

Clay County Schools

Fleming Island High School



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

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
2021-22 Title I School	No
2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	23%
2021-22 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	2021-22: A (68%) 2018-19: A (66%) 2017-18: 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	N/A
* 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

Fleming Island High School

2233 VILLAGE SQUARE PKWY, Orange Park, FL 32003

<http://fih.oneclay.net>

School Demographics

<p>School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">High School PK, 9-12</p>	<p>2021-22 Title I School</p> <p style="font-size: 24px;">No</p>	<p>2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p style="font-size: 24px;">23%</p>
<p>Primary Service Type (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">K-12 General Education</p>	<p>Charter School</p> <p style="font-size: 24px;">No</p>	<p>2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p style="font-size: 24px;">30%</p>

School Grades History

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

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
Pittman, Tom	Principal	Oversees policies and procedures of the daily functions at Fleming Island High School, Math Administrator
Labbe, Heather	Assistant Principal	Professional Development, ELA Administrator, State Testing Administrator, SEL
Senna, Brittany	Assistant Principal	Master Schedule, Instructional Technology, Bio & CTE Administrator
Boysen, Paul	Assistant Principal	Social Studies Administrator, Property, Accelerated Programs Admin
Mckinney, Mark	Assistant Principal	Facilities, Science Admin, textbooks, MTSS
Alfano, Megan	Dean	Daily discipline, attendance and tardy tracking, assist school leadership team accomplish daily goals

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Friday 6/1/2012, Thomas Pittman

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.*

1

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.*

20

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

100

Total number of students enrolled at the school

1,888

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

13

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

14

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	0	0	0	460	474	516	452	1902
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19	24	43	32	118
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	13	6	4	27
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 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	33	48	50	0	131
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	45	59	25	41	170
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

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	0	0	0	14	31	12	8	65

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

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 9/15/2022

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	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	0
Course failure in Math	0	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	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	0
Students retained two or more times	0	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	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	

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	73%	56%	51%				71%	60%	56%
ELA Learning Gains	62%						57%	52%	51%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	47%						39%	39%	42%
Math Achievement	57%	35%	38%				65%	55%	51%
Math Learning Gains	56%						48%	46%	48%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	48%						41%	38%	45%
Science Achievement	88%	43%	40%				83%	73%	68%
Social Studies Achievement	78%	48%	48%				93%	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

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
2022					
2019	83%	72%	11%	67%	16%

CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019					

HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	93%	80%	13%	70%	23%

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	60%	65%	-5%	61%	-1%

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	67%	64%	3%	57%	10%

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	37	49	40	25	39	36	54	58		96	31
ELL				20				45		100	42
ASN	94	78		77	64		100	86		100	77
BLK	60	55	50	35	57	35	88	62		100	44
HSP	63	58	47	50	47	44	84	67		100	64
MUL	72	49		70	76		89	74		100	67
WHT	75	63	49	60	56	53	88	81		99	78
FRL	57	52	30	47	50	45	82	63		98	57
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
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

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)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	69
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0

ESSA Federal Index	
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	77
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	758
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	97%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	47
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	57
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	85
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	59
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	62
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	75
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	70
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	58
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?

In core content areas, FIHS improved in 7 of the 10 school report card categories. The categories that remained the same were Math Achievement (57%) and Graduation rate (99%). US History was the only core content area that dropped (8 points). While most core content scores increased for FIHS, there are still sizeable learning gaps between overall scores and our students with disabilities. In regards to achievement, US History had the smallest learning gap between sub groups.

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

The greatest need for improvement is with our lower quartile students. Only 47% of our LQ students had learning gains in ELA, and 36% with gains in Math. 37% of our students with disabilities scored a '3' or higher in ELA and 25% of our SWD scored a '3' or higher in Math.

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

Math: While there have been district updates to the Math course progression, all above grade-level (and many on-grade level) students are completing Algebra 1 at the junior high level. This means the majority of 9th and 10th grade Algebra and Geometry students are entering high school behind grade-level in mathematics. To assist with this, students below grade level will now have 2 full years of Algebra (Algebra 1A 9th grade, Algebra 1B 10th grade). If still below grade level when reaching Geometry, they will have the opportunity to also be placed in Foundations Math for further remediation and test prep.

ELA: For the 21-22 school year, FIHS did not have enough Intensive Reading allocations to satisfy the need for all level 1 and 2 students in ELA to have a seat in this remedial class. For the 22-23 school year we have added an additional ESE/Intensive Reading allocation, allowing us to place approximately 100 additional students into this course.

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

Our Math Learning Gains showed the most improvement, increasing from 33% to 56%.

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

PLCs focused on disaggregating data in order to identify specific strands and benchmarks 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. Algebra and Geometry teachers incorporated the IXL program into courses for remediation. Bootcamps were conducted prior to testing, to provide intentional, focused instruction.

