

Clay County Schools

Fleming Island High School



2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	19
Positive Culture & Environment	23
Budget to Support Goals	0

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: 6/1/2012

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	High School PK, 9-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2020-21 Title I School	No
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	23%
2020-21 ESSA Subgroups Represented (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
School Grades History	2018-19: A (66%) 2017-18: A (69%) 2016-17: A (69%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	

* 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.

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	19
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Fleming Island High School

2233 VILLAGE SQUARE PKWY, Orange Park, FL 32003

<http://fih.oneclay.net>

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2020-21 Title I School	2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
High School PK, 9-12	No	16%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	29%

School Grades History

Year	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18
Grade		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	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Pittman, Tom	Principal	Oversees policies and procedures of the daily functions at Fleming Island High School, Math Administrator
Warmouth, Nathan	Assistant Principal	Master Schedule, Facilities, AICE & Science Administrator
Labbe, Heather	Assistant Principal	Professional Development, PBIS & SEL, ELA and AP Administrator
Senna, Brittany	Assistant Principal	Instructional Materials, State Testing, CTE Administrator
Boysen, Paul	Assistant Principal	Social Studies evaluator, Property administrator
Moriarity, Micheala	Dean	Daily discipline, assist school leadership team accomplish daily goals

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Friday 6/1/2012, 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

105

Total number of students enrolled at the school

1,916

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2020-21 school year.

13

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2021-22 school year.

11

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

2021-22

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	451	528	461	476	1916
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	56	91	60	53	260
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	11	10	8	32
Course failure in ELA	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	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	49	66	55	0	170
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	37	34	25	37	133
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	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	1	10	5	1	17

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	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 9/13/2021

2020-21 - 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	495	446	472	550	1963
Attendance below 90 percent	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	
Course failure in ELA	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	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	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	37	34	25	37	133
	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	

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	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

2020-21 - 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	0	495	446	472	550	1963
Attendance below 90 percent	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	
Course failure in ELA	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	
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	

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	
Students with two or more indicators	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	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data Review

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	2021			2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement				71%	60%	56%	74%	57%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				57%	52%	51%	62%	53%	53%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				39%	39%	42%	53%	43%	44%
Math Achievement				65%	55%	51%	69%	55%	51%
Math Learning Gains				48%	46%	48%	49%	46%	48%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				41%	38%	45%	44%	36%	45%
Science Achievement				83%	73%	68%	93%	92%	67%
Social Studies Achievement				93%	81%	73%	86%	79%	71%

Grade Level Data Review - State Assessments

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	2021					
	2019	71%	61%	10%	55%	16%
Cohort Comparison						
10	2021					
	2019	70%	57%	13%	53%	17%
Cohort Comparison		-71%				

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
2021					
2019	83%	72%	11%	67%	16%
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019					
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	93%	80%	13%	70%	23%
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	60%	65%	-5%	61%	-1%
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	67%	64%	3%	57%	10%

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

Provide the progress monitoring tool(s) by grade level used to compile the below data.

Performance Matters and Achieve3000 for Fall and Winter, Spring scores are from FSA and EOC Assessments.

Grade 9				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students			70
	Economically Disadvantaged			51.2
	Students With Disabilities			31.4
	English Language Learners			NA
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students			69.6
	Economically Disadvantaged			52.7
	Students With Disabilities			50
	English Language Learners			NA
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Biology	All Students			91.8
	Economically Disadvantaged			85
	Students With Disabilities			91.7
	English Language Learners			NA
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
US History	All Students			NA
	Economically Disadvantaged			NA
	Students With Disabilities			NA
	English Language Learners			NA

Grade 10				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students			69.6
	Economically Disadvantaged			54.7
	Students With Disabilities			29.1
	English Language Learners			NA
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students			41.8
	Economically Disadvantaged			35.4
	Students With Disabilities			13.6
	English Language Learners			38.5
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Biology	All Students			61.6
	Economically Disadvantaged			60
	Students With Disabilities			47.5
	English Language Learners			NA
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
US History	All Students			NA
	Economically Disadvantaged			NA
	Students With Disabilities			NA
	English Language Learners			NA

