

Alachua County Public Schools

Eastside High School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	10
III. Planning for Improvement	14
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	23
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	0
VI. Title I Requirements	0
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

Eastside High School

1201 SE 43RD ST, Gainesville, FL 32641

<https://www.sbac.edu/eastside>

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Alachua County School Board on 10/17/2023.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes (F.S.), requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a new, amended, or continuation SIP for each school in the district which has a school grade of D or F; has a significant gap in achievement on statewide, standardized assessments administered pursuant to s. 1008.22 by one or more student subgroups, as defined in the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), 20 U.S.C. s. 6311(b)(2)(C)(v)(II); has not significantly increased the percentage of students passing statewide, standardized assessments; has not significantly increased the percentage of students demonstrating Learning Gains, as defined in s. 1008.34, and as calculated under s. 1008.34(3)(b), who passed statewide, standardized assessments; has been identified as requiring instructional supports under the Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE) program established in s. 1008.365; or has significantly lower graduation rates for a subgroup when compared to the state's graduation rate. Rule 6A-1.098813, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.), requires district school boards to approve a SIP for each Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) school in the district rated as Unsatisfactory.

Below are the criteria for identification of traditional public and public charter schools pursuant to the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) State plan:

Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)

A school not identified for CSI or TSI, but has one or more subgroups with a Federal Index below 41%.

Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)

A school not identified as CSI that has at least one consistently underperforming subgroup with a Federal Index below 32% for three consecutive years.

Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)

A school can be identified as CSI in any of the following four ways:

1. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%;
2. Have a graduation rate at or below 67%;
3. Have a school grade of D or F; or
4. Have a Federal Index below 41% in the same subgroup(s) for 6 consecutive years.

ESEA sections 1111(d) requires that each school identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI develop a support and improvement plan created in partnership with stakeholders (including principals and other school leaders, teachers and parent), is informed by all indicators in the State's accountability system, includes evidence-based interventions, is based on a school-level needs assessment, and identifies resource inequities to be

addressed through implementation of the plan. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as TSI, ATSI and non-Title I CSI must be approved and monitored by the school district. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as Title I, CSI must be approved by the school district and Department. The Department must monitor and periodically review implementation of each CSI plan after approval.

The Department's SIP template in the Florida Continuous Improvement Management System (CIMS), <https://www.floridacims.org>, meets all state and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all ESSA components for a support and improvement plan required for traditional public and public charter schools identified as CSI, TSI and ATSI, and eligible schools applying for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) funds.

Districts may allow schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions to develop a SIP using the template in CIMS.

The responses to the corresponding sections in the Department's SIP template may address the requirements for: 1) Title I schools operating a schoolwide program (SWD), pursuant to ESSA, as amended, Section 1114(b); and 2) charter schools that receive a school grade of D or F or three consecutive grades below C, pursuant to Rule 6A-1.099827, F.A.C. The chart below lists the applicable requirements.

SIP Sections	Title I Schoolwide Program	Charter Schools
I-A: School Mission/Vision		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(1)
I-B-C: School Leadership, Stakeholder Involvement & SIP Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(2-3)	
I-E: Early Warning System	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-A-C: Data Review		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-F: Progress Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(3)	
III-A: Data Analysis/Reflection	ESSA 1114(b)(6)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(4)
III-B: Area(s) of Focus	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(i-iii)	
III-C: Other SI Priorities		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(5-9)
VI: Title I Requirements	ESSA 1114(b)(2, 4-5), (7)(A)(iii)(I-V)-(B) ESSA 1116(b-g)	

Note: Charter schools that are also Title I must comply with the requirements in both columns.

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 Department 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.

I. School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

Eastside High School strives to promote the balance and connectedness of practical skills, critical thinking, academic excellence, and ethical standards. The school will promote student achievement of short-term and long-term goals through specific programs including relevant technology training, vocational programs, rigorous academics and cultural awareness. To achieve these goals, each student must develop purposefulness, professionalism, and self-discipline.

We Are...

R-Respectful

A-Accountable

M-Motivated

Provide the school's vision statement.

Beliefs:

Eastside High School will provide a safe and organized learning and working environment.

Success is measured by more than grades, college acceptances, and future careers; we have a larger purpose.

Students and staff should pursue ethical interactions in the quest for knowledge.

