

Flagler Schools

Flagler Palm Coast 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	15
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	26
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	0
VI. Title I Requirements	0
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

Flagler Palm Coast High School

5500 E HIGHWAY 100, Palm Coast, FL 32164

www.flaglerschools.com

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.

As a courageous, innovative leader in education, Flagler County Public Schools will be the Nation's premier learning organization where ALL students graduate as socially responsible citizens with the skills necessary to reach their maximum potential.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Flagler County Public Schools ensures educational success through high expectations and innovative thinking in a safe learning environment to empower students to reach their full potential as responsible, ethical, and productive citizens in a diverse and changing world.

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
Bossardet, Robert	Principal	Lead our faculty and staff as we all work towards supporting student success. Steers our student services team, connects with community stakeholders, and serves as our school's liaison to the district office.
Collier, Stacia	Assistant Principal	Organizes academic systems and structures. Helps create and maintain systems and structures that support MTSS, SWD, ESOL, Graduation Rate, and Credit Recovery.
Kraverotis, Mandy	Assistant Principal	Coordinates data quality and educational equity. Creates and maintains systems to promote student acceleration and targeting student groups through data-based evidence.
Schell, Nick	Assistant Principal	Oversees operations and innovation. Coordinates facility needs and school-based capital improvements.
Thompson, Althia	Assistant Principal	Oversees all aspects of the exceptional student education program at FPCHS.
Gambone, Amy	Other	Coordinates supports for the academic MTSS program. Ensures fidelity of academic interventions and, if necessary, works with ESE to bring students to eligibility.
DeAugustino, Philip	School Counselor	Leads the counseling department and spearheads master scheduling.
Lombardo, Sarah	Instructional Coach	Provide job embedded STEM based support to teachers, including providing professional learning, coaching, modeling, and data analysis.
Moss, Danielle	Reading Coach	Provide job embedded literacy based support to teachers, including providing professional learning, coaching, modeling, and data analysis.
Tincher, Chris	Assistant Principal	Guides our school in resiliency and well being as well as leads our student services team.

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.

Flagler Palm Coast High School gains input from our School Advisory Council at our first SAC meeting of the school year. FPCHS presents data from 22-23 and our preliminary SIP goals to the SAC and then solicits feedback. FPCHS uses this feedback to edit our SIP goals for the 23-24 school year.

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))

FPCHS School Improvement Plan team will meet quarterly to monitor the effective implementation and impact of our SIP plan. At the end of the 1st, 2nd, and 3rd quarters, FPC will use FAST Data, District Quarterly Data, and student qualitative data to gauge our current plan and will make modifications if necessary.

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	Yes
2022-23 Minority Rate	42%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	56%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	TSI
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD)* English Language Learners (ELL) Asian Students (ASN) 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	Grade Level										Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that have two or more early warning indicators:

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

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

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

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

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

Indicator	Grade Level										Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	645	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	276	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	714	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	714	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	538	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	538	
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	318

The number of students identified retained:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The number of students identified retained:

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

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

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

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

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	50	51	50	50	51	51	52		
ELA Learning Gains				51			49		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				33			34		
Math Achievement*	43	42	38	37	35	38	37		
Math Learning Gains				38			26		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				36			20		
Science Achievement*	72	72	64	65	39	40	53		
Social Studies Achievement*	62	65	66	57	38	48	69		
Middle School Acceleration					34	44			
Graduation Rate	89	91	89	90	67	61	90		
College and Career Acceleration	44	50	65	48	61	67	57		
ELP Progress	52	55	45	63			61		

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

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

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index

ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	TSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	59
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	412
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	97
Graduation Rate	89

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index

ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	52
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	568
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	95
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	31	Yes	4	3
ELL	42			
AMI				
ASN	81			
BLK	46			
HSP	53			
MUL	62			
PAC				
WHT	64			

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	53			

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	28	Yes	3	2
ELL	47			
AMI				
ASN	71			
BLK	38	Yes	1	
HSP	49			
MUL	57			
PAC				
WHT	53			
FRL	48			