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.

Teachers will continue to receive training on how to pull both state and local level data, how to analyze this data, and how to monitor student data throughout the year to make informed instructional and remediation decisions. Teachers will also receive training from our ESE department for assistance with instructional strategies that best support our students with disabilities, as well as our lower quartile students.

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

Content areas will work to emulate the work proven to be effective for improvement within multiple categories last school year. This includes meeting regularly with Professional Learning Communities both on campus and with county specialists, disaggregating appropriate data, and using the data to drive instructional including additional remediation and resources when needed. Teams are becoming more cohesive as expectations and supports are implemented and communicated. Teams are working together on curriculum and common assessments to guide their instructional practice and hone their individual craft.

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 Math

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

FIHS leads Clay County in Math Achievement and Math Learning Gains; however, we do not lead the county in Math Lower Quartile Learning Gains. This disparity shows that while our instructional practices for math are efficient, there is additional work to be done with our math students who fall within the lower 25%.

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

Math Lower Quartile Learning Gains will increase 2% from 48% to 50% on the Algebra 1 and Geometry EOCs.

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

Math teachers will monitor through common assessments and additional instructional platforms such as ALEKS.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Tom Pittman (thomas.pittman@myoneclay.net)

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

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:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this 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
 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.

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

Based on previous year's test scores, schedule students appropriately including 2 years to complete Algebra 1 (Algebra 1A 9th grade, Algebra 1B 10th grade) so that LQ students are able to receive further remediation. In addition, students entering Geometry who have not yet passed the Algebra EOC will have an opportunity to be placed in Foundation Math Skills as an elective for further remediation for EOC, PSAT, ACT, and SAT prep to ensure students meet state graduation requirements for math.

Person Responsible

Tom Pittman (thomas.pittman@myoneclay.net)

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities**Area of Focus****Description and****Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

While overall achievement scores improved for FIHS during the 21-22 school year, the gap widened between our overall scores and that of our students with disabilities (SWD). Last year there was an average difference of 30.5% in overall achievement scores, and those of our SWD students. This was a 7% larger gap than the previous school year.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Learning gaps between our overall achievement scores and those obtained by our students with disabilities will decrease by 3%.

Monitoring:

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

Teachers will monitor through common assessments (both departmentally created and district provided).

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Tom Pittman (thomas.pittman@myoneclay.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:

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

Interventions, remediation, and differentiated instruction will be used to meet each student's needs to provide a deeper learning experience with grade level practice. Targeted remediation will be provided. This data will be shared with support facilitators, ESE support staff, and case managers as needed to ensure appropriate support may be provided from all team members.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

Students with disabilities at FIHS are demonstrating proficiency/achievement on state exams at a much lower percentage than the overall "pass rate." Because of this, we must focus on providing targeted supports and remediation to these students

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.

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)

#3. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Student Attendance

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

Based on data from the 21-22 school year, average daily attendance was identified as an area of opportunity for improvement at FIHS. For all grade levels, FIHS averaged 85.64% percent present.

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

We will increase the average daily attendance and average percent present to 88% for the 22-23 school year. This will be measured with attendance reporting in Synergy.

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

Student absences will regularly be monitored by the Dean of Students, attendance team, guidance, attendance secretary, and administration.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Megan Alfano (megan.alfano@myoneclay.net)

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

The attendance policy will revert to pre-COVID standards, including contacting parents at 3 days of absences, letters being mailed home at 5 days. Students with unimproved attendance will be referred for a Student Success Meeting, and District Level attendance meeting.

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

A clear and concise attendance policy allows expectations to be clearly communicated to all stakeholders. This policy also includes involving parents and guardians as early as 3 days of absences.

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.

Attendance reports will be pulled weekly by the Dean of Students. Data from these reports will be used to mail parent letters home, and set up success team meetings for involved parties. These meetings will result in attendance intervention plans designed to support students in school attendance. Conversely, PBIS will recognize our students will perfect attendance each quarter to promote the positive behavior.

Person Responsible

Tom Pittman (thomas.pittman@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.

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. This year, administration has further partnered with the PBIS team to create clear school-wide expectations for students. This includes students being: Safe, On time, Accountable, and Respectful. PBIS created SOAR posters and reminders for all common areas. Students now have visual reminders of how to be Safe, On Time, Accountable, and Respectful in all areas of the FIHS campus.

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

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, rewards, and recognitions. We also recognize an "Eagle of the Week" for students, teachers, and staff members to highlight those on campus who exhibit positive behaviors. Community members and business partners play a role in rewarding our students through donating to our PBIS team. We frequently invite guests on campus for presentations, support (including mental health), and partner with local businesses to provide treats and rewards for students and teachers.