Escambia County School District

J. M. Tate 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	11
III. Planning for Improvement	16
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	25
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	0
VI. Title I Requirements	0
VII Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

J. M. Tate Senior High School

1771 TATE RD, Cantonment, FL 32533

www.escambiaschools.org

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.

Tate High School's mission is to create a safe and supportive environment where each student can achieve high levels of learning and become a productive citizen.

Provide the school's vision statement.

In order to create a safe and supportive environment where each student can achieve high levels of learning and become a productive citizen, we will:

- implement consistant rules, procedures, and consequences
- build rapport and lasting relationships with students
- implement a guaranteed and viable curriculum
- involve and communicate effectively with stakeholders
- provide an equitable learning experience for each student
- work in collaborative teams toward the same goal

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
Touchstone, Laura	Principal	Athletics Budgeting/Finance Curriculum and Instruction Faculty and Staff Evaluations and Assignments Instructional Leadership Graduation Outside organizations Personnel and Teacher Retention Professional Development Professional Learning Community Professional Learning Teams School Advisory Council School Improvement School Safety
Long, Deborah	Assistant Principal	ARC Document Shredding Bell Schedule Canvas Chromebooks Distribution/Maintenance Clinic COVID Emergencies Medication Distribution Cram the Van/School Supply Drive Discipline (Deans/Behavior Coaches) Referrals Change of Placements ISS/ILR Court/Delinquency Detention Drug Screenings Duty Schedule AM/PM/Lunch/Class Change ESE IEPs 504 Plans Transitions LEA Gifted Plans Free & Reduced Meals School Contact Fundraising/Vending Inservice Points Lunch Schedule By classroom Mental Health Lessons Student Teacher Training Paraprofessional Scheduling

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		PBIS Random Searches/Wanding Safe Schools School Accreditation School Drills/Evacuations Emergency Plan School Programs/Awards Grade Level Awards/Assemblies School Safety Active Shooter/Emergency Plan Crisis Team Threat Assessment Team Summer School Textbooks Distribution/Maintenance Ordering (work with MM) Volunteers/Mentors/Guest Speakers Wellness Coordinator
McElhaney, Melanie	Assistant Principal	Academics Promotion Scheduling Registration Advanced Placement Dual Enrollment Virtual School Edgenuity Crisis Team DoDEA Grant FTE Reporting Surveys Satsy Report Grades Grade Change Requests Grades entered accurately/timely Grade Posting Report Cards Guidance Services Registration Placement Schedules Transfers Counseling Services Mental Health College/Military Recruitment Literacy Leadership Team Master Schedule NCAA Clearinghouse and Others Parent/Teacher Conferences

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		Records Cumulative Graduation Transcripts Withdrawals Room Assignments School Map Master Schedule RTI School Accreditation School Improvement Plan Team School Programs/Awards Orientation/Open House Senior Honors Night Substitutes Testing/Testing Calendar ACT SAT PSAT State Testing AP Threat Assessment Team
Young, Kelly	Teacher, K-12	
White, Brandy	Assistant Principal	Athletics Booster Clubs Coaches WeatherStem Attendance Child Study DMV Reports Navigator Campus Resident Child Study Team Clubs/Organizations/Extracurriculars Field Trips Crisis Team CTE/Business Certifications Custodians Hire and Supervise Facilities Grounds Athletic Parking Decals Senior Painting Spaces Facility Usage/Rental Keys Door codes

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		Work Orders United Way's Day of Caring - Oct. 1 Security Cameras Capital Outlay Construction Projects Health and Safety Inspections Accident/Incident Reports HVAC Calendar FISH Report Inventory Tagged Assets/Equipment Disposal/Transfer Room Inventories Master School Calendar Night School School Accreditation School Pictures School Programs/Awards Pep rallies Aggie Day Social Media/Website Media Teacher & Student of the Month Threat Assessment Team Transportation District and School Based Fuel Usage
King, Christy	Teacher, K-12	
Snyder, Virginia	Teacher, K-12	
Criswell, Olivia	Teacher, K-12	
Courson, Austin	Teacher, Career/ Technical	
Bailey, Liesl	Teacher, K-12	
Maum, Kristin	Instructional Coach	Provide instructional support and research based strategies to the faculty and staff. Collect, share, and monitor data.