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	50			43			72	62		89	44	52
SWD	16			15			33	32		5	6	
ELL	27			28			43	31		22	7	52
AMI												
ASN	74			55			91			91	5	
BLK	35			27			62	38		23	6	
HSP	42			41			63	51		43	7	43
MUL	48			37			68	79		53	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	55			48			75	70		47	6	
FRL	44			38			67	54		34	7	45

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	50	51	33	37	38	36	65	57		90	48	63
SWD	16	25	16	17	26	25	38	34		70	12	
ELL	19	49	43	37	56	82	33	15		94	31	63
AMI												
ASN	95	79		50	36			72		93	71	
BLK	32	41	28	23	35	28	44	36		86	31	
HSP	46	48	32	34	36	51	59	45		90	42	60
MUL	61	66	53	31	37		72	74		93	25	
PAC												
WHT	53	52	32	43	40	33	71	64		90	55	
FRL	43	48	32	32	36	31	60	52		88	38	64

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	49	34	37	26	20	53	69		90	57	61
SWD	16	31	29	20	23	19	23	31		74	18	
ELL	31	48	38	19	10			55		80	50	61
AMI												
ASN	79	79		64						91	90	
BLK	36	42	32	20	24	18	35	49		94	43	
HSP	54	50	33	35	21	24	56	76		87	59	63
MUL	50	38	18	30	12		60	84		86	47	
PAC												
WHT	54	49	38	42	29	20	57	72		91	60	
FRL	44	43	34	31	24	20	44	64		88	50	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	51%	51%	0%	50%	1%
09	2023 - Spring	48%	51%	-3%	48%	0%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	37%	56%	-19%	50%	-13%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	48%	51%	-3%	48%	0%

BIOLOGY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	71%	71%	0%	63%	8%

HISTORY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	63%	65%	-2%	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.

In the 2022-2023 school year, FPCHS's Algebra 1 proficiency was 39%. The major contributing factor to this was staffing issues. Two of our Algebra 1A/1B classrooms had several teacher changes throughout the year. These students were also in a supported classroom model. The ESE support teacher also changed several times in these classrooms. These students needed the highest level of instructional support and due to staffing changes, had inconsistent support.

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

In the 2022-2023 school year, FPCHS's ELA grade 9 proficiency declined from 52% proficiency to 48% proficiency. The major contributing factor was staffing changes. In one supported classroom, both the ELA teacher and the ESE support facilitator changed several times throughout this year. These students needed the highest level of instructional support and due to staffing changes, had inconsistent support. Another contributing factor was lack of common and cohesive planning amongst the groups of supported classrooms.

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.

In the 2022-2023 school year, FPCHS's Algebra 1 proficiency was 15% lower than the state. The major contributing factor was staffing changes. Two of our Algebra 1A/1B classrooms had several teacher changes throughout the year. These students were also in a supported classroom model. The ESE support teacher also changed several times in these classrooms. These students needed the highest level of instructional support and due to staffing changes, had inconsistent support. Another contributing factor was lack of common and cohesive planning amongst this group of teachers.

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

In the 2022-2023 school year, FPCHS's Geometry proficiency increased by 14% from the past year. Many of our Geometry classes are supported by ESE support facilitators and these math/ESE pairings worked very well together. These teachers prioritized common planning, created common assessments, and data analysis throughout the year. This focus showed by the gains we made in this year.

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

Attendance is a major EWS concern. In the 2022-2023 school year, approximately 400 FPCHS students missed 21 days or more, making them habitually truant. Attendance has been a historical area of concern since the pandemic.

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

1. ESE student proficiency in ELA and Alg 1
2. African American student proficiency in ELA
3. Overall Algebra 1/ELA proficiency
4. Student attendance

Area of Focus

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

#1. 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.

A review of student performance data over the past five years indicates ELA proficiency scores in 9th grade have declined to below 50% and below the state average. Although the new Florida Assessment of Student Thinking was implemented last year it has proven to be a valid indicator of student performance. Given this trend, our lowest performing students will continue to decline in ELA and Reading, therefore not meeting proficiency standards to graduate high school.

