Matanzas High School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Matanzas High School

3535 PIRATE NATION WAY, Palm Coast, FL 32137

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.

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.

Provide the school's vision 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.

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
Bozeman, Kristin	Principal	Establish and implement school mission and vision along with all stakeholders. Coordinate community relations and school-wide communication. Supervise and direct implementation of PLC process.
Scott, Joshua	Assistant Principal	Assist with implementation of PLC and school improvement initiatives in particular with the Math and Social Studies Department. Data analysis and reporting. Supervise testing.
Novak, Sara	Assistant Principal	Assist with implementation of PLC and school improvement initiatives in particular with the Science Department. Supervise guidance and scheduling.
Snell, Nancy	Instructional Coach	In collaboration with administration, model and coach for teachers high impact instructional strategies. Collaborate with MTSS Coordinator and Admin to identify and implement interventions with fidelity to target struggling students. Primary responsibility Literacy Coaching.
Terry, Fred	Assistant Principal	Mr. Terry is the Assistant Principal over Facilities and Discipline. In this position he oversees the implementation of discipline procedures and PBIS (Positive Behavior) supports in the school.
Brock, Savannah	Assistant Principal	Ms. Brock is our Assistant Principal for ESE (Exceptional Student Education) and oversees compliance and instructional leadership for our ESE teachers and all of our students with disabilities.
Frys, Adam	Instructional Coach	In collaboration with administration, model and coach for teachers high impact instructional strategies. Collaborate with MTSS Coordinator and Admin to identify and implement interventions with fidelity to target struggling students. Primary responsibility Math/Science Coaching.

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-wide data was first analyzed by the administration and leadership team at MHS during the summer to reflect on our performance and plan for improvement. Additionally, all teachers and staff members engaged in data reflection processes during pre-planning to help with goals for the school improvement plan. The SAC (School Advisory Council) provides input through our monthly meetings. Results from a parent survey created by the SAC committee were also analyzed by the leadership team and provided input for the development of goals, in particular those related to school climate and culture. Our SAC committee consists of teachers, parents, students and community members.

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))

Our Operational Leadership and Learning Support teams meet monthly to analyze school data related to the school improvement plan and make adjustments to action steps as needed. Mid-year the school completes a reflection including input from our SAC committee as to our progress toward goals on the SIP and any needed adjustments are made. This will be in addition to our Professional Learning Community process which will include regular monitoring through data chats.

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	38%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	50%
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)* 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: B 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	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

Indicator	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	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

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

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	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	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

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

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	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*	53	51	50	52	51	51	54		
ELA Learning Gains				49			45		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				39			33		
Math Achievement*	40	42	38	43	35	38	35		
Math Learning Gains				38			19		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				25			11		
Science Achievement*	72	72	64	72	39	40	63		
Social Studies Achievement*	70	65	66	66	38	48	64		
Middle School Acceleration					34	44			
Graduation Rate	94	91	89	94	67	61	95		
College and Career Acceleration	60	50	65	59	61	67	61		
ELP Progress	57	55	45	47			65		

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](https://www.floridacims.org).

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	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	446
Total Components for the Federal Index	7

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
Percent Tested	96
Graduation Rate	94

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	53
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	584
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	96
Graduation Rate	94

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	37	Yes	4	
ELL	55			
AMI				
ASN	79			
BLK	49			
HSP	62			
MUL	60			
PAC				
WHT	69			
FRL	58			

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	31	Yes	3	1
ELL	49			
AMI				
ASN	77			
BLK	39	Yes	1	
HSP	48			
MUL	57			
PAC				
WHT	58			
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	53			40			72	70		94	60	57
SWD	21			13			35	46		12	6	
ELL	29			31			60			53	6	57
AMI												
ASN	74			65			88			68	5	
BLK	35			20			45	56		42	6	
HSP	48			34			68	65		59	6	
MUL	44			35			67	71		53	6	
PAC												
WHT	57			46			77	75		64	6	
FRL	44			37			66	65		52	7	50

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21	ELP Progress
All Students	52	49	39	43	38	25	72	66		94	59	47
SWD	15	38	29	20	28	19	27	33		80	24	
ELL	32	57	42	33	27					100	53	47
AMI												
ASN	75	53		62				85		94	94	
BLK	25	37	31	28	29	17	52	35		88	51	
HSP	45	41	32	38	35	17	59	71		91	55	
MUL	48	57	54	38	43		67	68		88	52	
PAC												
WHT	59	53	44	47	40	31	78	69		95	59	
FRL	42	46	38	34	36	27	61	58		92	52	45