School Leadership Team, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring

School Leadership Team

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 as it relates to SIP implementation for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Williams, Leroy	Principal	
Turnage, Adele	Assistant Principal	
Coleman, Samuel	Assistant Principal	
Currens, Regina	Assistant Principal	
Koon, Anne	Other	
Brown, Lindsey	School Counselor	
Coleman-Hayes, Elizabeth	Teacher, K-12	
Lacy, Amanda	Teacher, K-12	
Wishin, Brittany	Teacher, K-12	
Allen, Jon	Teacher, K-12	
Thomas, Leslie	Dean	

Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Development

Describe the process for involving stakeholders (including the school leadership team, teachers and school staff, parents, students (mandatory for secondary schools) and families, and business or community leaders) and how their input was used in the SIP development process. (ESSA 1114(b)(2))

Note: If a School Advisory Council is used to fulfill these requirements, it must include all required stakeholders.

The SIP is shared for review and input with the School Advisory Council. The SAC includes students, teachers, school staff, business/community leaders and parents. The meeting will be held on 8/31 for their review. The purpose of the SAC is to further assist with evaluation of the school improvement plan and the overall budget to increase overall student achievement.

SIP Monitoring

Describe how the SIP will be regularly monitored for effective implementation and impact on increasing the achievement of students in meeting the State's academic standards, particularly for those students with the greatest achievement gap. Describe how the school will revise the plan, as necessary, to ensure continuous improvement. (ESSA 1114(b)(3))

Early Warning System data will be reviewed frequently, with a focus on live attendance and discipline data, to ensure students are in attendance to receive instruction. Multiple data sources available throughout the year will be reviewed as it becomes available, including but not limited to AIMS, standardized test retake information, grades, Reading+, etc. to determine achievement for English(reading) and math.

Demographic Data

Only ESSA identification and school grade history updated 3/11/2024

2023-24 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	High School 9-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	79%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	92%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	TSI
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD)* Asian Students (ASN) Black/African American Students (BLK)* Hispanic Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)*
School Grades History	2021-22: C

*2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2019-20: C
	2018-19: C
	2017-18: B
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

Using 2022-23 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		
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	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 that have two or more early warning indicators:

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

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students identified retained:

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

Prior Year (2022-23) As Initially Reported (pre-populated)

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

Indicator	Grade Level										Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	261	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	259	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	126	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	201	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	301	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	135	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	301	

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	440

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	48
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	40

Prior Year (2022-23) Updated (pre-populated)

Section 3 includes data tables that are pre-populated based off information submitted in prior year's SIP.

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

Indicator	Grade Level										Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

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

The number of students identified retained:

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

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review**ESSA School, District and State Comparison (pre-populated)**

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school or combination schools). Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school.

On April 9, 2021, FDOE Emergency Order No. 2021-EO-02 made 2020-21 school grades optional. They have been removed from this publication.

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	44			52	58	52	56		
ELA Learning Gains				44	51	52	51		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				17	33	41	31		
Math Achievement*	26			22	48	41	28		
Math Learning Gains				28	47	48	20		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				40	41	49	27		
Science Achievement*	60			51	65	61	64		
Social Studies Achievement*	30			55	72	68	63		
Middle School Acceleration									
Graduation Rate	88			93			97		
College and Career Acceleration	63			56			60		
ELP Progress									

* In cases where a school does not test 95% of students in a subject, the achievement component will be different in the Federal Percent of Points Index (FPPI) than in school grades calculation.

See [Florida School Grades, School Improvement Ratings and DJJ Accountability Ratings](#).

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index

ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	TSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	52
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	311
Total Components for the Federal Index	6
Percent Tested	95
Graduation Rate	88

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index

ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	TSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	46
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	458
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	89
Graduation Rate	93

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)**2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY**

ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	26	Yes	4	4
ELL				
AMI				
ASN	94			
BLK	34	Yes	4	
HSP	71			
MUL	61			
PAC				
WHT	81			

2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY

ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
FRL	36	Yes	3	

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY

ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	29	Yes	3	3
ELL				
AMI				
ASN	83			
BLK	32	Yes	3	
HSP	69			
MUL	52			
PAC				
WHT	80			
FRL	33	Yes	2	

Accountability Components by Subgroup

Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school. (pre-populated)

