

Baker County School District

Baker County Senior 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	8
III. Planning for Improvement	12
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	19
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	0
VI. Title I Requirements	0
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

Baker County Senior High School

1 WILDCAT DR, Glen St Mary, FL 32040

www.bakerk12.org

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Baker County School Board on 10/16/2023.

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.

Baker County High School's mission is to encourage student achievement, foster appropriate student attitudes, and facilitate academic and workplace achievement.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Baker County High School's vision is to prepare individuals to be lifelong learners, self-sufficient, and responsible citizens of good character.

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
Jacobs, Johnnie	Principal	
Cannon, Steve	Assistant Principal	
Gurganious, Donna	Assistant Principal	
Lewis, Danyle	Assistant Principal	
Rhoden, Angela	Assistant Principal	

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.

School administration collaborates with district administration and services, the School Advisory Counsel (SAC), and school site Professional Learning Communities to assess successes and needs in order to make decisions on how to best serve Baker County High School students. District level administrative support includes the Superintendent of Schools, Executive Director of Human Resources, Executive Director of Curriculum and Instruction, Director of Accountability, Director of Career and Technical Education and Director of Student Services. The Professional Learning Communities include teachers that represent all departments and areas of instruction for BCHS. The SAC for BCHS is made up of stakeholders including administrators, teachers, parents, students and community members. Data from teacher, student and parent surveys are considered in decision making processes when planning for the school year. Guidance and administrative teams collaborate annually to evaluate the pupil progression plan and master schedule. The SIP is presented to the School Advisory Council and the BCSD School Board before approval.

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 school site administration participates in weekly school site administrative meetings and monthly district education leader meetings, faculty meetings and PLC meetings in which progress can be assessed. There will also be quarterly SAC meetings to update stakeholders on progress. Classroom walkthrough and observations are conducted regularly throughout the school year to ensure best practices and pedagogy are being utilized in the classroom. Common benchmarks are used in same subject areas and data analysis are conducted to ensure student learning takes place and necessary corrections are made in the curriculum or teaching practices. School leadership is involved in data chats and make determinations for professional development for staff in order to improve teacher practices. The MTSS & PBIS school based leadership teams meets monthly to evaluate data of academic, behavior and attendance for students.

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	21%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	71%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	ATSI
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)* 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: A
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

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*	46	46	50	46	46	51	48		
ELA Learning Gains				47			48		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				32			39		
Math Achievement*	44	44	38	36	30	38	42		
Math Learning Gains				42			37		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				35			33		
Science Achievement*	58	58	64	59	36	40	60		
Social Studies Achievement*	68	68	66	70	42	48	76		
Middle School Acceleration					32	44			
Graduation Rate	81	81	89	86	59	61	84		
College and Career Acceleration	65	65	65	57	70	67	56		
ELP Progress			45						

* 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)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	60
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	362

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
Total Components for the Federal Index	6
Percent Tested	96
Graduation Rate	81

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	51
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	510
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	96
Graduation Rate	86

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	42			
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	40	Yes	3	
HSP	46			
MUL	66			
PAC				
WHT	63			
FRL	52			

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	33	Yes	1	
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	34	Yes	2	
HSP	54			
MUL	43			
PAC				
WHT	54			
FRL	44			

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	46			44			58	68		81	65	
SWD	27			29			42	37		23	6	
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	29			18			42	45		33	6	
HSP	30			47							3	
MUL	60			45			71	62		73	6	
PAC												
WHT	49			49			59	72		68	6	
FRL	37			37			51	62		53	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	46	47	32	36	42	35	59	70		86	57	
SWD	26	17	15	17	24	24	30	45		91	41	
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	23	28	26	16	32	24	29	46		86	33	
HSP	58	50										
MUL	53	48		38	40		36					
PAC												
WHT	49	50	33	39	43	38	65	73		85	60	
FRL	36	39	31	24	34	32	48	59		81	60	

