

Clay County Schools

Keystone Heights Junior/ Senior High



2022-23 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	14
Positive Culture & Environment	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Keystone Heights Junior/Senior High

900 ORCHID AVE, Keystone Heights, FL 32656

<http://khh.oneclay.net>

Demographics

Principal: Laurie Burke

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2020

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	High School 7-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2021-22 Title I School	No
2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	56%
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2021-22: B (54%) 2018-19: B (60%) 2017-18: B (60%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	ATSI
* 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	14
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Keystone Heights Junior/Senior High

900 ORCHID AVE, Keystone Heights, FL 32656

<http://khh.oneclay.net>

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2021-22 Title I School	2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
High School 7-12	No	56%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	12%

School Grades History

Year	2021-22	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19
Grade	B		B	B

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.

Our mission is to work collaboratively with all stakeholders to provide a public education experience that is motivating, challenging, and rewarding for all students. We will increase student achievement by providing students with learning opportunities that are rigorous and relevant; which transcend beyond the boundaries of the school walls. We will ensure a working and learning environment built upon honesty, integrity, and respect. Through these values, we will maximize student potential and promote individual responsibility.

Provide the school's vision statement.

KHHS exists to prepare lifelong learners for success in a global and competitive workplace and to help them acquire applicable life skills.

School Leadership Team

Membership

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.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Burke, Laurie	Principal	School Instructional Leader; Mathematics
Underwood, Barry	Assistant Principal	School Instructional Leader; Science
Rodriguez, Melanie	Assistant Principal	School Instructional Leader; Language Arts/Reading
Stilianou, John	Assistant Principal	School Leader; Social Studies

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Wednesday 7/1/2020, Laurie Burke

Number of teachers with a 2022 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.*

0

Number of teachers with a 2022 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.*

25

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

75

Total number of students enrolled at the school

1,220

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

7

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2022-23 school year.

7

Demographic Data**Early Warning Systems**

Using prior year's data, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:

Indicator	Grade Level														Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12		
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	204	224	204	180	215	193	1220	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	31	35	31	27	31	31	186	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	13	11	12	9	5	63	
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 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	38	51	59	36	46	3	233	
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25	39	34	0	0	0	98	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	39	44	55	31	25	35	229	

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level who have 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	54	57	53	53	53	46	316	

Using current year data, complete the table below with the number of students identified as being "retained.":

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

Wednesday 9/28/2022

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	236	224	180	219	228	163	1250	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	16	15	15	20	6	89	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	12	6	9	8	6	50	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	18	16	0	17	0	65	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	18	17	0	15	0	64	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25	12	15	25	10	0	87	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	16	20	29	10	0	95	
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	3	5	4	7	7	2	28	

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		

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	236	224	180	219	228	163	1250	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	16	15	15	20	6	89	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	12	6	9	8	6	50	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	18	16	0	17	0	65	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	18	17	0	15	0	64	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25	12	15	25	10	0	87	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	16	20	29	10	0	95	
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	3	5	4	7	7	2	28

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	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	46%	56%	51%				52%	60%	56%
ELA Learning Gains	41%						52%	52%	51%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	29%						45%	39%	42%
Math Achievement	55%	35%	38%				59%	55%	51%
Math Learning Gains	47%						49%	46%	48%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	37%						40%	38%	45%
Science Achievement	59%	43%	40%				58%	73%	68%
Social Studies Achievement	65%	48%	48%				70%	81%	73%

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
07	2022					
	2019	54%	59%	-5%	52%	2%
Cohort Comparison						
08	2022					
	2019	55%	62%	-7%	56%	-1%
Cohort Comparison		-54%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
07	2022					
	2019	65%	63%	2%	54%	11%
Cohort Comparison						
08	2022					
	2019	46%	49%	-3%	46%	0%
Cohort Comparison		-65%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
07	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
08	2022					
	2019	54%	64%	-10%	48%	6%
Cohort Comparison		0%				

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	66%	72%	-6%	67%	-1%
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	65%	80%	-15%	71%	-6%

HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	77%	80%	-3%	70%	7%
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	57%	65%	-8%	61%	-4%
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	65%	64%	1%	57%	8%

Subgroup Data Review

2022 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 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21
SWD	21	26	21	29	36	29	36	45	23	81	20
BLK	21	43		7	36			60			
HSP	37	30	17	45	48	46	69	54			
MUL	40	44		67	47			62			
WHT	47	41	28	56	48	38	58	66	62	88	64
FRL	38	38	23	44	43	41	51	60	55	82	56
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	21	31	26	22	29	28	28	42	16	87	33
BLK	38	32	20	22	10		36				
HSP	42	43		29	37		47	67	30	90	
MUL	36	32		67	50		33				
WHT	47	38	29	49	37	27	60	72	50	93	70
FRL	38	32	25	39	36	23	52	70	34	87	57
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	24	41	32	27	41	38	32	40		91	41
BLK	25	35	30	53	62		46				
HSP	45	63	70	50	54		67	92			
MUL	30	60		47	44		19				
WHT	54	51	42	60	48	38	59	70	72	91	72
FRL	42	48	45	56	47	42	51	60	70	90	60