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY 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 2021-22	C & C Accel 2021-22	ELP Progress
All Students	44			26			60	30		88	63	
SWD	9			9			21	20		7	6	
ELL												
AMI												
ASN	92			80			100			98	5	
BLK	18			15			32	25		34	6	
HSP	66			33			78			82	5	
MUL	50			35			77	27		86	6	

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY 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 2021-22	C & C Accel 2021-22	ELP Progress
PAC												
WHT	84			59			95	64		87	6	
FRL	22			13			39	27		35	6	

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	52	44	17	22	28	40	51	55		93	56	
SWD	13	16	14	15	35	45	18	33		86	11	
ELL												
AMI												
ASN	97	78		76	27		95	100		100	94	
BLK	22	23	16	11	24	42	26	33		92	32	
HSP	82	68		67	40		82	50		86	75	
MUL	53	44		27	20		44	75		93	57	
PAC												
WHT	84	66		66	46		92	94		95	94	
FRL	26	24	13	13	23	34	31	38		90	36	

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	56	51	31	28	20	27	64	63		97	60	
SWD	13	24	20	10	22	38	25	13		90	21	
ELL												
AMI												
ASN	90	66		80			91	97		100	100	
BLK	29	37	29	13	18	28	34	32		95	37	
HSP	69	52		37	6		75	79		100	71	
MUL	69	50		50	14		85	83		100	92	
PAC												
WHT	83	72		64	36		94	95		97	79	
FRL	29	37	30	13	22	31	32	39		95	35	

Grade Level Data Review– State Assessments (pre-populated)

The data are raw data and include ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data. The percentages shown here represent ALL students who received a score of 3 or higher on the statewide assessments.

An asterisk (*) in any cell indicates the data has been suppressed due to fewer than 10 students tested, or all tested students scoring the same.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
10	2023 - Spring	42%	52%	-10%	50%	-8%
09	2023 - Spring	45%	52%	-7%	48%	-3%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	19%	52%	-33%	50%	-31%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	32%	57%	-25%	48%	-16%

BIOLOGY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	58%	63%	-5%	63%	-5%

HISTORY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	28%	63%	-35%	63%	-35%

III. Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis/Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources.

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

ELA Lowest 25th percentile and our overall Math achievement showed the lowest performance. Contributing factors that led to learning loss includes the pandemic (Covid), attendance (Truancy), students demonstrating difficulty demonstrating growth on grade level texts/benchmarks, and literacy including proficiency gaps among students. Students with Disabilities, Economically Disadvantaged, and African American students scored below 41% in reading and math as it relates to the Federal Index passing rate.

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

ELA achievement dropped from 52% to 42% from the previous year. Possibly contributing to this decline includes the new progress monitoring assessments (PM1-PM3), the continued effects of pandemic learning loss (Covid), and continued truancy and chronic absenteeism of students. Students continue to demonstrate lack of reading comprehension that then directly correlates to math, social studies and science grade level comprehension. This literacy proficiency gap affects all areas of student data.

Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends.

ELA Achievement White vs. African Americans 35% gap at state & 63% gap at EHS (28 percentage points difference)

Mathematics Achievement White vs. African American 33% gap at state 64% at EHS (31 percentage points difference)

Factors that have contributed to this need for improvement include students have difficulty demonstrating growth on grade level texts, attendance (truancy), and literacy gaps among subgroup of students. Also, the achievement gaps in math and ELA due to the pandemic have led to the need of improvement. Students will receive ongoing digital literacy support in all classes. All teachers will implement BEST E.L.A. standards across subject areas to monitor students growth in ELA Reading. For math, students will be strategically scheduled based upon data and needs. Highly qualified teachers will meet systematically with district staff and administrators to review ELA and math data from AIMS and F.A.S.T. assessment to further guide instruction or determine student growth. This will enable students and teachers to identify specific areas of growth or improvement.

Teachers will review AIMS assessment data to identify areas of remediation and target growth. Administrators will meet with teachers to discuss current data. Data will be shared at monthly department meetings and faculty meetings. First year teachers will meet with school principal to discuss data during mid-year appraisals. Teachers will provide administrators with data that reflect lowest quartile students. Administrators will review students performance (assessments and grades) with teachers. Data chats will also include attendance data, discipline data, AIMS results, grade distributions, and F.A.S.T. assessment data. Math teachers will participate in ongoing data review PLCs to analyze data to further guide overall student achievement.