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	48	48	39	42	37	33	60	76		84	56	
SWD	29	40	29	43	50	53	50	39		81	24	
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	25	37	41	24	31	17	43	50		82	23	
HSP	65	59					60					
MUL	43	45		36	19		73	85				
PAC												
WHT	51	49	37	45	39	39	62	77		85	63	
FRL	42	44	38	37	34	28	55	72		76	48	

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	52%	52%	0%	50%	2%
09	2023 - Spring	41%	41%	0%	48%	-7%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	35%	56%	-21%	50%	-15%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	49%	50%	-1%	48%	1%

BIOLOGY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	58%	58%	0%	63%	-5%

HISTORY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	68%	68%	0%	63%	5%

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.

Grade 9 ELA is the lowest performing area at BCHS. This is due to teacher turnover in the ELA department and a teacher shortages. Two of the three teachers are out of field, but are currently working on completing certification in this area. The transition from the FSA ELA to the progress monitoring assessments may be a contributing factor for the low performance.

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

Grade 9 ELA experienced a 6 percent decline from the previous school year due to the factors listed above.

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.

Grade 9 ELA had the greatest negative gap when compared to the state average at 6 percent below the state average. This is due to the factors listed above.

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

Algebra 1 showed the most improvement. Used a new curriculum (math nation) along with common and benchmark assessments across all subject areas. Data analysis was conducted to drive instruction.

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

We would like to continue to improve on the 90.3% daily attendance rate for students. We would like reduce the amount of total referrals processed from the approximate 1,400 referrals processed in order to have students remain in class.

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

Meet or exceed the state average of proficiency on the 9th grade ELA assessment. Improve the achievement levels on all assessment of the African American and SWD subgroups to be at or above the 41% threshold. Increase proficiency on the Biology EOC to achieve at minimum the state average

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 PBIS team will work to improve overall school culture and environment for all students. The team has been expanded to include more individuals from a diverse academic and non-academic backgrounds. The PBIS team is going to reward students based on Tier 2 successes in areas of academic success and behavior. The

goal is to improve the culture and environment for the entire student body which will positively impact all students and subgroups. Classes have been created to address these students who have not proficient in academic areas to assist students with catching up on missed credits and build resiliency. A school program has been developed for students who have been identified as needing an alternative school setting to be successful to work in small group setting with more intensive one on one interactions with teachers to become proficient and meet graduation requirements. Education Talent Search and Take Stock in Children are two programs that identify students with socioeconomic barriers to successfully complete high school and transition to college.

Measurable Outcome:

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

The MTSS team will work to identify students who are struggling to meet proficiency in the areas of academics, behavior and achievement. The team will work to identify students in the African-American and SWD subgroups to provide the necessary Tier 2 and 3 interventions. The team will identify students who are struggling academically by evaluating the D/F reports quarterly in an effort to reduce the number of students on this list by the end of the school year. The team will evaluate behavior reports quarterly to identify students in these subgroups to ensure that there is not a disproportionate number of discipline referrals for African American students and SWD. Attendance reports are run daily to identify students who are missing school. Students receive 5 day letters, 8 day phone calls and 10 day letters from administration to promote student attendance.

Monitoring:

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

This area of focus will be monitored monthly in meetings involving the PBIS and MTSS teams along with school-based administration team evaluate the progress.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Johnnie Jacobs (johnnie.jacobs@bakerk12.org)

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.)

PBIS and MTSS are evidence based programs that provide environmental and intervention assistance to support students in academics, behavior and attendance.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The PBIS and MTSS models are widely accepted evidence-based best practice models that are proven to be successful across all socioeconomic areas.

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.

Selected teachers are participating in student engagement and question professional development.

Person Responsible: Johnnie Jacobs (johnnie.jacobs@bakerk12.org)

By When: September 30th

#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.

