# Fleming Island High School



## 2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

## Table of Contents

# 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**<br>(per MSID File) | Active |
| **School Type and Grades Served**<br>(per MSID File) | High School<br>PK, 9-12 |
| **Primary Service Type**<br>(per MSID File) | K-12 General Education |
| **2021-22 Title I School** | No |
| **2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate**<br>(as reported on Survey 3) | 23% |
| **2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented**<br>(subgroups with 10 or more students)<br>(subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Students With Disabilities<br>English Language Learners<br>Asian Students<br>Black/African American Students<br>Hispanic Students<br>Multiracial Students<br>White Students<br>Economically Disadvantaged Students |
| **School Grades History** | 2021-22: A (68%)<br><br>2018-19: A (66%)<br><br>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.](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

# 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) | **2021-22 Title I School** | **2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3) |
|---|---|---|
| High School PK, 9-12 | No | 23% |

| **Primary Service Type** (per MSID File) | **Charter School** | **2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2) |
|---|---|---|
| K-12 General Education | No | 30% |

## School Grades History

| Year | 2021-22 | 2020-21 | 2019-20 | 2018-19 |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 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**
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 | 460 | 474 | 516 | 452 | 1902 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 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 | 4 | 13 | 6 | 4 | 27 |
| 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 | 0 | 0 | 33 | 48 | 50 | 0 | 131 |
| Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment | 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 | |

**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 | 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 | |
| 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**

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 | |
| 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 | |

**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**<br>Identify the key Areas of Focus to address your school's highest priorities based on any/all relevant data sources.<br><br>**:** |
|---|

### #1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

| **Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**<br>**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:**<br>**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:**<br>**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:**<br>**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:**<br>**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:**<br>**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:**<br>**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:**<br>**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:**<br>**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:**<br>**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 Respectrful. 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.