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.

Our SAC includes students, teachers, administrators, parents, and community representatives.

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 SAC and leadership team will meet twice in the first semester and twice in the spring semester. During those meetings, the data from PLTs, district probes, and district Schoolnet tests will inform and guide the instruction and intervention to better meet the needs of our students and ensure student growth.

Demographic Data

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

2023-24 Status	
	Active
(per MSID File)	
School Type and Grades Served	High School
(per MSID File)	9-12
Primary Service Type	K 40 Compand Education
(per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	28%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	45%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification	
*updated as of 3/11/2024	ATSI
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	112
	Students With Disabilities (SWD)*
	Asian Students (ASN)
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented	Black/African American Students (BLK)
(subgroups with 10 or more students)	Hispanic Students (HSP)
(subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an	Multiracial Students (MUL)
asterisk)	White Students (WHT)
	Economically Disadvantaged Students
	(FRL)
	2021-22: B
	2021 22. 5
School Grades History	2019-20: B
*2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	0040.40.5
2022-20 Scribbi grades will serve as an initionnational baseline	2018-19: B
	2017-18: B
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	
	1

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.

Associate billity Common and	2023		2022		2021				
Accountability Component	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	43	40	50	44	42	51	52		
ELA Learning Gains				41			47		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				26			36		
Math Achievement*	42	37	38	47	33	38	41		
Math Learning Gains				56			33		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				52			30		
Science Achievement*	70	58	64	67	33	40	77		
Social Studies Achievement*	63	56	66	71	47	48	70		
Middle School Acceleration					44	44			
Graduation Rate	86	79	89	90	57	61	90		
College and Career Acceleration	78	63	65	75	59	67	61		
ELP Progress		47	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	64		
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No		
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0		
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	382		
Total Components for the Federal Index	6		

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
Percent Tested	98
Graduation Rate	86

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index				
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI			
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	57			
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No			
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1			
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	569			
Total Components for the Federal Index	10			
Percent Tested	98			
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	42						
ELL							
AMI							
ASN	78						
BLK	50						
HSP	54						
MUL	64						
PAC							
WHT	67						
FRL	55						

	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	39	Yes	1								
ELL											
AMI											
ASN	59										
BLK	43										
HSP	50										
MUL	57										
PAC											
WHT	60										
FRL	51										

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	43			42			70	63		86	78	
SWD	18			30			40	36		48	6	
ELL												
AMI												
ASN	58						70			83	4	
BLK	28			21			54	45		65	6	
HSP	29			37			70	57		56	6	
MUL	45			38			72	62		81	6	
PAC												
WHT	47			46			73	67		82	6	
FRL	33			36			63	51		71	6	

			2021-2	2 ACCOU	NTABILIT	Y COMPO	NENTS BY	SUBGRO	UPS			
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	44	41	26	47	56	52	67	71		90	75	
SWD	18	29	16	26	46	41	42	49		74	44	
ELL												
AMI												
ASN	47	53		30				75		90		
BLK	27	37	27	27	46	37	46	50		93	40	
HSP	44	38	31	38	44		45	54		88	64	
MUL	34	40	19	45	56		59	81		85	91	
PAC												
WHT	48	42	25	52	59	59	73	76		89	80	
FRL	33	36	23	40	52	47	61	71		83	68	

	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	52	47	36	41	33	30	77	70		90	61	
SWD	25	39	38	32	38	30	55	46		84	28	
ELL												
AMI												
ASN	71	60		58	50		94			100	70	
BLK	31	37	32	17	28	32	46	44		85	32	
HSP	44	43		37	25		65	59		86	44	
MUL	48	36	33	35	28		92	83		94	71	
PAC												
WHT	57	49	38	48	34	29	81	75		91	65	
FRL	44	43	38	36	28	27	74	65		84	57	

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%	40%	2%	50%	-8%
09	2023 - Spring	45%	38%	7%	48%	-3%

			ALGEBRA			
Grade	Year	School	District	School- District Comparison	State	School- State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	22%	38%	-16%	50%	-28%

			GEOMETRY			
Grade	Year	School	District	School- District Comparison	State	School- State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	55%	48%	7%	48%	7%

			BIOLOGY			
Grade	Year	School	District	School- District Comparison	State	School- State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	69%	56%	13%	63%	6%

			HISTORY			
Grade	Year	School	District	School- District Comparison	State	School- State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	63%	54%	9%	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.