Grade 11				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students			NA
	Economically Disadvantaged			NA
	Students With Disabilities			NA
	English Language Learners			NA
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students			20
	Economically Disadvantaged			NA
	Students With Disabilities			NA
	English Language Learners			NA
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Biology	All Students			NA
	Economically Disadvantaged			NA
	Students With Disabilities			NA
	English Language Learners			NA
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
US History	All Students			85.1
	Economically Disadvantaged			72.9
	Students With Disabilities			75
	English Language Learners			NA

Grade 12				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students			NA
	Economically Disadvantaged			NA
	Students With Disabilities			NA
	English Language Learners			NA
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students			NA
	Economically Disadvantaged			NA
	Students With Disabilities			NA
	English Language Learners			NA
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Biology	All Students			NA
	Economically Disadvantaged			NA
	Students With Disabilities			NA
	English Language Learners			NA
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
US History	All Students			83.3
	Economically Disadvantaged			NA
	Students With Disabilities			83.3
	English Language Learners			100

Subgroup Data Review

2021 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 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
SWD	31	40	36	30	33	31	62	81		100	41
ELL				10						100	36
ASN	88	77		65	22		100			100	89
BLK	52	46	36	44	37	62	70	81		100	54
HSP	60	47	38	44	36	37	78	83		98	66

2021 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 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
MUL	78	58		62	17		86	85		96	78
WHT	73	57	42	60	33	32	84	87		99	72
FRL	54	44	26	42	36	38	72	79		99	60
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

ESSA Data Review

This data has been updated for the 2021-22 school year as of 10/19/2021.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	63
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	56
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	689
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	97%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	49
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	51
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	77
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	58
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	59
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	70
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	

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%	
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	64
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	55
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Analysis

Data Analysis

Answer the following analysis questions using the progress monitoring data and state assessment data, if applicable.

What trends emerge across grade levels, subgroups and core content areas?

The largest gaps between sub groups are between total grade-level cohorts and students with disabilities, specifically in ELA and Math for 9th and 10th grade. Biology classes have the smallest learning gap between subgroups for both 9th and 10th grade, as well as US History for 11th grade.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

Greatest need for improvement is in Math, specifically the 10th grade cohort. Proficiency for all students was 41.8%, with only 13.6% of students with disabilities scoring a 3 or higher.

What were the contributing factors to this need for improvement? What new actions would need to be taken to address this need for improvement?

Current students who obtained a score of '3' or higher on their 6th Grade Math FSA were placed in Algebra or Pre-Algebra at the junior high level. This means the majority of students testing in 9th and 10th grade for Algebra 1 and Geometry are entering high school behind grade-level in mathematics.

To assist with further remediation, students are now scheduled into either Block Algebra courses, or Block Geometry if needed. In addition, the district has moved forward with IXL that teachers will be able to use as a Tier 3 resource for students struggling with concepts in the classroom.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

The lowest quartile in ELA improved from 39 to 42, and College and Career Readiness Acceleration went from 63 to 71%.

What were the contributing factors to this improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

ELA PLCs focused on disaggregating Performance Matters data in order to identify the specific strands that need to be targeted for instruction. Faculty meetings were utilized for teaching best practices and providing ideas for group instruction. Teams met cross-curricularly to discuss strategies and skills that could be used in multiple content areas.

What strategies will need to be implemented in order to accelerate learning?

PLC teams need to meet on a weekly basis to discuss standards, data, and instructional practices. Data needs to drive both conversation in PLCs and instruction in classrooms. Professional development will be offered to assist teachers with data, instructional practices, and curriculum guidelines.

Based on the contributing factors and strategies identified to accelerate learning, describe the professional development opportunities that will be provided at the school to support teachers and leaders.

With a variety of new programs being implemented this school year, teachers will need additional training in how to pull their progress monitoring data in Synergy. Further training in the online textbook platforms, Lexia, and IXL programs are also needed.

Provide a description of the additional services that will be implemented to ensure sustainability of improvement in the next year and beyond.

Other content areas will work to emulate the work proven to be effective for improvement within the ELA lowest quartile. This includes meeting regularly with Professional Learning Communities both on campus and with county specialists, disaggregating appropriate data, and using the data to drive instruction including additional remediation and resources when needed.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Math Learning Gains fell from 48 to 33% from 2019 to 2021 for FIHS. We will have a strong focus to support these students in strategic learning of the standards to help students grow academically through grade-level appropriate instruction.

Measurable Outcome: Math learning gains will increase by 2%, 33% to 35%.