The PBIS team will work to improve overall school culture and environment for all students. The team has been expanded to include more individuals from a diverse academic and non-academic backgrounds. The PBIS team is going to reward students based on Tier 2 successes in areas of academic success and behavior. The

goal is to improve the culture and environment for the entire student body which will positively impact all students and subgroups. Classes have been created to address these students who have not proficient in academic areas to assist students with catching up on missed credits and build resiliency. A school program has been developed for students who have been identified as needing an alternative school setting to be successful to work in small group setting with more intensive one on one interactions with teachers to become proficient and meet graduation requirements. Education Talent Search and Take Stock in Children are two programs that identify students with socioeconomic barriers to successfully complete high school and transition to college.

Measurable Outcome:

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

The MTSS team will work to identify students who are struggling to meet proficiency in the areas of academics, behavior and achievement. The team will work to identify students in the African-American and SWD subgroups to provide the necessary Tier 2 and 3 interventions. The team will identify students who are struggling academically by evaluating the D/F reports quarterly in an effort to reduce the number of students on this list by the end of the school year. The team will evaluate behavior reports quarterly to identify students in these subgroups to ensure that there is not a disproportionate number of discipline referrals for African American students and SWD. Attendance reports are run daily to identify students who are missing school. Students receive 5 day letters, 8 day phone calls and 10 day letters from administration to promote student attendance.

Monitoring:

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

This area of focus will be monitored monthly in meetings involving the PBIS and MTSS teams along with school-based administration team evaluate the progress.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

[no one identified]

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.)

PBIS and MTSS are evidence based programs that provide environmental and intervention assistance to support students in academics, behavior and attendance.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The PBIS and MTSS models are widely accepted evidence-based best practice models that are proven to be successful across all socioeconomic areas.

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.

Teachers are participating in student engagement and questioning training.

Person Responsible: Johnnie Jacobs (johnnie.jacobs@bakerk12.org)

By When: September 30th.

#3. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Teacher Attendance**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 student daily attendance average is greater than the teacher daily attendance average. This data reveals that when teachers are absent, the amount of discipline events increased. It is inferred that this causes a disruption to the learning environment and ultimately to the school culture.

Measurable Outcome:

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

We will increase teacher attendance rates to surpass the student daily attendance rate.

Monitoring:

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

This will be monitored through Skyward reports pulled monthly to review progress.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Johnnie Jacobs (johnnie.jacobs@bakerk12.org)

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.)

Teachers are eligible for perfect attendance bonuses of \$225 which are available quarterly for teachers who worked every day in a 9-week period up to \$900 for the year.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Teachers will have the opportunity to earn bonuses by attending work regularly.

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.

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

#4. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA**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 9th grade ELA scores dropped by six points were well below the state.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Ninth grade ELA scores will meet or exceed the state averages.

Monitoring:

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

A data focused environment has been established by Language Arts instructors by using common benchmark tests to determine students' mastery of standards. Any standards that are not met by 40% of a class will be retaught. Teachers will participate in data chats to review student progress and develop plans that address student deficiencies. Ninth and tenth grade teachers will use state progress monitoring to adapt instruction to student needs.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Johnnie Jacobs (johnnie.jacobs@bakerk12.org)

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.)

Teachers will use common benchmark assessments and progress monitoring.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Teachers will use common benchmark assessments to track students' progress and differentiate instruction based on need.

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.

ELA teachers will identify their students most recent scores and use that data to influence their instruction. ELA teachers will use data from progress monitoring and common benchmark assessments and will participate in data chats based on the results of those assessments.

Person Responsible: Johnnie Jacobs (johnnie.jacobs@bakerk12.org)

By When: The process is already ongoing and will continue through the school 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).

BCHS is in ongoing communication with district officials in reference to different funding options that are available to the school. Title I Director shares available funding opportunities as it relates to open grants and ESSER. The Director of Curriculum and Instruction shares financial resources with BCBS that are available to use towards instructional materials, professional development and equipment. The needs for resources are shared from the faculty and staff to school based administration to create a plan to obtain the needed resources and decide whether the resources can be purchased internally. If the funds are not available internally, communication with the district office and plans are created for purchasing with district funds.