For the ESSA subgroup of students with disabilities, the proficiency score for FAST was lowest for ELA in 22-23 at 10%, as compared to the overall state average of ELA proficiency at 49%. Contributing factors include implementation of new standards with a new testing format, an increased standardized testing schedule, new curriculum to adopt in the classroom, new teachers for both 9th and 10th grade ELA, and student attendance and discipline.

In comparing 2018-19 overall ESSA data for SWD to 2021-22 data, students with disabilities showed a

decrease of 4% from 43% in 2018-19 to 39% in 2021-22 according to ESSA historical data. For our students with disabilities there are multiple factors contributing to the decrease; ELA Achievement Scores decreased by 10% from 28% to 18%, ELA Learning Gains decreased from 40% to 29%, with the lower 25 percentile decreasing from 35% to 16%, Math Achievement score decreased from 37% to 26%, Science Achievement score decreased from 53% to 42%, Social Studies Achievement scores decreased from 56% to 49%. These number compare pre-pandemic to post pandemic.

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

In a comparison from 2021-2022 to 2022-2023, overall proficiency decreased 1.2% in ELA. For the ESSA sub-group Students With Disabilities (SWD), ELA proficiency decreased by 7.9%, and the African Americans sub-group ELA proficiency decreased by 15.1%.

In a comparison from 2021-2022 to 2022-2023, overall proficiency decreased 2.2% in Math. For the ESSA sub-group Students With Disabilities (SWD), math proficiency decreased by 5.2%, and the African Americans sub-group math proficiency decreased by 7.6%.

Contributing factors include inadequate staffing from the district for our students which leads to overflowing classes. Another contributing factor is the inability to recruit highly qualified, specialized teachers due to an extreme teacher shortage.

Schoolwide tardiness and lack of consistent attendance also contributed to this deficiency.

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 greatest gap, when compared to the state average, occurred in Algebra 1 with a proficiency score of 23.5% which was 8.5% lower than the state average of 32%.

Contributing factors include: implementation of new standards with a new testing format, new curriculum to adopt in the classroom, new teachers to Algebra 1, prolonged teacher absence, and student attendance and discipline.

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

The sub-group that showed the highest increase in ELA proficiency are our Multiracial students with a gain of 9.1%.

The sub-group that showed the highest increase in math proficiency are our Hispanic students with a gain of 5.5%. Hispanic students also showed the most improvement in social studies proficiency with a gain of 4.5%.

Science overall proficiency increased by 1.4% compared to the previous year. Improvement is a result of the stability of the staff in this area for Biology and planning together in their Professional Learning Teams. In science, multiple sub-groups showed gains in proficiency: economically disadvantaged students increased by 3%, African American increased by 5.4%, Hispanic students increased by 24.6%, and multiracial students increased by 11.5%.

We have implemented a Professional Learning Community school-wide over the past 2 years, and started the process and implementation of creating Professional Learning Teams in every content area.

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

Our areas of concerns are average daily attendance (ADA) and tardiness.

Although we saw an increase in ADA from 91.68% to 92.09%, we need to focus on students with 5+ more absences per quarter. The data reflected 17.03% of students in Q1 were absent 5 or more times. That number increased to 33.63% by Q2.

Our data shows a continued increase in tardies from quarter 1 to quarter 4. We piloted a program called Focus Attendance Check-in Kiosk linking late check-ins to receiving a referral so we could better track those students. That led to an increase in office disciplinary referrals written for tardies.