Measurable Outcome:

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

52% of 2023 9th grade students did not meet proficiency on the ELA FAST. This was an increase of 4% of students that did not meet proficiency. For this year, the focus will be on improving student proficiency on Grade 9 ELA by 5 percentage points. This outcome was set because it will place FPC proficiency for 9th Grade ELA above 50%. This will be measured by the progress monitoring performance on state wide progress monitoring assessments.

Monitoring:

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

Students will take 2 progress monitoring assessments in ELA before February of 2024. Results from these assessments will help our school and teachers determine which students need additional interventions or classrooms that need additional educational support.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Danielle Moss (mossd@flaglerschools.com)

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.)

The following strategies will be used to increase proficiency on 9th Grade FAST ELA:

1. Providing professional learning for teachers on explicit instruction through professional learning communities.
2. Providing professional learning for teachers on Secondary Foundational (Reading) Skills

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Explicit instruction was chosen as a strategy for student proficiency on the ELA FAST due to its clear and transparent approach to teaching while establishing strong instructional foundations and managing the student cognitive load. According to John Hattie's Visible Learning for Teachers (2012) direct, or explicit instruction, has an effect size of .6 on student learning.

<https://dataworks-ed.com/blog/2018/07/edi-hatties-visible-learning/>

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.

Implement Explicit Instruction professional learning in the 9th grade ELA professional learning communities.

Person Responsible: Danielle Moss (mossd@flaglerschools.com)

By When: October 2023

Incorporate explicit instructional practices into the classroom instruction in 9th grade ELA classes.

Person Responsible: Danielle Moss (mossd@flaglerschools.com)

By When: December 2023

Monitor the delivery of explicit instructional practices through classroom walkthroughs and student data.

Person Responsible: Danielle Moss (mossd@flaglerschools.com)

By When: December 2023

Repeat explicit instructional professional learning as needed based on student data and classroom walkthrough observations.

Person Responsible: Danielle Moss (mossd@flaglerschools.com)

By When: February 2024

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math**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.

A review of student performance data over the past five years indicates Algebra 1 EOC proficiency is historically below the state average, with the latest data indicating 39% proficiency. Although the new Florida BEST EOC was implemented last year, based on historical data, it proves to be a valid indicator of student performance. Given this trend, our lowest performing students will continue to decline in Algebra 1 and not meet proficiency standards to graduate high school.

Measurable Outcome:

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

61% of 2023 Algebra 1 students did not meet proficiency on the BEST EOC. This was an increase of 9% of students that did not meet proficiency. For this year, the focus will be on improving student proficiency on Algebra 1 by 3 percentage points. We would like to continue our upward trend with Algebra 1 progress. This will be measured by the progress monitoring performance on district-based assessments (CSA-common standards assessments). Our goal is for 60% of students to demonstrate mastery on the CSAs throughout the year.

Monitoring:

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

Students will take 3 common standards assessments in Algebra 1 before February of 2024. Results from these assessments will help our school and teachers determine which students need additional interventions or classrooms that need additional educational support.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Sarah Lombardo (lombardos@flaglerschools.com)

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.)

The following strategies will be used to increase proficiency on Algebra 1:

1. Providing professional learning for teachers on explicit instruction through professional learning communities.
2. Providing professional learning for teachers on using common mathematical language and teaching mathematical vocabulary in context

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Explicit instruction was chosen as a strategy for student proficiency on the Algebra 1 EOC due to its clear and transparent approach to teaching while establishing strong instructional foundations and managing the student cognitive load. According to John Hattie's Visible Learning for Teachers (2012) direct, or explicit instruction, has an effect size of .6 on student learning.

<https://dataworks-ed.com/blog/2018/07/edi-hatties-visible-learning/>

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.