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	54	45	33	35	19	11	63	64		95	61	65
SWD	20	27	14	30	23	11	22	30		90	15	
ELL	11	56	67	25	18		20	50		100	50	65
AMI	40	43										
ASN	50	17		50				56		100	69	
BLK	30	34	23	22	16	10	39	42		93	37	
HSP	59	59	40	34	18	30	62	65		94	59	80
MUL	64	52		18	8		64	63		100	40	
PAC												
WHT	57	44	35	39	19	9	68	69		96	67	
FRL	45	41	27	31	19	12	55	56		94	51	69

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	53%	51%	2%	48%	5%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	43%	56%	-13%	50%	-7%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	41%	51%	-10%	48%	-7%

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

CIVICS						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	*	71%	*	66%	*

HISTORY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	69%	65%	4%	63%	6%

III. Planning for Improvement

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

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

The lowest data component is math, inclusive of both our Geometry EOC (approximately 42% on grade level) and Algebra 1 EOC (45% on grade level). One contributing factor for Geometry was the lack of a permanent teacher for about 150 of our students for the second half of the school year. We have also experienced consistent turnover in teachers in Algebra 1 over the past two years. Another contributing factor for Geometry was the prior year performance of these students in Algebra 1. In addition, our middle schools track students who are on grade level into Algebra 1 in middle school, meaning that the percentage of students who enter Algebra 1 on grade level in math at Matanzas is very low to begin with. Geometry and Algebra have been the lowest performing areas in our school since the 17-18 school year. The percent of students on grade level in Algebra did increase 14% points from 21-22 to 22-23, however, it is still one of our lowest performing areas.

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

Geometry showed the greatest decline from the prior year. One contributing factor for Geometry's decline was the lack of a permanent teacher for about 150 of our students for the second half of the school year. Another contributing factor for Geometry was the prior year low performance of those students in Algebra 1.

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.

Algebra 1 EOC has the greatest gap when compared with the state average (45% for MHS vs. 54% state-wide). One factor that contributes to this gap is that the state average is including students across all grade levels vs. at MHS 9th grade students take Algebra 1 which means the majority of students entering Algebra 1 at MHS are starting the year below grade level in math. We also had a teacher who taught Algebra 1 resign mid-year and were unable to secure a permanent replacement (affecting about 30 students).

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

Our Algebra 1 students on grade level increased by 14 points from 21-22 to 22-23. Our guidance department and district collaborated to ensure correct placement of students into the appropriate form of Algebra 1. Our school offers 3 Algebra 1 scheduling methods (year-long Algebra 1A, year-long block Algebra 1A/1B and year-long Algebra 1) and we worked to ensure students were matched correctly with the instructional model we have found to be most successful. Our school streamlined support for students with disabilities and increased the amount of time ESE teachers were in the classroom supporting students. Our school selected highly effective teachers and assigned them to teach Algebra 1.

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

N/A

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

1. Math Achievement
2. ELA Achievement
3. Performance of SWD
4. Performance of Black/African American Students
5. Reduction in repeat discipline referrals

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 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.

Our data analysis indicated that this group of students has significant gaps in achievement as compared with our overall population. A few key indicators are an ELA on-grade level rate of 21% (compared to 58% for Non-SWD), and a math on-grade level rate of 17% (compared to 47% for Non-SWD).

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

MHS will increase the percentage of SWD on-grade level for ELA and Math by at least 3% as measured by the State assessments.

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

The leadership team will meet quarterly with the PLC teams for English 1, English 2, Intensive Reading, Algebra 1 and Geometry to analyze State Assessment data and the results of district and school-based assessments to analyze progress toward increasing proficiency of SWD.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Savannah Brock (brocks@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.)

ESE and General Education teachers will use the PLC (Professional Learning Community) process to provide support for students who are not working up to grade level standards. ESE teachers will collaborate in PLCs to support General Education teachers in analyzing the results of common assessments to identify students in need of additional remediation. The ESE teachers will then provide remediation to these students through small group instruction.