ESSA Data Review

This data has not been updated for the 2022-23 school year.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	54
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	589
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	97%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	33
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
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
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	33
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	43
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	52
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	54
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	48
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Part III: Planning for Improvement

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 trends that have emerged from 2019, 2021, and 2022 data show declines in ELA Achievements and ELA Lowest 25th Percentile. The percentage of level 3 proficiency and above in ELA correlates with this drop. In Math, all levels of Achievement, Learning Gains, and the Lowest 25th Percentile show an increase from 2021 to 2022. While subgroups of SWD lead the lowest performing in all subjects and categories for the 2022 school year.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

The greatest area of improvement is ELA Achievement, Learning Gains, and Lower Quartile (Lowest 25%). Based on the 2019, 2021, and 2022 steady decline in each of the ELA areas this needs to be an area of improvement. Additionally, we are looking at the difference between students who scored a Level 1 on Math compared to students who scored a Level 1 on ELA; in 7th grade 25 students scored a Level 1 in Math, whereas, 38 scored a Level 1 in ELA; in 8th grade 39 students scored a Level 1 in Math, whereas, 51 scored a Level 1 in ELA; in 9th grade 34 scored a Level 1 in Math, whereas, 59 scored a Level 1 in ELA.

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

High teacher turnover during the last school year particularly in ELA, lack of evidence-based practice and/or teaching experience, as well as, an over alarming amount of student absences. In order to address this area, there needs to be structured and consistent PLC groups, PD surrounding evidence-based strategies, a focus on following and aligning to the curriculum guides, as well as attendance incentives will need to be followed to help make improvements in these areas.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

Math is an area that has made steady increases in all reporting areas. Although our scores are not as high as they were pre-covid, there are notable gains from the 2021 - 2022 school year; with Achievement moving from 47% to 55%, Learning Gains increasing from 36% to 47%, and our Lowest 25% jumping from 24% to 37%. Science is another area that has had a steady and slight increase in scores from 2019, 2021 to 2022 from 58%, 58%, to 59%.

From 2021 to 2022, our lowest weakest subgroup (SWD) increased in each category of Achievement, Learning Gains, and Lowest (25%) in both Math and Science.

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

We have a strong veteran group of Math and Science teachers who work hard and have a solid, structured, and consistent PLC group. Our teachers make time to plan together and use their data to drive their instruction.

The contributing factor to our SWD improvement in Math and Science is the increase in Support Facilitation in classes. We have incorporated more Support Facilitators to push into various subjects to support our SWD students. Pulling small groups as needed.

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

In order to accelerate learning the following will be implemented:

- 1.) Strong and consistent PLC's
- 2.) Increased Administrative Walkthroughs
- 3.) Offer afterschool tutoring
- 4.) School and District based PD
- 5.) Data-driven instruction
- 6.) Following and aligning benchmarks to district-provided curriculum guides
- 7.) Utilizing support and feedback from our ELA District Specialist/Coaches

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.

School-led PD on evidence-based strategies and monthly district focus to drive instruction.
District-led PD on ELA B.E.S.T. Standards, SAVVAS, CommonLit, lesson planning

FIN-led PD on how to utilize push-in teachers in the classroom to support small group learning.
District Leadership Academy

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

District personnel support monthly. Calibrated Administrative walkthroughs with district curriculum coaches. Check-Ins, Data Chats with teachers, and district new teacher support coaches.

Areas of Focus

Identify the key Areas of Focus to address your school's highest priorities based on any/all relevant data sources.

:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

Over the course of the years 2019, 2021, and 2022, our ELA scores have lowered and have not reached the pre-covid range. In 2019 the ELA Achievement rate was 52%, in 2022, it is 46%, the Learning Gains in 2019 were 52%, to now being 41%, and the Lower 25 Percentile in 2019 was 45%, and in 2022 is 29%. We had a total of 233 students score Level 1 on the ELA FSA, which is 19% of our student body.

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

With the current year testing platform of the FAST PM ELA Assessment, we will only have proficiency rates, our measurable goal is to decrease the number of students who score a Level 1 on the ELA state assessment by 10%, making our of students scoring a Level 1, less than 210 students.