Training provided to math teachers during preplanning on using common mathematical language and teaching mathematical vocabulary in context

Person Responsible: Sarah Lombardo (lombardos@flaglerschools.com)

By When: August 2023

Implement Explicit Instruction professional learning in the Algebra 1 professional learning communities.

Person Responsible: Sarah Lombardo (lombardos@flaglerschools.com)

By When: October 2023

Monitor the delivery of explicit instructional practices through classroom walkthroughs and student data.

Person Responsible: Sarah Lombardo (lombardos@flaglerschools.com)

By When: December 2023

Repeat explicit instructional professional learning as needed based on student data and classroom walkthrough observations.

Person Responsible: Sarah Lombardo (lombardos@flaglerschools.com)

By When: February 2024

#3. 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.

Our Black/African American ESSA subgroup historically underperforms when compared to peers. A review of student performance data over the past five years indicates math proficiency scores have been steadily declining in proficiency. Furthermore, our lowest quartile learning gains have been consistently below 50% and experienced a sharp decline in 2021. Scores increased by 16 points in 2022, however Black and African American students in this same category only rose to 28%. Given this trend, we want to capitalize on the upswing of our lowest performing students and will continue to devote support to this area.

Measurable Outcome:

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

For this year, the focus will be on improving student proficiency on the Algebra 1 EOC by 3 percentage points for Black and African American students. This outcome was set because that would continue the upward trend. This will be measured by the progress monitoring performance on district and state-wide progress monitoring assessments.

Monitoring:

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

Students will take CSAs (common standards assessments) in Algebra I and Algebra 1A/1B. Results from these assessments will help our school and teachers determine which students need additional interventions or classrooms that need additional educational support. Students in 9th and 10th grade ELA will take the FAST PM1 and PM 2. Results from these assessments will help our school and teachers determine which students need additional interventions or classrooms that need additional educational support.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Mandy Kraverotis (kraverotisa@flaglerschools.com)

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.)

The following strategies will be used to increase student proficiency in Algebra 1 and ELA FAST:

1. Continuing our supported classroom model for ELA and Algebra.
2. Providing professional learning for teachers on co-teaching models and effective small group instruction.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

These students may not be identified as ESE, but the benefits of having 2 certified teachers in the classroom provides the opportunity for more targeted support for our African American subgroup population.

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.

Structure master schedule to include supported model classrooms for Algebra 1A/1B and 9th and 10th grade ELA.

Person Responsible: Stacia Collier (colliers@flaglerschools.com)

By When: August 2023

Provide training to teachers participating in the supported classroom model

Person Responsible: Althia Thompson (thompsona@flaglerschools.com)

By When: August 2023

Engage ELA and Algebra 1 teachers in professional learning communities that specifically analyze the data regarding our Black/African American subgroup population and unpack strategies that will help with proficiency.

Person Responsible: Danielle Moss (mossd@flaglerschools.com)

By When: October 2023

Collect and analyze student progress monitoring data to determine effectiveness.

Person Responsible: Sarah Lombardo (lombardos@flaglerschools.com)

By When: February 2024

Continue monitoring implementation

Person Responsible: Stacia Collier (colliers@flaglerschools.com)

By When: March 2024

#4. 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.

A review of student performance data over the last 5 years indicates that students with disabilities are making learning gains and achieving proficiency significantly less than their typical peers. In the last 5 years students with disabilities, overall, scored above 30% points only once; earning 39 percentage points in 2018. Given this trend, students with disabilities are not demonstrating knowledge of standards in our core courses and will struggle to meet the requirements for graduation.

Measurable Outcome:

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

According to the Federal Percent of Points Index, students with disabilities earned 28 percentage points in 2021 and 2022. The ELA indicator showed that only 16% of SWD earned proficiency, which was 34 percentage points below the school average. For this year, the focus will be on increasing proficiency on the ELA FAST by 4% points for Students with Disabilities. This will be measured with state progress monitoring and end of year state assessments.

Monitoring:

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

Students will take 2 progress monitoring assessments in ELA before February of 2023. Results from these assessments will help our school and teachers determine which students need additional interventions or classrooms that need additional educational support.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Danielle Moss (mossd@flaglerschools.com)

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.)