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

PLCs enable teachers to continually learn from one another via shared visioning and planning, as well as in-depth critical examination of what does and doesn't work to enhance student achievement. Moreover, PLCs that make data a part of an on-going cycle of instructional improvement, establish a clear vision for schoolwide data use, and provide support that foster a data-driven culture have been shown to promote positive change in student outcomes measures.

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 2 - Moderate Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement
List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

The master schedule will be designed to ensure ESE teachers have a limited (1 or 2) number of teachers whose classes they support and that these teachers will have common planning.

Person Responsible: Savannah Brock (brocks@flaglerschools.com)

By When: August 2023

All ESE teachers will use common data collection documents to monitor the progress of students with disabilities so that their PLC and the school leadership team can accurately identify students in need of additional intervention and support.

Person Responsible: Savannah Brock (brocks@flaglerschools.com)

By When: Quarterly

ESE teachers will meet weekly with the general education teachers they support in the subject-area PLC that they support to plan remediation for students who are not meeting grade level standards in math and ELA, as measured by common assessments. The ESE support teachers have the same planning period as one of the general education teachers that they support.

Person Responsible: Savannah Brock (brocks@flaglerschools.com)

By When: Quarterly

#2. 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.

For 22-23, 37% of our Black/African American students were on grade level in ELA as measured by the FAST ELA 9/10 Assessment, compared with 52% of our student population as a whole. In math, 21% of our Black/African-American students were on grade level in math as measured by the Algebra and Geometry EOC, compared with 43% of our student population as a whole. These are significant gaps in achievement which must be addressed.

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

MHS will increase the percentage of Black/African-American students on grade level in ELA and Math by at least 3% as measured by state assessments.

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

As progress monitoring data becomes available from district assessments, state testing, quarterly report cards etc. the leadership team will review the progress of this subgroup specifically. The leadership team will meet quarterly with the PLC teams for Algebra 1 and Geometry to analyze the results of district and school-based assessments to analyze progress toward increasing proficiency of Black/African-American students.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Joshua Scott (scottj02@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.)

In addition to Capturing Kids Hearts and PLC being implemented with all students, MHS will focus tutoring efforts to target students not performing on grade level. MHS will engage students by offering curricula and programs that connect schoolwork with college and career success through dual enrollment, AICE and our CTE Programs of Study. Additionally, MHS will provide intensive, individualized support to students who have fallen off track and face significant challenges to success through our RtI/MTSS process and Grad100 Lab.

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

Black/African-American students have historically lacked access to tutoring and other academic enrichment programs. Black/African-American students are under-represented in advanced coursework at MHS including AICE, dual enrollment and CTE Programs of Study.

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 2 - Moderate 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.

Tutors will provide supplemental instruction to students after school two days a week, with the support of an activity bus to provide transportation for all students.

Person Responsible: Sara Novak (novaks@flaglerschools.com)

By When: September 2023

As progress monitoring data becomes available (grades and results of common assessments) the leadership team will identify students who are in need of academic interventions to refer to the MTSS problem solving team for interventions.

Person Responsible: Nancy Snell (snelln@flaglerschools.com)

By When: Quarterly throughout the school year.

In November/December students will be reviewed to identify students who have not yet had advanced academic opportunities during their school enrollment thus far. Students identified will meet one on one with school staff to discuss course selections for the next year and assist those students in enrolling in coursework for the upcoming school year.

Person Responsible: Sara Novak (novaks@flaglerschools.com)

By When: May 2024

#3. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Other

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.

Based on stakeholder feedback and an analysis of discipline data from the 22-23 school year we identified improving student behavior as an area for improvement. For the 22-23 school year, 23% of MHS students had 2 or more discipline referrals. Students who have repeated discipline infractions, particularly those which result in out of school suspension, in school suspension and alternate placement, have adverse outcomes both in terms of progress toward on-time graduation and a negative overall effect on school climate and culture.

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

Matanzas HS will decrease the percentage of students with repeated referrals for misconduct. For 22-23, 23% of all students had 2 or more discipline incidents (referrals) for the school year. For 23-24 our goal is to reduce the percentage of students with 2 or more discipline incidents (referrals) to less than 20%.

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

Monthly our deans, behavior interventionists and administrators will review discipline data in collaboration with district support staff to identify students in need of behavior interventions. This is in addition to school-wide implementation of Capturing Kids Hearts (CKH) as a Tier 1 intervention.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Fred Terry (terryf@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.)

