Year - Updated**

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	454	489	564	515	2022
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	53	85	88	103	329
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	8	13	5	42
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	34	38	26	9	107
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	38	83	120	75	316

**The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:**

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

**The number of students identified as retainees:**

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

**Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis**

**School Data**

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school, or combination schools).

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	71%	60%	56%	69%	54%	53%
ELA Learning Gains	57%	52%	51%	54%	50%	49%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	39%	39%	42%	40%	40%	41%
Math Achievement	65%	55%	51%	76%	60%	49%
Math Learning Gains	48%	46%	48%	60%	51%	44%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	41%	38%	45%	50%	37%	39%
Science Achievement	83%	73%	68%	83%	63%	65%
Social Studies Achievement	93%	81%	73%	91%	78%	70%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey					
Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)				Total
	9	10	11	12	
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	0 (0)

**Grade Level Data**  
**NOTE: This data is raw data and includes ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.**

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
09	2019	71%	61%	10%	55%	16%
	2018	71%	56%	15%	53%	18%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison						
10	2019	70%	57%	13%	53%	17%
	2018	75%	58%	17%	53%	22%
Same Grade Comparison		-5%				
Cohort Comparison		-1%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	83%	72%	11%	67%	16%
2018	92%	90%	2%	65%	27%
Compare		-9%			

CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					

HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	93%	80%	13%	70%	23%
2018	85%	78%	7%	68%	17%
Compare		8%			
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	60%	65%	-5%	61%	-1%
2018	63%	66%	-3%	62%	1%
Compare		-3%			
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	67%	64%	3%	57%	10%
2018	72%	61%	11%	56%	16%
Compare		-5%			

### Subgroup Data

2019 SCHOOL GRADE 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
SWD	30	45	44	41	39	37	47	86		85	24
ELL	19	23	18	26	47		55	82			
ASN	80	64		73	54		76	100		100	80
BLK	58	48	41	43	44	39	73	89		98	35
HSP	63	53	43	53	40	29	80	88		96	62
MUL	61	44	31	54	57	58	70	100		100	50
WHT	74	58	38	71	48	42	86	94		97	66
FRL	49	42	32	52	41	36	70	86		93	42
2018 SCHOOL GRADE 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 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	25	35	31	35	41	42		54		98	25
ELL	21	55	60	44	46						
ASN	87	73		81	44		100	91		100	69
BLK	60	63	50	48	52	56	68	70		98	34
HSP	63	55	53	59	48	34	92	76		96	55
MUL	72	55	33	66	46	45	96	81		96	72
PAC	82	80									
WHT	76	63	55	73	50	44	94	90		99	66
FRL	61	57	44	55	48	45	92	78		99	37

2017 SCHOOL GRADE 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 2015-16	C & C Accel 2015-16
SWD	24	31	19	44	48	40	44	78		96	35
ELL				40							
ASN	85	56		96	77		100			100	50
BLK	50	48	50	65	65	58	70	90		89	41
HSP	57	46	33	69	52	52	78	91		95	66
MUL	78	58		78	64		83	100		95	90
PAC	79	50		86	71						
WHT	70	55	39	77	60	49	84	92		97	70
FRL	50	46	40	60	56	53	76	86		89	45

### ESSA Data

This data has been updated for the 2018-19 school year as of 7/16/2019.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	TS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	62
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	23
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	680
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	48
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	37
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A

Native American Students	
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	78
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	57
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	58
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	63
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	67
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	51
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

## Analysis

**Data Reflection**

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources (see guide for examples for relevant data sources).

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

The data component that showed the lowest performance is English Language Arts Learning Gains of the Lowest 25%. This area scored 41% in 2016, 40% in 2017, 53% in 2018, and then took a dip to 39% for the 2018-2019 school year. In 2018 we increased our 10th grade ELA proficiency to 75% which was up from 65% the previous school year. In those same years, in our ELA Learning Gains of the Lowest 25% went from 40% in 2017 to 53% in 2018. Also, our ELA Learning Gains followed a similar trend those years with 54% in 2017 to 62% in 2018. For 2019 each of the areas explained above followed a similar trend dropping to percentages near normal percents as seen over the year. The year 2018 was an exceptional year for the improvement. This cohort scored well on the Social Studies Achievement area with 93% as 11th graders in 2019. Some contributing factors to these trends are overall strength and weakness of cohorts, teacher placement changes, and instructional practice.

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

The data component that showed the greatest decline from the prior year is also the English Language Arts Learning Gains of the Lowest 25%. The factors that contributed to this were the 13 percentage point increase from 2017 to 2018 results in this area which was difficult to maintain such improvement with a different cohort so we then had a decline of 14 percentage points from 2018 to 2019 results. While we were successful in our improvements with the 2016-2017 cohort of students, a different cohort of students, 2017-2018 possess different strengths and weakness. Other factors are instruction and teacher placement.

**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 data component that had the greatest gap when compared to the state average was Algebra 1 EOC by -1%. One factor that contributed to this was a greater number of higher performing students taking the assessment in 7th and 8th grade in our school district. Students who scored lower on the FSA Math in prior years completed the Algebra 1 EOC in 9th grade so therefore, the lower performing students in the cohort factored in the high school data. Other factors include instruction and teacher placement.

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

The data that showed the most improvement was the US History EOC which showed 8 percentage point growth from 85% proficiency in 2018 to a 93% proficiency in 2019. One action which was the natural progression of a strong 2016-2017 cohort who also moved the 10th grade ELA from 65% proficiency in 2017 to 75% proficiency in 2018. Other factors are instruction and teacher placement. The teachers work closely during their PLC time to plan valuable instruction for students.

**Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern?**

No data

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

1. Learning Gains of the lowest 25% in FSA ELA
2. Learning Gains of the lowest 25% in Math EOC
3. Overall Learning Gains in FSA ELA
4. Overall Learning Gains in Math EOC
5. Performance of ELL students

## Part III: Planning for Improvement

### Areas of Focus:

#### #1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to English Language Learners

<b>Area of Focus Description and Rationale:</b>	Focus will be on our ELL population in working to increase 9 of our 20 ELL learners to a passing score on the FSA.
<b>Measurable Outcome:</b>	9 or more of our 20 ELL students will score a passing grade on the FSA.
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome:</b>	Tom Pittman (thomas.pittman@myoneclay.net)
<b>Evidence-based Strategy:</b>	Looking at the data on our ELL subgroup, there are 20 9th/10th graders who will be taking the FSA in the upcoming year. We will continue to focus on these students to help them improve their scores.
<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:</b>	Noting the data of the less than 41% of our ELL students passing the FSA, we will be focusing on these students to assist them in passing the FSA.

#### Action Steps to Implement

ELL students have access to individualized instruction and ongoing classroom assistance using ESOL assistants who are employed by the school.

<b>Person Responsible</b>	Tom Pittman (thomas.pittman@myoneclay.net)
---------------------------	--

ELL students utilize technology to increase their English vocabulary.	
<b>Person Responsible</b>	Tom Pittman (thomas.pittman@myoneclay.net)



**#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA**

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** The lowest 25% learning gains in ELA were 39% on the Florida Standards Assessment results in 2019 for FIHS. Analyzing this data directs us to intently work with the students' learning in the lowest quartile group. We will have a strong focus to support these students in strategic learning of the standards to help students grow academically through on grade level appropriate instruction.

**Measurable Outcome:** FIHS plans to achieve 42% FSA ELA learning gains for the lowest 25% in 2020-2021 school year.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** Laurie Coburn (laurie.coburn@myoneclay.net)

**Evidence-based Strategy:** After identifying students who are in the lowest quartile, we will provide interventions and differentiated instruction to meet each student's needs to provide a deeper learning experience with on grade level practice. This instruction will be standards-based. If a student has been identified as ESE, then designated accommodations are necessary as well.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** Students in the lowest quartile need intensive interventions to scaffold their learning experiences to bring them up to grade level for each standard.

**Action Steps to Implement**

- Analyze student data using 2019 FSA ELA results, Achieve 3000 baseline and identify LQ
- Determine appropriate grouping of students with similar needs
- Develop and plan interventions and strategies according to individual student needs
- Develop and utilize mentoring program
- Monitor student progress and make adjustments according to academic needs.

**Person Responsible:** Laurie Coburn (laurie.coburn@myoneclay.net)

**#3. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Social Emotional Learning**

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** Students are faced with many barriers while working towards academic success. Many times these barriers impede learning which is not due to their abilities but is directly linked to the mental health of students. By building skills in students' mindsets to be stronger/ positive thinkers in their abilities, social skills, self-determination, behavior and etc will build a more impactful learning environment and overall positive school culture.

**Measurable Outcome:** We plan to see an improvement in school grades, attendance, discipline and state assessment scores.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** Tom Pittman (thomas.pittman@myoneclay.net)

**Evidence-based Strategy:** We are implementing the 7 Mindsets program school-wide. The 7 Mindsets program is a researched-based program to effectively teach students through prepared engaging lessons to become thinkers of success in their own abilities and having positive/respectful relationships with others. We have lead teachers, Rachel Schofield and Meghann Collier, who will be guiding our activities to teach the skills of the following mindsets: 1. Everything is possible, 2. Passion First, 3. We are Connected, 4. 100% Accountable, 5. Attitude of Gratitude, 6. Live to Give, 7. The Time is Now

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** The Climate and Culture Dept. in the Clay County District Office researched and purchased this program to support out students mental health.

**Action Steps to Implement**

- Analyze data from discipline referrals, student climate surveys, attendance, grades, and state assessments.
- Determine social and emotional needs of students.
- Plan implementation
- Implement school-wide activities using the 7 Mindsets program.

**Person Responsible** [no one identified]

**Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities**

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities.

**We will continue to work on all other areas of coursework focusing on the Florida Standards. Also, all other areas of our school safety, health, climate and culture will be top priorities to provide the most successful learning environment for ALL students.**

**Part IV: Positive Culture & Environment**

A positive school culture and environment reflects: a supportive and fulfilling environment, learning conditions that meet the needs of all students, people who are sure of their roles and relationships in student learning, and a culture that values trust, respect and high expectations. Consulting with various stakeholder groups to employ school improvement strategies that impact the positive school culture and environment are critical. Stakeholder groups more proximal to the school include teachers, students, and families of students, volunteers, and school board members. Broad stakeholder groups include early childhood providers, community colleges and universities, social services, and business partners.

Stakeholders play a key role in school performance and addressing equity. Consulting various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment ensuring all stakeholders are involved.

FIHS continues to involve stakeholders through the use of the on-campus WGET daily morning news, the Talon Newsletter for faculty, staff and parents that relays information about campus activities, positive messages, recognitions and announcements and utilizing the 7 Mindsets curriculum. Faculty and staff are also recognized during their birthday month by receiving a handwritten, signed card from the administrative team along with a special treat. Various school clubs and teams also provide opportunities for building a positive school culture and environment for students and the surrounding community.

#### **Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link**

The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.