

The School District of Lee County

# Ida S. Baker High School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

---

## Table of Contents

---

<b>SIP Authority and Purpose</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>I. School Information</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>II. Needs Assessment/Data Review</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>III. Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review</b>	<b>20</b>
<b>V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>VI. Title I Requirements</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus</b>	<b>0</b>

## Ida S. Baker High School

3500 AGUALINDA BLVD, Cape Coral, FL 33914

<http://ibh.leeschools.net/>

### School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Lee County School Board on 10/17/2023.

### SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes (F.S.), requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a new, amended, or continuation SIP for each school in the district which has a school grade of D or F; has a significant gap in achievement on statewide, standardized assessments administered pursuant to s. 1008.22 by one or more student subgroups, as defined in the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), 20 U.S.C. s. 6311(b)(2)(C)(v)(II); has not significantly increased the percentage of students passing statewide, standardized assessments; has not significantly increased the percentage of students demonstrating Learning Gains, as defined in s. 1008.34, and as calculated under s. 1008.34(3)(b), who passed statewide, standardized assessments; has been identified as requiring instructional supports under the Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE) program established in s. 1008.365; or has significantly lower graduation rates for a subgroup when compared to the state's graduation rate. Rule 6A-1.098813, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.), requires district school boards to approve a SIP for each Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) school in the district rated as Unsatisfactory.

Below are the criteria for identification of traditional public and public charter schools pursuant to the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) State plan:

#### Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)

A school not identified for CSI or TSI, but has one or more subgroups with a Federal Index below 41%.

#### Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)

A school not identified as CSI that has at least one consistently underperforming subgroup with a Federal Index below 32% for three consecutive years.

#### Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)

A school can be identified as CSI in any of the following four ways:

1. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%;
2. Have a graduation rate at or below 67%;
3. Have a school grade of D or F; or
4. Have a Federal Index below 41% in the same subgroup(s) for 6 consecutive years.

ESEA sections 1111(d) requires that each school identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI develop a support and improvement plan created in partnership with stakeholders (including principals and other school leaders, teachers and parent), is informed by all indicators in the State's accountability system, includes evidence-based interventions, is based on a school-level needs assessment, and identifies resource inequities to be

addressed through implementation of the plan. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as TSI, ATSI and non-Title I CSI must be approved and monitored by the school district. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as Title I, CSI must be approved by the school district and Department. The Department must monitor and periodically review implementation of each CSI plan after approval.

The Department's SIP template in the Florida Continuous Improvement Management System (CIMS), <https://www.floridacims.org>, meets all state and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all ESSA components for a support and improvement plan required for traditional public and public charter schools identified as CSI, TSI and ATSI, and eligible schools applying for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) funds.

Districts may allow schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions to develop a SIP using the template in CIMS.

The responses to the corresponding sections in the Department's SIP template may address the requirements for: 1) Title I schools operating a schoolwide program (SWD), pursuant to ESSA, as amended, Section 1114(b); and 2) charter schools that receive a school grade of D or F or three consecutive grades below C, pursuant to Rule 6A-1.099827, F.A.C. The chart below lists the applicable requirements.

SIP Sections	Title I Schoolwide Program	Charter Schools
I-A: School Mission/Vision		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(1)
I-B-C: School Leadership, Stakeholder Involvement & SIP Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(2-3)	
I-E: Early Warning System	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-A-C: Data Review		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-F: Progress Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(3)	
III-A: Data Analysis/Reflection	ESSA 1114(b)(6)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(4)
III-B: Area(s) of Focus	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(i-iii)	
III-C: Other SI Priorities		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(5-9)
VI: Title I Requirements	ESSA 1114(b)(2, 4-5), (7)(A)(iii)(I-V)-(B) ESSA 1116(b-g)	

Note: Charter schools that are also Title I must comply with the requirements in both columns.

## **Purpose and Outline of the SIP**

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Department encourages schools to use the SIP as a “living document” by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

## I. School Information

### School Mission and Vision

#### Provide the school's mission statement.

The Ida S. Baker High School community will provide students with a challenging comprehensive education using real life applications that will prepare them to be active participants in an ever increasing technological world.

#### Provide the school's vision statement.

Ida S. Baker envisions a dynamic collaborative multicultural school community where students come to learn and become active members in the community.

### 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
Covert, Jami	Principal	Oversee progress towards goal achievement.

#### 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.

Preschool week, data is reviewed that was used to the create the SIP goals by all teachers and staff members with direct involvement in achieving the goals.

#### 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))

Quarterly data chats with individual teachers in tested areas. Quarterly monitoring of student data for those with the greatest needs ie. lowest 25%, students with IEP's and LY students. Quarterly data chats in non-tested areas to support ELA SIP goal. Weekly meetings with school counseling team and MTSS lead to track grades attendance and behavior for 9th grade cohort as well as seniors not on track for graduation. Quarterly, SIP will be reviewed by administrative team, leadership team, and teachers in tested areas, school counselors and MTSS lead to adjust goals and strategies when necessary.

