Santa Fe High School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Santa Fe High School

16213 NW US HIGHWAY 441, Alachua, FL 32615

https://www.sbac.edu/santafe

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.

In alignment with the district's mission, our mission at Santa Fe High School is to build character and citizenship by providing a comprehensive education that fosters learning and critical thinking for a productive life. We are committed to working collaboratively with our students, families, and community to provide the highest quality of education.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The community, parents, students, faculty, staff, and administration work together to create an academically rigorous curriculum in a safe and positive environment that is also culturally responsive. We continue to develop, support, and maintain powerful teaching and learning. We use innovative techniques to enhance life-long learning through the use of technology and varied instructional strategies. We celebrate our diversity within a positive school atmosphere. We recognize accomplishments, promote good sportsmanship, and appreciate the unique qualities of each individual. We nurture growth, responsibility, citizenship, and productivity through daily studies, academic achievements, and social interactions.

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
Wright, Timothy	Principal	The Principal's job is to provide our community with the vision for the year and ways we will work collaboratively to achieve goals created through the analysis of our data. The Principal also reviews all data for students and looks for trends, areas of concern, and then supports teachers so they can meet the needs of the students. The Principal communicates the vision, mission, and goals to the community and explains the roles of all stakeholders in supporting student achievement and academic success. The Principal also provides professional development opportunities for teachers in order to enhance teaching practices that are culturally responsive and academically appropriate for our student population in which we serve. The Principal works with the staff and outlines how they are to be instrumental in providing the highest level of customer service to our community and facilitates discussions on maintaining professionalism staying up-to-date on inputting accurate data into the system. The Principal and Assistant Principals have data chats with each of the teachers who have been assigned to them for formal evaluations. Struggling and beginning/ new teachers are assigned a mentor teacher who observes, models, and gives support to that teacher so that students are successful. All of these discussions stem from looking at assessment data and observing classrooms (informal walkthroughs and formal observations). The administration meets with all teachers facilitating a needs assessment to gather concerns and areas of needed support, discussing data, and using that input to plan Professional Development, allocate resources, and provide support.
Brown, Jr.	Assistant Principal	The Assistant Principal of Administration ensures the safest and cleanest academic space for students and teachers. The APA works with teachers and building services personnel (custodians, district staff, school staff, deans) to provide academic supplies and instructional technology in support of impacting effective teaching practices. The APA also monitors attendance and behavior trends in order to be responsive in using the Early Warning System. The APA works in collaboration with the APC and principal to analyze how attendance and discipline impacts academic achievement and identifies trends and areas of concern. The APA also works with teachers to reflect on teaching practices and instructional delivery through the use of classroom walk-throughs (objective data collection). The Principal and Assistant Principals have data chats with each of the teachers who have been assigned to them for formal evaluations. Struggling and beginning/new teachers are assigned a mentor teacher who observes, models, and gives support to that teacher so students are successful. All of these discussions stem from looking at assessment data and observing classrooms (informal walk-throughs and formal observations). The administration meets with all teachers, facilitating a needs

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		assessment to gather concerns and areas of needed support, discussing data, and using that input to plan Professional Development, allocate resources, and provide support.
Rendek, David	Assistant Principal	The Assistant Principals' jobs are to monitor individual teacher data, have data chats with teachers, and discuss students who may need differentiation in their classrooms. The Assistant Principal of Curriculum maintains the schedule and provides job-embedded professional development for teachers that highlights effective instructional strategies that align with our mission and vision for academic success. The APC also works with teachers to reflect on teaching practices and instructional delivery through the use of classroom walk-throughs (objective data collection). The APC works with families and students in creating academic plans that assists students with maintaining academic progress through scheduling the appropriate courses, working with the school counseling office on matriculation of credits, offering information on remediation and reteaching opportunities offered through tutoring, establishing progress monitoring check points, and teaching self-advocacy through understanding how to assess Infinite Campus and ask teachers for help. The Principal and Assistant Principals have data chats with each of the teachers who have been assigned to them for formal evaluations. Struggling and beginning/new teachers are assigned a mentor teacher who observes, models, and gives support to that teacher so students are successful. All of these discussions stem from looking at assessment data and observing classrooms (informal walk-throughs and formal observations). The administration meets with all teachers, facilitating a needs assessment to gather concerns and areas of needed support, discussing data, and using that input to plan Professional Development, allocate resources, and provide support.

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.

All stakeholders have a voice in the SIP Development. The Department Chairs provide input in creating the academic goals for the upcoming school year based on our school data. These goals are then discussed with all teachers within the departments and adjustments made where needed. Once the school staff has provided input, it goes to the School Advisory Council for review. The SAC is comprised of the Principal, Teachers, Students, Parents, and Community/Business partners as well as open to any other stakeholder to provide input towards the SIP.