Monitoring: Teachers will monitor through common assessments and additional instructional platforms such as IXL.

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

Evidence-based Strategy: Interventions and differentiated instruction will be used to meet each student's needs to provide a deeper learning experience with grade level practice. Instruction will be standards-based, and targeted remediation will be provided.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Students who are not on grade level throughout the school year need remediation and interventions to scaffold their learning experiences to ensure they are able to obtain learning gains.

Action Steps to Implement

Analyze student data from EOC and FSA results. Determine appropriate grouping of students with similar needs. Develop and plan interventions and strategies according to individual student needs. Monitor student progress and make adjustments accordingly.

Person Responsible Tom Pittman (thomas.pittman@myoneclay.net)

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to English Language Learners

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Focus will be on our ELL population in working to increase learners to a passing score on the FSA.
Measurable Outcome:	ELL proficiency in ELA will increase by 5%, from 37% to 42%.
Monitoring:	Data will be monitored regularly through Lexia and Achieve, as well as baseline and mid year assessments.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	[no one identified]
Evidence-based Strategy:	Continuous support from ESOL assistants, as well as collaboration with content-area ELA and reading teachers will take place to provide targeted interventions for ELL students.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	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

Analyze student data from previous year's FSA results. Analyze student data from baseline testing (Achieve and Lexia). Develop and plan interventions and strategies according to individual student needs. Intentional collaboration between ELL teachers and ESOL assistants. Monitor student progress and make adjustments accordingly.

Person Responsible Tom Pittman (thomas.pittman@myoneclay.net)

#3. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Student Attendance

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Based on data from the 20-21 school year, as well as responses from both student and faculty climate surveys, student tardiness was identified as an area of opportunity for improvement for FIHS.
Measurable Outcome:	There will be a 7% reduction in tardies, from 12% to 5%, of students having 5 or more tardies.
Monitoring:	Student tardy data will be compared year over year consistently to ensure effectiveness of sweep implementation.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Tom Pittman (thomas.pittman@myoneclay.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Tardy sweeps will be implemented to promote punctuality to class, and accountability for students. In addition, we have implemented "Eagle of the Week" for students to promote positive behaviors on campus.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	An organized tardy sweep allows teachers and school leadership to more accurately enter and track student "tardies" thus allowing the opportunity for accountability and data comparison.

Action Steps to Implement

Tardy Sweeps will be implemented as a new teacher duty to ensure consistency with marking of tardies and to promote punctuality on-campus. Reports will be ran weekly so that the Dean of Students and grade-level administrators can conference with students who have frequent tardies. Parent communication will begin for students who are at 4 or more tardies per quarter. Tardy data will be reviewed regularly to ensure effectiveness of current tardy sweeps.

Person Responsible Nathan Warmouth (nathan.warmouth@myoneclay.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the [SafeSchoolsforAlex.org](https://www.safeschoolsforalex.org), compare the discipline data of the school to discipline data across the state and provide primary or secondary areas of concern that the school will monitor during the upcoming school year. Include how the school culture and environment will be monitored through the lens of behavior or discipline data.

The FIHS School Incident Ranking is "Moderate" compared to other schools in the state. Based on this data, as well as student and faculty climate surveys, we will focus on a couple areas within behavior and discipline. In regards to behavior, the PBIS team is collaborating with faculty members and students on activities that promote positive behavior on campus. Tardies were an area of concern in which FIHS wanted to focus on in regards to discipline. We have instituted tardy sweeps for the 21-22 school year to assist in improving student punctuality to class. Data will be compared year to year to consistently evaluate the effectiveness.

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.

FIHS uses the 7 Mindsets program school-wide. This program is a research-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. In addition, there is a PBIS team in place to create rewards and activities that reinforce positive interactions between students, faculty, and staff.

Identify the stakeholders and their role in promoting a positive culture and environment at the school.

FIHS involves stakeholders in promoting a positive culture and environment through the use of the Talon Newsletter for both faculty and parents, as well as through a strong social media presence. The newsletter and our regular social media posts relay information about campus activities and rewards and recognitions. As of the 2021-22 school year, we also recognize an "Eagle of the Week" for students, teachers, and support staff to highlight those on campus who exhibit positive behaviors. Community members and business partners play a role in rewarding our students through PBIS.