Capturing Kids' Hearts (CKH) is a set of processes intended to create healthy relationships between adults and youth and to support high-achieving learning environments. It is designed to strengthen students' connection to school by 1) increasing protective factors including positive character development, strong bonds with teachers, and consistently enforced behavioral agreements and 2) decreasing risk factors such as inappropriate behavior and poor social coping skills. Schoolwide implementation of CKH consists of several strategies, collectively referred to as the EXCEL Model strategies, used by K-12 classroom teachers that includes: greeting students at the door with a handshake, asking students to share good things in their lives, having students create a social contract for expected classroom behavior, posing four questions to redirect behavior, using and encouraging students to use non-verbal hand signals to redirect behavior, ending the class on a powerful note or launch.

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

Student resilience and engagement programs, such as CKH, have been shown to have a positive impact on student outcome measures and student/student as well as student/teacher relationship development.

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 2 - Moderate 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 will receive training and set expectations during pre-planning for establishing the practices of CKH in their classroom.

Person Responsible: Fred Terry (terryf@flaglerschools.com)

By When: August 10, 2023

On a monthly basis the deans and behavior interventionists will review discipline referral data to identify students who may need intervention. Students with one or more discipline referral will be screened for an MTSS Behavior Plan.

Person Responsible: John White (whitej@flaglerschools.com)

By When: Monthly.

Behavior interventionists will draft and implement MTSS Behavior Plans for students identified as needing additional behavioral support.

Person Responsible: John White (whitej@flaglerschools.com)

By When: Monthly.

Teachers will implement CKH school-wide behaviors in their classroom including: greeting students at the door, sharing "good things" in their classroom and creating a social contract with each class.

Person Responsible: Fred Terry (terryf@flaglerschools.com)

By When: Ongoing throughout the school year through May 2024.

MHS will apply common procedures in the classroom for all teachers to handle low-level student discipline concerns such as cell phone violations and off-task behavior. Expectations are posted in each classroom for all students and include parent consultation.

Person Responsible: Fred Terry (terryf@flaglerschools.com)

By When: Ongoing throughout the school year through May 2024.

MHS will implement PBIS (Positive Behavior Interventions and Support) to recognize and support positive behaviors across the campus. This includes recognizing students who make improvements to their behavior as well as students who are in compliance with behavior expectations.

Person Responsible: John White (whitej@flaglerschools.com)

By When: Ongoing throughout the school year through May 2024.

#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.

ELA grades 9 and 10 are one of the lowest performing areas at Matanzas High School. In 2023 53% of 9th grade students were on grade level as measured by the FAST ELA Assessment (PM3) and 51% of 10th grade students were on grade level as measured by the FAST ELA Assessment (PM3). These numbers show a significant decline over the past 5 school years.

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

MHS will increase the percentage of students on grade level in ELA as measured by the FAST ELA Assessment (PM3) by 3%.

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

Our leadership team will analyze the result of the FAST ELA PM 1 and PM 2 assessments in addition to school and district-created common assessments in ELA to identify progress toward this outcome.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Nancy Snell (snelln@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.)

Flagler Schools has partnered with SolutionTree to provide high quality and deliberate learning opportunities for teachers through professional learning communities (PLCs). These PLCs are founded on a "focus on student learning", "building a collaborative culture", and a "focus on results." These are achieved with a shared mission and vision as well as shared values and goals, collaborative teams, collective inquiry, a commitment to continuous improvement and an action and results-oriented mindset. Teams work in recurring cycles of inquiry and action research to improve outcomes for the students they serve.

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

PLCs enable teachers to continually learn from one another via shared visioning and planning, as well as in-depth critical examination of what does and doesn't work to enhance student achievement. Moreover, PLCs that make data a part of an on-going cycle of instructional improvement, establish a clear vision for schoolwide data use, and provide support that foster a data-driven culture have been shown to promote positive change in student outcomes measures.

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 2 - Moderate 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 work as a PLC in collaborative teams to create at least one common unit plan and assessment per quarter aligned with the FL BEST standards and their assessment blueprint for the F.A.S.T. Test. They will administer this assessment and analyze the data to drive instruction and identify students in need of additional intervention.

Person Responsible: Nancy Snell (snelln@flaglerschools.com)

By When: Quarterly.

Students identified as needing additional intervention, based on the results of common assessment will receive academic tutoring and other interventions on identified skills through the direction of the ELA Coach.