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))

The SIP will be monitored through multiple State, District, and Classroom Progress Monitoring assessments such as the FAST, AIMS Progress Monitoring, Great Leaps data, Reading Plus data, and classroom grades/observational data. All stakeholders will review this data in a timely manner and adjustments will be made based on this data.

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	42%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	48%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	N/A
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)* English Language Learners (ELL)* Black/African American Students (BLK)* Hispanic Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)

School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: C 2019-20: B 2018-19: B 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	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Total
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	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	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	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	

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	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Total
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	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Total
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	215
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	115
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	214
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	187
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	221
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	66
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	221

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	355

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	2
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8

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	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	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	

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	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Total
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*	52			47	58	52	56		
ELA Learning Gains				37	51	52	56		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				21	33	41	37		
Math Achievement*	45			48	48	41	36		
Math Learning Gains				40	47	48	29		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				29	41	49	43		
Science Achievement*	62			58	65	61	57		
Social Studies Achievement*	62			55	72	68	70		
Middle School Acceleration									
Graduation Rate	89			90			93		
College and Career Acceleration	61			53			65		
ELP Progress	55			63			42		

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)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	61
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	426
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	96
Graduation Rate	89

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	TSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	49
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	541
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	93
Graduation Rate	90

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	37	Yes	4	
ELL	46			
AMI				
ASN	73			
BLK	35	Yes	4	
HSP	63			
MUL	55			
PAC				
WHT	71			

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	51			

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	31	Yes	3	3
ELL	36	Yes	1	
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	35	Yes	3	
HSP	50			
MUL	44			
PAC				
WHT	55			
FRL	42			

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	52			45			62	62		89	61	55
SWD	27			12			35	32		25	6	
ELL	41			43							3	55
AMI												
ASN	73										1	
BLK	29			7			29	36		21	6	
HSP	56			54			70	67		47	7	60
MUL	52			35			63	40		64	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	58			58			70	74		74	6	
FRL	44			36			50	48		39	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	47	37	21	48	40	29	58	55		90	53	63
SWD	19	28	20	13	26	29	26	43		84	23	
ELL	8	36										63
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	23	29	25	22	31	29	34	33		95	30	
HSP	45	38	24	45	43	40	55	65		84	56	55
MUL	39	35	9	40	33		33	70		88	53	
PAC												
WHT	58	41	20	57	42	27	72	79		90	61	
FRL	33	29	20	36	38	44	43	50		86	41	

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	56	37	36	29	43	57	70		93	65	42
SWD	24	47	39	27	28	36	30	25		83	26	
ELL	31	46										42
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	28	36	26	15	30	39	19	48		96	38	
HSP	59	53	55	37	31		71	60		85	82	
MUL	57	68		19	27		57	40		91	70	
PAC												
WHT	64	62	40	45	30	53	66	83		93	71	
FRL	39	49	41	26	31	47	43	59		89	50	

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	54%	52%	2%	50%	4%
09	2023 - Spring	52%	52%	0%	48%	4%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	28%	52%	-24%	50%	-22%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	58%	57%	1%	48%	10%

BIOLOGY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	62%	63%	-1%	63%	-1%

HISTORY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	63%	63%	0%	63%	0%

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.

The data component that showed the lowest performance were the Algebra 1 EOC scores, with a 28% proficiency rating. A factor that contributes to this is that the students who take this course at the high school level have minimal math skills that have to be built up before they can be successful in the course. A lot of scaffolding must be implemented to build the skills.

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

The data component that showed the greatest decline from the 21-22 year was the US History EOC scores. Low attendance was a contributing factor to the decline in this area.

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.

The data component with the greatest gap when compared to the state average were the Algebra 1 EOC scores. The greatest factor is the state average includes middle school students who also take this course in 7th or 8th grade. Those students usually have a higher skill base to be able to take it in middle school. Students who take the course in high school are less proficient and were not able to take the course in middle school.

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

That data component that showed the most improvement was the Geometry EOC scores. The use of reduced class sizes in this course as well as the use of an interactive guided curriculum helped provide support for this course.

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

Two potential areas of concern in reflecting on the EWS are the number of students that missed 10% or more days of school in the 22-23 school year, as well as the number of students 9-11 that failed either Math or ELA.

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

1. Increasing Graduation Rate to 95%
2. Increasing proficiency in all content areas for the Black/African-American subgroup.
3. Increasing proficiency in all content areas for the Students With Disabilities subgroup.
4. Increasing overall attendance to 95% or higher.
5. Decreasing the number of Out of School Suspensions by 10% among all students.