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

Remediation for students/ subgroups at risk

Tardiness/ Attendance

Discipline Interventions/ Behavior Management

Class size/ teacher ratio

Area of Focus

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

#1. 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.

Social Contracts

Student of the Month

"Good Things"

School-wide Celebrations/Positive Behavior Quarterly Rewards

Open House

Parent Nights

NCAA Nights

Measurable Outcome:

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

Average daily attendance (ADA) will go from 92% to 94% for a 2% gain for the 23-24 school year. Office discipline referrals will decrease by 2% for the 23-24 school year (4307 ODR in 22-23).

Monitoring:

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

The data metric that will be utilized to monitor ADA will be district generated weekly and quarterly attendance reports. The team will meet quarterly to identify students with 5+ absences, contact parents, conduct Child Study meetings, and/or connect to the school's navigator to create a plan of action. The data metric that will be utilized to monitor discipline will be Focus generated reports. The Behavior Team will meet quarterly to review the discipline data and establish quarterly positive rewards. The team will also look at areas of concern to implement interventions.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Laura Touchstone (Itouchstone@ecsdfl.us)

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.)

- 1.Tate has a multitiered system in place that supports the behavioral practices—from the school wide to the individualized levels ("10 Keys to Behavior" Tier 1)
- 2. School decisions are guided by school wide discipline data. ("10 Keys to Behavior" Tier 1)
- 3. Provide intensive, individualized support to students who have fallen off track and face significant challenges to success. ("Preventing Dropout in Secondary Schools" Tier 2)
- 4. Monitor the progress of all students, and proactively intervene when students show early signs of attendance, behavior, or academic problems. ("Preventing Dropout in Secondary Schools" Tier 2)

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

- 1. According to "10 Keys to Behavior Practice Guide" from The Meadow Center, having a multitiered system in place that supports the behavior practices from the school wide to the individualized levels shows a positive impact on student achievement, behavior, and attendance. (Tier 1)
- 2. According to "10 Keys to Behavior", school decisions guided by school wide discipline data show a positive impact on student behavior and attendance. (Tier 1)
- 3. According to "Preventing Dropout in Secondary Schools", providing intensive, individualized support to students who have fallen off track and face significant challenges to success has a positive impact on

student achievement, behavior, and attendance. (Tier 2)

4. According to "Preventing Dropout in Secondary Schools", monitoring the progress of all students, and proactively intervening when students show early signs of attendance, behavior, or academic problems has a positive impact on student achievement, behavior, and attendance. (Tier 2)

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.

Data: The Behavior team will meet quarterly to review behaviors. The Academic Advisors will meet quarterly to review attendance.

Attendance: The purpose of these meetings will be to identify students for attendance child studies. At these meetings, students missing more than 5 days of school will be identified and referred to guidance and/or the Navigator for an attendance child study.

Behavior: The purpose of these meetings will be to review Office Disciplinary Referrals to identify and act on needs for behavioral interventions. The team will take the data collected to determine the students in need of interventions. Reviewed documents include the number of major vs. minor referrals, the number of referrals written by specific teachers to identify teachers in need of coaching, and high numbers of referrals for specific students to identify needs for behavioral interventions. Action steps for each situation will be identified and assigned to each member of the disciplinary team.

Person Responsible: Deborah Long (dlong@ecsdfl.us)

By When: Quarterly

Communication: Parents are notified each time their student is absent via an automated phone call. Parents are contacted when a student receives an office discipline referral. As part of the minor referral process, teachers are asked to contact parents. At the beginning of the school-year, teachers are asked to send home post cards to random students with positive affirmations.

Teachers are required to have a syllabus that is signed by parents and students at the beginning of the school-year. The syllabus outlines the attendance and behavioral expectations.

Teachers utilize FOCUS Messenger, email, Canvas, callouts, and personal calls home to provide information and feedback regarding attendance and behavior (positive and negative).

The Tate High School Website stays updated to keep stakeholders abreast of current events and activities. Our goal is to create a transparent and inclusive environment.