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

Progress will be monitored through the Florida FAST PM1 and PM2 assessment, as well as, a data review of Achieve 3000 and Savvas.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Melanie Rodriguez (melanie.rodriguez@myoneclay.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:
Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

Utilizing district support in professional development. Increase in collaborative lesson planning, using formative data to monitor student progress. PD on small group instruction
 Data meetings/chats
 Achieve3000
 Savvas
 PLC Modeling and Reflection
 School-wide Initiative - ACE Strategy

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

Utilizing district support will help align expectations and outcomes to district initiatives. We will be able to track the entire cohort of students based on data derived from common assessments which will allow us to update our planning process to meet the needs of students as those needs emerge. Using district curriculum guides will help increase the rigor of ELA lessons by guiding students to engage more deeply with the material and not by simply increasing the amount of material dispersed to students. Increased walkthroughs will monitor progress.

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.

1. Align schedules to meet with ELA team more frequently.
2. Create PD plan with district-level support
3. Create goal as department that is rooted in data-driven needs
4. Conduct regular walkthroughs with coaching support
5. ESE Facilitators will mainstream to support SWD subgroups through classroom push-in and small group instruction.
6. Review benchmark assessments to monitor progress and reevaluate as necessary

Person Responsible Melanie Rodriguez (melanie.rodriguez@myoneclay.net)

#2. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Social and Emotional Learning

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

Through active collaboration with our Community Partnership School (CPS) team, we are looking to increase our 2022-2023 wellness support totals in the following categories:

- Increase Access to Expanded Learning Opportunities for Students
- Reduce Absenteeism by 10%
- Increase the volunteer opportunities to support educational enrichment programs, and educational incentive programs.

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

25% of students who attend academic support through tutoring will improve in their content mastery of math or reading by the end of the 2022-2023 school year.
By the end of the 2022-2023 school year, we will reduce the rate of absenteeism (10 (unexcused) or more days in nine weeks) by 10% through strategies that address barriers students and families are facing. 2021-2022 SY=84% average daily attendance (ADA)
Increase the number of students surveyed responses to feeling more connected to the campus and their educational goals by 15% by pairing a student with a mentor by the school year ending in 2023.

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

Tutoring, grades, appointments, attendance, and volunteer sign-in data will be reviewed quarterly to determine success and monitor the progress of each of our wellness initiatives.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Melanie Rodriguez (melanie.rodriguez@myoneclay.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:
Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

Response to Interventions based on student's needs whether they are social, emotional, academic, environmental, etc...

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

The influence response to intervention has on a student's success is measured by a 1.29 effect size according to John Hattie (.4 is considered a years worth of growth). Offering interventions that will remove barriers for students who identify the need will essentially allow them to close academic gaps.

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.

Offer after-school tutoring
Increase the number of doctors, eye, and dental appointments
Increase mentorships
Provide attendance initiatives (rewards, activities, etc..)

Person Responsible Melanie Rodriguez (melanie.rodriguez@myoneclay.net)

#3. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups

Area of Focus
Description and Rationale:
 Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

Our ESSA Subgroup data indicated both SWD and BLK students' current overall Federal Index was below 41% in the current year. These two subgroups missed the target, which identifies these subgroups as areas of focus. Data indicated SWD students scored the lowest of all subgroups in each content area, with 21% Achievement in ELA, 29% in Math, 36% in Science, and 45% in Social Studies. BLK students were also among the lowest to make achievements in both Math with 7% and ELA with 21%.

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

With the current year testing platform of the FAST PM ELA and Math Assessment, as well as, Achieve Level Set data, and content area EOCs as our measurable outcomes our goal is to increase the Federal Index above 41%, for both subgroups.

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

Progress will be monitored through the Florida FAST PM1 and PM2 assessment, common assessments, content area assessments, EOCs, as well as, SLD ESE Goal Achievement, Achieve 3000, Savvas, and ALEKS.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Melanie Rodriguez (melanie.rodriguez@myoneclay.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:
 Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

Utilizing district support in PD.
 Increase collaborative planning.
 PD on small group instruction.
 Achieve3000
 Lexia Power Up
 Savvas
 PLC Modeling and Reflection
 School-wide - ACE strategy initiative
 PBIS - acknowledgements and supports

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:
 Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for

Utilizing district support in professional development. Increase instruction to foster cultural awareness in hopes to reshape the curriculum to reflect students' diversity to lead to better educational outcomes. Intentional planning to target students who would benefit from small group instruction. Utilize FIN to support and train teachers on how to collaboratively plan to incorporate the support facilitators more effectively, as well as, guidance on how to implement a Universal Design approach in the classroom. Increased walkthroughs will monitor progress.

selecting this strategy.

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.

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

RAISE

The RAISE program established criteria for identifying schools for additional support. The criteria for the 2022-23 school year includes schools with students in grades Kindergarten through fifth, where 50 percent or more of its students, for any grade level, score below a level 3 on the most recent statewide English Language Arts (ELA) assessment.