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

Biology scores increased from 58% to 61% (3 total percentage points).

Administrators, district staff, and teachers (including Science Dept.) worked collaboratively with Biology teachers of 9th and 10th grade students individually to review students scores from District level assessments and EOCs from the previous years. Students were able to identify their strengths and areas for improvement and they chose specific strategies they would use to improve their scores. Students also received additional instructional support as it related to meeting Biology benchmarks/ standards.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I, identify one or two potential areas of concern.

Students absent 10% or more days (Overall Attendance Grades 9-12), Discipline in 9/10th grade (students receiving 1 or more suspensions and students course failure in ELA & Math classes.

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

1. African-American, Economically Disadvantaged, and Students With Disabilities (ESSA Subgroups)
Increase reading and math achievement within all subgroups.
2. Improve overall attendance data and behavior data
3. Improving proficiency scores and instructional practices in U.S History.

Area of Focus

(Identified key Area of Focus that addresses the school's highest priority based on any/all relevant data sources)

#1. 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 crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

ELA

Review of 2022-2023 Data showed that African American students, Students with Disabilities, and Economically Disadvantaged students are scoring the lowest at Level 1 on the PM 3 Assessment. Our Students with Disabilities showed the lowest performance.

Math

Review of Mathematics Data showed that African American students, Students with Disabilities, and Economically Disadvantaged students all scored a Level 1 on the state mathematics EOC (Algebra, Geometry).

Students in these ESSA subgroups show significant deficiencies in math.

Measurable Outcome:

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

ELA

1. 35% of Economically Disadvantaged Students will score at least a 3 or the equivalent of a passing score on the FAST ELA PM 3.
2. 30% of SWD will score at least a 3 or the equivalent of a passing score on the FAST ELA PM 3 assessment.
3. Reduce the achievement gap by 15%
4. 30% of students in the Lowest Quartile will show learning gains in math.

1. 25% of students will score a level 3 or higher on the Algebra 1 state assessment.
2. 41% of students will score a level 3 or higher on the Geometry state assessment.
3. 30% of students in the Lowest Quartile will show gains in math achievement levels.

Monitoring:

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

The following data will be shared and used to guide instruction and student performance:

ELA FAST data

Common Assessment Progress Monitoring data

Reading Plus data

High dose tutoring progress data

AIMS Data

EOC Data

Math IXL

1. Teachers will meet monthly in grade level teams to share data and discuss student progress.
2. District Literacy Specialist and the Administrative Team will meet with teachers in PLCs to review data, discuss interventions, and to guide instruction based upon student performance.
3. Faculty meetings will involve professional development with instructional strategies to improve overall student performance.

Math

1. Classroom walkthroughs and snapshots to monitor instruction on benchmarks and use of high yield

strategies.

2. Algebra and Geometry teachers will utilize assessments on Illuminate to monitor student progress.
3. Team data chats will occur monthly with District Math Specialist and Administrative team.
4. Teachers will provide real world math applications.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Adele Turnage (turnagas@gm.sbac.edu)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

ELA

Students in 9th and 10th grade and seniors who still need the reading score will be enrolled in a separate reading class to receive instruction from a certified reading teacher. Both 9th and 10th grade students will use Reading Plus while seniors will focus on preparing to earn the concordant score through the ACT/SAT. Students with Disabilities will receive support facilitation instruction in general courses english and math courses to improve academic performance.

Math

Teachers will implement high yield strategies including Kagan, Gradual Release Model, and Marzano. Students will have opportunities to apply mathematical concepts to real world applications. Teachers will provide remediation based on data from in class and district level assessments. Students who are level 1 will be enrolled in Algebra 1 A in order to prepare them for Algebra 1.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Students need an additional period to receive targeted reading instruction and remediation to address reading deficiencies. The school used ADV money to pay for the additional teaching unit, and the district is paying for the Reading Plus program. Students with disabilities will receive support per their IEPs along with accommodations to address reading and math deficiencies.

Teachers will use data to drive instruction and provide remediation for students to achieve mastery of the targeted skills. Differentiation through the use of multiple strategies meets the needs of a variety of learners.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 3 - Promising Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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. Enroll all level 1 students in reading in 9th and 10th grade.
2. Enroll seniors in reading if they need the concordant score.
3. Support 11th grade ELA and History teachers to incorporate literacy strategies
4. Individual data chats to identify areas of strength and weakness in literacy.
5. Utilize myPerspectives, Reading Plus, and NoRedInk literacy resources with fidelity and supported through ongoing professional development. Also, supplement reading classes with Common Lit.
6. Co teach classes prioritized grades 9-10 for reading and math.