Person Responsible: Laura Touchstone (Itouchstone@ecsdfl.us)

By When: Quarterly

Positive Behavior: A Student of the Month is selected based on being a representative of that month's specific character trait.

Quarterly celebrations are held based on established discipline and attendance criteria.

Person Responsible: Deborah Long (dlong@ecsdfl.us)

By When: Quarterly

Professional Development: Professional development was provided on Capturing Kids' Hearts. Over the summer, professional development was presented on Classroom Management & Building Positive

Relationships with Students, at the school level. Building a social contract was modeled for teachers during pre-planning. Teachers new to Tate received specified training on classroom management and establishing a positive classroom environment. All teachers will receive state mandated De-escalation Training. Select staff members have received Safety Care Training.

Person Responsible: Laura Touchstone (Itouchstone@ecsdfl.us)

By When: Annually

#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.

Achievement for Students with Disabilities in Algebra 1 has not reached 41% proficiency this past year and shows deficiencies in the following subgroups based on the 2022-2023 FAST scores: Students with Disabilities (13.3%), Economically Disadvantaged (18.9%), African American/Black (16.2%), Hispanic (31%), Multiracial (29.2%).

Measurable Outcome:

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

Algebra 1 proficiency for SWD will go from 13.3% proficiency on the 2023 FAST Algebra 1 PM3 to 41% or higher on the 2024 FAST Algebra 1 PM3 school-wide.

Monitoring:

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

Common Formative Assessments, PM 1, and PM2 data will be used to identify which SWD need additional interventions. Interventions will be provided by classroom teachers and the instructional coach; additionally, interventions will be monitored by administrative walk-throughs.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Laura Touchstone (Itouchstone@ecsdfl.us)

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.)

Student interventions will be determined by classroom teachers during their weekly PLT meetings. Additional strategies will be provided by the ESE Co-teachers, district's Secondary Math Instructional TSA, and the school's instructional coach. ("Visible Learning", John Hattie)

Teachers have common planning in order to collaborate on the creation of common formative assessments, analysis of data from the common formative assessments, lesson plans, interventions, and extensions. ("Learning by Doing", Dufour, et al)

Ninth grade students who scored a level 2 on the previous year's FAST Mathematics PM3 were placed in an Algebra 1A class as well as an Algebra 1 class. ("Raising the Bar and Closing the Gap", Mike Mattos)

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The district math specialist and instructional team has attended the FL BEST Mathematics conference and is implementing research-based strategies to support student growth specific to mathematic areas of need. Research supports that students who scored below proficient on the math EOC need intensive math interventions. The students identified as level 2 will receive math interventions in their Algebra 1A class to support/supplement their grade level instruction received in the Algebra 1 class. These classes are scheduled strategically so that these students have a math class each day.

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.

Common Formative Assessment and PM 1 and PM 2 data will be analyzed to establish need for intervention and extension. Teachers will analyze the data within their PLT meetings and plan data chats with students. Students will track their progress using tracking logs. Parents receive Canvas alerts when teachers update scores from CFAs and other assessments. This process is ongoing throughout the school year. PLT meetings are conducted weekly (and tracked through a calendar), meeting logs are updated weekly, administrators and instructional coach conduct walk-throughs and visit PLT meetings to provide feedback and support. Co-teachers are a part of the PLT and monitor, analyze, and plan based on the ESE student assessment results; they also ensure that students are receiving their accommodations in order to support learning growth.

Person Responsible: Laura Touchstone (Itouchstone@ecsdfl.us)

By When: Throughout the school year, the instructional coach and administrative team will work with the PLTs to analyze and evaluate common formative assessment data, progress monitoring, as well as student progress.

#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.

Achievement for Students with Disabilities in ELA has not reached 41% proficiency this past year and shows deficiencies in the following subgroups based on the 2022-2023 FAST scores: Students with Disabilities (10%), Economically Disadvantaged (33.4%), African American/Black (26.1%), Hispanic (28.6%), Multiracial (43.1%).