Area of Focus Description and Rationale

Include a description of your Area of Focus (Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA) for each grade below, how it affects student learning in literacy, and a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed. Data that should be used to determine the critical need should include, at a minimum:

- The percentage of students below Level 3 on the 2022 statewide, standardized ELA assessment. Identification criteria must include each grade that has 50 percent or more students scoring below level 3 in grades 3-5 on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.
- The percentage of students in kindergarten through grade 3, based on 2021-2022 end of year screening and progress monitoring data, who are not on track to score Level 3 or above on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.
- Other forms of data that should be considered: formative, progress monitoring and diagnostic assessment data.

Grades K-2: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

n/a

Grades 3-5: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

n/a

Measurable Outcomes:

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each grade below. This should be a data based, objective outcome. Include prior year data and a measurable outcome for each of the following:

- Each grade K-3, using the new coordinated screening and progress monitoring system, where 50 percent or more of the students are not on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment.
- Each grade 3-5 where 50 percent or more of its students scored below a level 3 on the most recent statewide, standardized ELA assessment and
- Grade 6 measurable outcomes may be included, as applicable.

Grades K-2: Measureable Outcome(s)

n/a

Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

n/a

Monitoring:

Describe how the school's Area(s) of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcomes. Include a description of how ongoing monitoring will take place with evaluating impact at the end of the year.

n/a

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Evidence-based Practices/Programs:

Describe the evidence-based practices/programs being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each grade and describe how the identified practices/programs will be monitored. The term "evidence-based" means demonstrating a statistically significant effect on improving student outcomes or other relevant outcomes as provided in 20 U.S.C. Â§7801(21)(A)(i). Florida's definition limits evidence-based practices/programs to only those with strong, moderate or promising levels of evidence.

- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs meet Florida's definition of evidence-based (strong, moderate or promising)?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align with the district's K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align to the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards?

7th - 10th Grade Intensive Reading Students will use Lexia Reading Program and CommonLit. Our school-wide initiative is for teachers in all content areas to model, teach and expect students to engage in the ACE writing strategy in responding to questions.

Rationale for Evidence-based Practices/Programs:

Explain the rationale for selecting the specific practices/programs. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting the practices/programs.

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs address the identified need?
- Do the identified practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

The rationale for using the evidence-based programs (Lexia and CommonLit), as well as, the evidence-based strategy ACE, is intended to target students who have not passed the ELA state assessment, these programs and strategies are designed to individually target student needs and close reading gaps.

Action Steps to Implement:

List the action steps that will be taken to address the school's Area(s) of Focus. To address the area of focus, identify 2 to 3 action steps and explain in detail for each of the categories below:

- Literacy Leadership
- Literacy Coaching
- Assessment
- Professional Learning

Action Step	Person Responsible for Monitoring
Literacy Leadership: Our school's literacy team will examine data to help target instruction for students to close their reading gaps.	
Literacy Coaching: District Literacy coaches will frequently visit our campus to support our reading teachers, conduct walkthroughs with formative feedback, and offer PD for our literacy department	
Assessment: Student progress will be monitored using the FL FAST ELA PM1, 2, and 3, as well as, Lexia data	
Professional Learning: Will be offered through our weekly PLCs, district offerings, and as needed based on progress monitoring data	Rodriguez, Melanie, melanie.rodriguez@myoneclay.net

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 is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies that impact the school culture and environment. 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.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment.

This year our school has focused our attention to build our PBIS supports. We have created school-wide expectations that promotes common language across the campus. Our students are expected to exhibit behaviors of being Indian "STRONG", where they show up, work together, give respect, take ownership, never give up, and use grit. These attributes will be modeled and taught throughout the year. Part of our initiative to build a positive climate and culture includes, nominating teachers, staff and students of the week. We have also incorporated a token economy, this will not only give teacher a way to acknowledge positive behaviors with students, but reward students for meeting school-wide expectations.

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

The stakeholders that will promote a positive culture and environment on our campus begins with our PBIS team, this team is made up of administrators, the school dean, teachers, staff members and guidance counselors. Each of these members are utilized as a voice of different areas of our campus in order to

reach all corners of our campus. This team works together to plan and implement initiatives on our campus to promote an environment that focuses on being proactively positive rather than reacting with discipline. Other stakeholders on our campus that help promote a positive school culture and environment are our students. We have clubs such as, Government, Key Club, National Honor Society, Builders, JROTC, etc... who each play a big part in promoting student involvement, planning activities, volunteering time, beautification, and building a culture on our campus where students feel heard, seen, and included. We also have our Community Partnerships that have a role in promoting a positive culture and environment by developing attendance rewards, mentoring students, volunteering for events and/or activities, as well as, offering tutoring for students.