7. Increase rigor in all MP English classes by enrolling students in IB Language and Literature 1 and 2. Math

1. Co teach classes prioritized for Algebra 1A and Algebra 1
2. Classroom walkthroughs and snapshots to record and report back on instructional practices
3. Provide targeted remediation and practice prior to Algebra 1 retakes for juniors and seniors who need the concordant score for graduation.

Person Responsible: Leroy Williams (williamslv@gm.sbac.edu)

By When: By the end of the 2023-2024 school year.

#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 crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

ELA

Review of 2021-2022 Data showed that 77.4% of Students with Disabilities scored a level 1 on the FSA and showed the lowest performance.

Math

Review of Mathematics Data showed that 75.6% of Students with Disabilities scored a level on the Algebra & Geometry EOCs.

Both of these measures are higher than the district and state averages.

Measurable Outcome:

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

We will reduce the percentage of students with disabilities scoring a level 1 on the state standardized assessments by 5%.

Monitoring:

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

Since the state standardized assessment happens once a year, we will rely on multiple measures throughout the school year to gauge progress. The district based common assessments along with the AIMS assessments will be used to measure achievement and progress toward growth for our students with disabilities.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Leroy Williams (williamslv@gm.sbac.edu)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

A combination of service delivery focusing on support facilitation or co-teach in english and math classes as well as the Reading+ intervention program will be used to provide support and instruction to students with disabilities. Similarly, all teachers will receive monthly UDL (Universal Design for Learning) framework pieces to incorporate in their classrooms.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The Reading Plus intervention program has been shown to increase reading comprehension. This then translates to comprehension in other academic areas. Similarly, the coteach/support facilitation model provides in class supports for students in the content areas with a focus on English and Math. All students with disabilities with a level one in reading are in a Reading+ intervention class.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 3 - Promising Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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. Co teach classes prioritized for Algebra 1A and Algebra 1 as well as 9th and 10th grade English.
2. CoTeach/Support Facilitation during pre-planning for all gen. ed. and ESE teachers in CoTeach/SF assignments.
3. Monthly UDL strategies to support students with disabilities.

Person Responsible: Regina Currens (currenrm@gm.sbac.edu)

By When: Monthly and during schedule building.

#3. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Early Warning System**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Students attending school can be one of the biggest impacts on their success. Data showed that a large number of our 9th and 10th graders were considered chronically absent and/or truant. The same is true for 11th and 12th graders, but not to the extent of underclassmen. To create a positive school culture and environment, focusing on attendance will be crucial.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Both chronically absent and truant students will decrease by 2%.

Monitoring:

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

Weekly monitoring of attendance records and attendance team meetings will occur. Overall, yearly attendance data will be reviewed consistently with staff and students.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Regina Currens (currenrm@gm.sbac.edu)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Targeted support to help problem-solve family barriers preventing attendance.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Using the attendance team to reach out to families with absenteeism through phone calls, emails, Team Educational Planning Team meetings, home visits and helping them problem solve their specific situations has shown the most effective.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 4 - Demonstrates a Rationale

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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) Information shared through Peach Jar about the importance of attendance monthly.
- 2) Attendance team (AP, attendance contact & Family Services Liaison) meetings weekly to determine student support needed.

Person Responsible: Regina Currens (currenrm@gm.sbac.edu)

By When: Throughout the school year; at least bi weekly attendance team meetings & overall attendance rates compared to last year.

CSI, TSI and ATSI Resource Review

Describe the process to review school improvement funding allocations and ensure resources are allocated based on needs. This section must be completed if the school is identified as ATSI, TSI or CSI in addition to completing an Area(s) of Focus identifying interventions and activities within the SIP (ESSA 1111(d)(1)(B)(4) and (d)(2)(C).

The School Advisory Committee meets regularly throughout the year to approve funding for school improvement needs. Allocation of funds were dispersed to address areas of need or concerns, specifically reading deficiencies. Additional reading teaching sections were allocated to provide additional support and remediation in areas of Reading and English.