Measurable Outcome:

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

ELA proficiency for SWD will go from 10% proficiency on the 2023 FAST ELA PM3 to 41% or higher on the 2024 FAST ELA PM3.

Monitoring:

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

Common Formative Assessments, PM 1, and PM2 data will be used to identify which SWD need additional interventions. Interventions will be provided by classroom teachers and the instructional coach; additionally, interventions will be monitored by administrative walk-throughs.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Laura Touchstone (Itouchstone@ecsdfl.us)

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.)

Student interventions will be determined by classroom teachers during their weekly PLT meetings. Additional strategies will be provided by the ESE Co-teachers, district's Secondary ELA Instructional TSA, and the school's instructional coach. ("Visible Learning", John Hattie)

Teachers have common planning in order to collaborate on the creation of common formative assessments, analysis of data from the common formative assessments, lesson plans, interventions, and extensions. ("Learning by Doing", Dufour, et al)

All students who scored a Level 1 and/or 2 (depending on the matrix) on the previous year's PM3 were scheduled into an Intensive Reading class in addition to their grade level ELA class. SWD are scheduled into an ELA class with a co-teacher. ("Raising the Bar and Closing the Gap", Mike Mattos)

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Teacher collaboration is proven to support student learning and teacher growth. It facilitates the sharing of best practices, identification of essential standards, and analysis of student strengths and weaknesses for the purpose of improving student achievement.

Research supports that students who scored below proficient on the ELA FAST PM3 need intensive ELA interventions. The students identified as level 1 or 2 will receive Reading interventions in their Intensive Reading class to support/supplement their grade level instruction received in the ELA 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 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.

Common Formative Assessment and PM 1 and PM 2 data will be analyzed to establish need for intervention and extension. Teachers will analyze the data within their PLT meetings and plan data chats with students. Students will track their progress using tracking logs. Parents receive Canvas alerts when teachers update scores from CFAs and other assessments. This process is ongoing throughout the school year. PLT meetings are conducted weekly (and tracked through a calendar), meeting logs are updated weekly, administrators and the instructional coach conduct walk-throughs and visit PLT meetings to provide feedback and support. Co-teachers are a part of the PLT and monitor, analyze, and plan based on the ESE student assessment results; they also ensure that students are receiving their accommodations in order to support learning growth.

Person Responsible: Laura Touchstone (Itouchstone@ecsdfl.us)

By When: Throughout the school year, the instructional coach and administrative team will work with the PLTs to analyze and evaluate common formative assessment data, progress monitoring, as well as student progress.

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).

Funding allocations for Title I funds are based on survey 3 poverty data. Schools receive these allocations in the spring and work with Title I and the level directors to determine how those funds are utilized. Title I schools also receive additional funding for low income students to support parent involvement. UniSIG allocations are based on school grade and overall Federal Index rates and are received in late summer. The schools work with the School Transformation Office (STO) and level directors to determine the usage of these funds to maximize impact on student achievement. Both Title I and UniSIG are aligned so there are no resource duplications between these two main school improvement funding sources. The Human Resource Department works with Budgeting, Finance, Title I, STO, and Executive staff to review staffing to ensure schools in need have staffing that reflects the need of the school. Title I, UniSIG, Reading Allocation, ESSER, and SAI funding sources are utilized to add supplemental positions to meet the needs of schools and align to state and district goals. School Improvement funding allocations are also utilized to pay staff to attend planning sessions and professional development sessions with the Professional Development Department and STO based on input from BSI and the district. The district identifies resources for coaching and planning support through the level directors, School Transformation Office, Title I, and Professional Development Department. Schools are tiered based on need including school grade, overall federal index, graduation rates, and ESSA subgroup data. Supplemental resources in addition to the district purchased core resources are reviewed based on the school need and approved for purchase utilizing school improvement funding and SAI funding. The district has also begun to utilize Canvas as the LMS to help support resource allocation to include benchmark aligned lessons, professional development, and content training for schools. Additional support that is identified by quarterly meetings with schools and monthly meetings with the BSI team will be supported through the LMS to ensure school needs and district resources are being appropriately allocated for the 2023-2024 school year.