The following strategies will be used to increase proficiency for students with disabilities:

1. For ELA: providing targeted students with phonics and phonemic awareness instruction through Rewards Program.
2. For ELA and Algebra 1: Creating professional learning communities for our supported classrooms that provides support for these teachers on co-teaching models, effective small group instruction, and data analysis.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

For ELA: Our ELA curriculum uses grade level appropriate text, which contains many multisyllabic words, that our many of our students struggle to decode and understand. Evidence-based support for Rewards Secondary shows strong evidence that "the REWARDS multisyllabic word reading strategy is effective in improving students' ability to decode unknown long words."

Regarding our ESE supported classroom model: this model was introduced last year, and although the assessment data does not yet show gains, our teachers and students felt more supported and our ESE students received more targeted instruction. By utilizing PLCs for reflecting upon and refining our practice, our teachers are able to plan for more explicit, targeted instruction.

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.

Identify students needing foundational reading instruction and classrooms that need professional learning on co-teach, small group, supported classroom models.

Person Responsible: Danielle Moss (mossd@flaglerschools.com)

By When: September 2023

Implement the foundational reading instruction for specific students and provide the professional learning for specific teachers/classrooms.

Person Responsible: Danielle Moss (mossd@flaglerschools.com)

By When: October 2023

Collect and analyze student progress monitoring data to determine effectiveness.

Person Responsible: Danielle Moss (mossd@flaglerschools.com)

By When: February 2024

Identify supported classrooms and create a professional learning community for them.

Person Responsible: Sarah Lombardo (lombardos@flaglerschools.com)

By When: September 2023

Hold monthly/quarterly PLC meetings with the supported classroom teachers, focusing on ESE progress monitoring data and strategies for small-group instruction.

Person Responsible: Sarah Lombardo (lombardos@flaglerschools.com)

By When: December 2023

Collect and analyze student progress monitoring data to determine effectiveness.

Person Responsible: Sarah Lombardo (lombardos@flaglerschools.com)

By When: February 2024

#5. 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.

A review of the student average daily attendance for the 22-23 school year was 88%. Research shows that when students are not in regular attendance their academic success suffers and are less likely to graduate on time.

Measurable Outcome:

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

The student average daily attendance rate was 88% for the 2022-2023 school year. This attendance goal focuses on creating a culture of regular attendance which in turn, contributes to improved student success, engagement, and overall school performance.

Monitoring:

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

The daily attendance rate will be monitored by the Student Services Team, the Guidance Department, and the school truancy clerk monthly. Students with excessive absences will receive targeted interventions based on their attendance.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Chris Tincher (tincher@flaglerschools.com)

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.)

The following strategies will be used to increase student daily attendance:

1. Identify students at risk for chronic absenteeism.
2. Provide interventions to support those targeted students that include check-in systems and removing the individual attendance barriers for each student.
3. Emphasize a positive school culture with PBIS, Capturing Kids Hearts, and SGA.
4. Offer wrap-around services like the after-school Youth Center and after school tutoring with provided transportation.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Offering interventions (mentoring, check-in systems, and wrap-around services) that are provided to students needing attendance support have been shown to increase attendance. Increasing positive school culture where students feel connected and valued has been linked to improving attendance because it increases students' feeling of belonging.

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.

Implement the milestone attendance incentive program by monitoring class attendance and providing the incentives.

Person Responsible: Chris Tincher (tincher@flaglerschools.com)

By When: As needed based on milestone attendance.

Identify chronically absent students

Person Responsible: Chris Tincher (tincher@flaglerschools.com)

By When: October 2023

Meet with and provide interventions to chronically absent students.

Person Responsible: Chris Tincher (tincher@flaglerschools.com)

By When: Ongoing throughout the 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).

School administration works closely with school and district finance as well as the Department of Teaching and Learning when building each year's budget. Priorities include instructional materials for identified courses as well as resources , like supplemental materials, to ensure student success in the classroom.