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 Black/African-American

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.

The Black/African-American subgroup scored lower in all areas compared to their peers. This includes ELA, Math, Science, and Social Studies. They have also scored below the Federal Index for 3 consecutive years.

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

The Black/African-American subgroup will increase proficiency in all academic areas to meet the Federal Index of 41%.

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

This area of focus will be monitored through classroom level data, such as classroom grades/attendance, district level progress monitoring in AIMS, state Progress Monitoring in FAST.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Timothy Wright (wrightte@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.)

Evidence-Based interventions are to supplement the classroom with Tier 2 interventions through our Reading Plus Program, IXL Math Intervention, and Tier 3 interventions through the Great Leaps Program.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The use of the Reading Plus Program will help support all content area classrooms through building the reading skills needed to be successful both in the classroom and on state assessments. Similar to Reading Plus, IXL Math Intervention will help provide the skills needed to be successful in the Math classroom and on state assessments.

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 1 - Strong 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.

Student progress will be tracked through the Student Services team meeting weekly to evaluate data and make recommendations/adjustments based on the data.

Person Responsible: Timothy Wright (wrightte@gm.sbac.edu)

By When: Weekly

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to English Language Learners

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.

The ELL subgroup scored well below their peers in proficiency for ELA as only 8% scored proficient which in turn had them scoring below the Federal Index of 41%.

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

The ELL subgroup will increase proficiency to 50%, accelerating them to closing the gap among their peers as well as meeting the Federal Index of 41%.

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

This area of focus will be monitored through classroom level data, such as classroom grades/attendance, district level progress monitoring in AIMS, state Progress Monitoring in FAST.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

David Rendek (rendekdm@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.)

Evidence-Based interventions are to supplement the classroom with Tier 2 interventions through our Reading Plus Program and Tier 3 interventions through the Great Leaps Program.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The use of the Reading Plus Program will help support all content area classrooms through building the reading skills needed to be successful both in the classroom and on state assessments. The Great Leaps Program will also provide explicit instruction in fluency, phonics, and phonemic awareness which is needed to improve the reading ability of our ELL students.

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 1 - Strong 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.

Students will be provided additional supports through the Great Leaps Program and the Reading Plus Program to grow their ELA skills with the data on reading levels being tracked weekly.

Person Responsible: David Rendek (rendekdm@gm.sbac.edu)

By When: Weekly

#3. 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.

The SWD subgroup scored lower in all areas compared to their peers. This includes ELA, Math, Science, and Social Studies. They have also scored below the Federal Index for 3 consecutive years.

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

The SWD subgroup will increase proficiency in all academic areas to meet the Federal Index of 41%.

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

This area of focus will be monitored through classroom level data, such as classroom grades/attendance, district level progress monitoring in AIMS, state Progress Monitoring in FAST. It will also be tracked in the student's IEP's through the implementation of their IEP goals.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Lawson Brown, Jr. (brownl@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.)

Evidence-Based interventions are to supplement the classroom with Tier 2 interventions through our Reading Plus Program, IXL Math Intervention, and the Learning Strategies course. Tier 3 interventions through the Great Leaps Program.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The use of the Reading Plus Program will help support all content area classrooms through building the reading skills needed to be successful both in the classroom and on state assessments. The Learning Strategies course provides daily instruction on skills needed to be successful in all courses. Similar to Reading Plus, IXL Math Intervention will help provide the skills needed to be successful in the Math classroom and on state assessments.

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 1 - Strong 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.

The ESE Team will track our SWD's through quarterly data provided through the classroom teachers and tracked within their IEP goals.

Person Responsible: Lawson Brown, Jr. (brownl@gm.sbac.edu)

By When: Quarterly

#4. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Teacher Retention and Recruitment

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.

In the current state of public education, consistency is paramount to the success of a school. Retaining high-quality teachers and staff members as well as recruiting high-quality teachers and staff members to fill vacancies provides a consistency in fulfilling the school's mission and vision year after year. Using long-term subs to fill vacancies is not conducive to providing the highest quality education that each student deserves. Thus, teacher retention and recruitment is paramount to a school's success.

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

100% of instructional personnel will be FDOE certified instructors, teaching in their field of certification.

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

This will be monitored through ACIIS and continuous professional development and data chats with instructional personnel.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Timothy Wright (wrightte@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.)

SFHS is implementing a school-wide PBIS program to help with the behavior of students and their participation in the classroom. Research shows one of the main reasons teachers leave a school is due to student behavior.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The PBIS Program provides a system of behavioral support to help the teacher provide a safe and academic learning environment, curbing unwanted behaviors. The improvement of behavior improves the ability to give instruction reducing the stress of the job.