Person Responsible: Nancy Snell (snelln@flaglerschools.com)

By When: May 2024

Quarterly, all PLC teams will meet with the leadership team for data chats, where the leadership team will monitor the fidelity of implementation as well as analyze data to drive next steps.

Person Responsible: Joshua Scott (scottj02@flaglerschools.com)

By When: May 2024

#5. 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.

Math was our lowest performing achievement area as a school, 45% of students were on grade level in Algebra 1 and 42% were on grade level in Geometry.

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

MHS will improve the percentage of students on-grade level in Math by 3% as measured by the Algebra and Geometry EOCs.

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

We will analyze common assessments, district summative assessments and teacher-created summative assessments to determine student progress toward these goals.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Adam Frys (frysa@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.)

Math teachers will use the Professional Learning Communities (PLC) process to establish a guaranteed and viable curriculum in our Math courses, including identifying key standards, crafting common assessments and using the results of these assessments to identify students in need of both remediation and acceleration.

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

PLCs enable teachers to continually learn from one another via shared visioning and planning, as well as in-depth critical examination of what does and doesn't work to enhance student achievement. Moreover, PLCs that make data a part of an on-going cycle of instructional improvement, establish a clear vision for schoolwide data use, and provide support that foster a data-driven culture have been shown to promote positive change in student outcomes measures.

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 2 - Moderate 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.

Math teachers will work in PLC teams to create at least one common assessment for one unit in the first quarter aligned with the BEST standards and their assessment blueprint for the Algebra 1 and Geometry EOC. They will administer this assessment and analyze the data to identify students in need of additional intervention. The second quarter, the PLC teams will create at least two common assessments for two units that are aligned with the BEST standards and their assessment blueprint for the Algebra 1 and

Geometry EOC. The third quarter, the PLC teams will create at least three common assessments for three units that are aligned with the BEST standards and their assessment blueprint for the Algebra 1 and Geometry EOC.

Person Responsible: Adam Frys (frysa@flaglerschools.com)

By When: Quarterly, throughout the school year.

Students identified as needing additional intervention, based on the results of common assessment will receive academic tutoring and intervention through the MTSS process through the direction of the Math Coach.

Person Responsible: Adam Frys (frysa@flaglerschools.com)

By When: May 2024

Prior to Algebra 1 EOC testing, the math teachers will work together in their PLC teams to develop lessons and snapshot assessments around key standards. They will work together to schedule an 'Algebra Blitz' for students to review previously learned content.

Person Responsible: Adam Frys (frysa@flaglerschools.com)

By When: May 2024

Quarterly, all PLC teams will meet with the leadership team for data chats, where the leadership team will monitor the fidelity of implementation as well as analyze data to drive next steps.

Person Responsible: Joshua Scott (scottj02@flaglerschools.com)

By When: May 2024

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 available for school improvement will primarily be expended toward the salary of instructional coaches and support personnel directly impacting our subgroups. This includes a literacy coach and math/science coach to identify and target interventions to struggling students and improve classroom implementation of high-yield instructional strategies and collaborative structures. Tutoring funding is specifically targeted to meet the needs of SWD and Black/African American students. In addition, positions such as our Graduation Coach, AICE Coordinator, MTSS Coordinator and CTE Coach are utilized to increase enrollment in advanced academic options and college and career acceleration targeted at traditionally underserved populations such as Black/African-American students.

Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE)

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Grades K-2 Measurable Outcomes

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

Monitoring

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

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

Evidence-based Practices/Programs

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

- ◦ Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs meet Florida's definition of evidence-based (strong, moderate or promising)?

- ◦ Do the evidence-based practices/programs align with the district's K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan?

- ◦ Do the evidence-based practices/programs align to the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards?

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

- ◦ Do the evidence-based practices/programs address the identified need?

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

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

- ◦ Literacy Leadership

- ◦ Literacy Coaching

- ◦ Assessment

- ◦ Professional Learning

Action Step	Person Responsible for Monitoring

Budget to Support Areas of Focus

Part VII: Budget to Support Areas of Focus

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

1	III.B.	Area of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities	$0.00
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Black/African-American	$0.00
3	III.B.	Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Other	$0.00
4	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	$0.00
5	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math	$0.00

	Total:	$0.00

Budget Approval

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

Yes