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.

Teacher morale will be tracked quarterly through climate surveys in an effort to use the data to improve their experience within their classrooms.

Person Responsible: Timothy Wright (wrightte@gm.sbac.edu)

By When: Quarterly

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 principal and district (support Principal or executive director) will review the data to ensure the identified areas of focus and action steps align to school needs as the data indicates. Subgroup data will be identified in addition to overall goals. Ongoing progress will be monitored on regular intervals to ensure alignment of action steps and student needs, including identified subgroups. Subgroups will be monitored in addition to school-wide, overall group data. The Federal Grants and programs department will aid in the budget alignment processes to ensure the student needs are met.

Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE)

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

- The percentage of students below Level 3 on the 2022 statewide, standardized ELA assessment. Identification criteria must include each grade that has 50 percent or more students scoring below level 3 in grades 3-5 on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.

- The percentage of students in kindergarten through grade 3, based on 2021-2022 end of year screening and progress monitoring data, who are not on track to score Level 3 or above on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.

- Other forms of data that should be considered: formative, progress monitoring and diagnostic assessment data.

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

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

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

- Each grade K -3, using the coordinated screening and progress monitoring system, where 50 percent or more of the students are not on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment;

- Each grade 3-5 where 50 percent or more of its students scored below a Level 3 on the most recent statewide, standardized ELA assessment; and

- Grade 6 measurable outcomes may be included, as applicable.

Grades K-2 Measurable Outcomes

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

Monitoring

Monitoring
Describe how the school's Area(s) of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcomes. Include a description of how ongoing monitoring will impact student achievement outcomes.

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome
Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Evidence-based Practices/Programs

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

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

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

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

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

- ◦ Literacy Leadership

- ◦ Literacy Coaching

- ◦ Assessment

- ◦ Professional Learning

Action Step	Person Responsible for Monitoring

Title I Requirements

Schoolwide Program Plan (SWP) Requirements
This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A SWP and opts to use the SIP to satisfy the requirements of the SWP plan, as outlined in the ESSA, Public Law No. 114-95, § 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

Provide the methods for dissemination of this SIP, UniSIG budget and SWP to stakeholders (e.g., students, families, school staff and leadership and local businesses and organizations). Please articulate a plan or protocol for how this SIP and progress will be shared and disseminated and to the extent practicable, provided in a language a parent can understand. (ESSA 1114(b)(4))
List the school's webpage* where the SIP is made publicly available.

NA

Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission, support the needs of students and keep parents informed of their child's progress.
List the school's webpage* where the school's Family Engagement Plan is made publicly available. (ESSA 1116(b-g))

NA

Describe how the school plans to strengthen the academic program in the school, increase the amount and quality of learning time and help provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum. Include the Area of Focus if addressed in Part III of the SIP. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)ii)

NA

If appropriate and applicable, describe how this plan is developed in coordination and integration with other Federal, State, and local services, resources and programs, such as programs supported under ESSA, violence prevention programs, nutrition programs, housing programs, Head Start programs, adult education programs, career and technical education programs, and schools implementing CSI or TSI activities under section 1111(d). (ESSA 1114(b)(5))

NA

Optional Component(s) of the Schoolwide Program Plan
Include descriptions for any additional strategies that will be incorporated into the plan.

Describe how the school ensures counseling, school-based mental health services, specialized support services, mentoring services, and other strategies to improve students' skills outside the academic subject areas. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(I))

NA

Describe the preparation for and awareness of postsecondary opportunities and the workforce, which may include career and technical education programs and broadening secondary school students' access to coursework to earn postsecondary credit while still in high school. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(II))

NA

Describe the implementation of a schoolwide tiered model to prevent and address problem behavior, and early intervening services, coordinated with similar activities and services carried out under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. 20 U.S.C. 1400 et seq. and ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(III).

NA

Describe the professional learning and other activities for teachers, paraprofessionals, and other school personnel to improve instruction and use of data from academic assessments, and to recruit and retain effective teachers, particularly in high need subjects. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(IV))

NA

Describe the strategies the school employs to assist preschool children in the transition from early childhood education programs to local elementary school programs. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(V))

NA

Budget to Support Areas of Focus

Part VII: Budget to Support Areas of Focus

The approved budget does not reflect any amendments submitted for this project.

1	III.B.	Area of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Black/African-American	$0.00
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: English Language Learners	$0.00
3	III.B.	Area of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities	$0.00
4	III.B.	Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Teacher Retention and Recruitment	$0.00
		Total:	$0.00

Budget Approval

Check if this school is eligible and opting out of UniSIG funds for the 2023-24 school year.

Yes