**Demographic Data**

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

<b>2023-24 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	High School 9-12
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2022-23 Title I School Status</b>	No
<b>2022-23 Minority Rate</b>	53%
<b>2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b>	88%
<b>Charter School</b>	No
<b>RAISE School</b>	No
<b>ESSA Identification</b> *updated as of 3/11/2024	ATSI
<b>Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)</b>	No
<b>2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (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)
<b>School Grades History</b> *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: B 2019-20: B 2018-19: B 2017-18: B
<b>School Improvement Rating History</b>	
<b>DJJ Accountability Rating History</b>	

**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	
	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	327	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	112	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	248	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	167	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	249	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	292	
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	261	

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	520

**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*	48	47	50	54	49	51	47		
ELA Learning Gains				50			44		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				38			35		
Math Achievement*	42	34	38	47	33	38	44		
Math Learning Gains				46			33		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				44			27		
Science Achievement*	61	54	64	43	35	40	52		
Social Studies Achievement*	61	58	66	59	40	48	54		
Middle School Acceleration					38	44			
Graduation Rate	96	84	89	96	49	61	94		
College and Career Acceleration	65	65	65	67	60	67	59		
ELP Progress	38	36	45	60			64		

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

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

**ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)**

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	59
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	411
Total Components for the Federal Index	7

**2021-22 ESSA Federal Index**

Percent Tested	96
Graduation Rate	96

**2021-22 ESSA Federal Index**

ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	55
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	604
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	96
Graduation Rate	96

**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	35	Yes	4	
ELL	45			
AMI				
ASN	83			
BLK	57			
HSP	57			
MUL	69			
PAC				
WHT	64			
FRL	56			

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	33	Yes	3	
ELL	45			
AMI				
ASN	65			
BLK	52			
HSP	53			
MUL	64			
PAC				
WHT	56			
FRL	52			

### 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	48			42			61	61		96	65	38
SWD	14			14			21	33		30	6	
ELL	29			24			31	52		56	7	38
AMI												
ASN	83										1	
BLK	45			38			47	59		57	6	
HSP	48			41			56	57		63	7	41
MUL	57			50			85			54	5	
PAC												
WHT	47			42			65	64		68	6	
FRL	46			38			56	59		65	7	36

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	54	50	38	47	46	44	43	59		96	67	60
SWD	19	33	29	20	36	35	11	31		92	27	
ELL	36	54	47	28	36	31	25	43		100	39	60
AMI												
ASN	60	70										
BLK	58	47	38	40	48	40	36	67		94	53	
HSP	53	51	41	43	43	41	40	56		98	60	60
MUL	73	80		46	42		55			100	53	
PAC												
WHT	53	47	35	51	48	49	44	61		94	74	
FRL	50	50	40	43	46	48	36	55		95	56	52

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	47	44	35	44	33	27	52	54		94	59	64
SWD	11	25	25	16	19	9	20	22		85	15	
ELL	30	37	30	29	39	23	30	38		97	42	64
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	37	40	29	47	36	33	53	60		93	38	
HSP	46	41	33	41	29	20	49	51		96	57	66
MUL	42	47		31	31		46	54				
PAC												
WHT	50	47	41	47	36	29	56	55		93	63	
FRL	42	40	27	40	29	27	48	49		91	50	67

### 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	47%	45%	2%	50%	-3%
09	2023 - Spring	48%	46%	2%	48%	0%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	23%	39%	-16%	50%	-27%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	51%	43%	8%	48%	3%

BIOLOGY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	58%	50%	8%	63%	-5%

HISTORY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	59%	54%	5%	63%	-4%

### 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 overall performance was in math with a 45% achievement, which is 2% lower than last year. Geometry showed an increase from prior year - 49.9 to 52%. Algebra dropped significantly from a 39.4 last year to a 23.6. Contributing factors include a change in schedule (time) that impacted scores.

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

The greatest decline in achievement was in Algebra - 39.4 to a 23.6. Contributing factors include a change in schedule (time) that impacted scores.

**Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends.**

The greatest gap was in Algebra - 8% difference. Contributing factors include a change in schedule (time) that impacted scores and created the gap.

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

Biology showed the most improvement, showing growth from 43% to 58% achievement. High Yield strategies to include high order thinking, text dependent questioning and writing to raise achievement. Students worked more utilizing paper/pencil vs. electronic resources.

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

Students with disabilities  
ELA achievement and Algebra Achievement

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

1. Algebra
2. ELA
3. SWD students

#### **Area of Focus**

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

**#1. Graduation specifically relating to Graduation****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 2023 data of the class of 2026, 9th grade graduation status was a concern based on the number of students below a 2.0 GPA and or failure of a course required for graduation. This led to the need to track incoming 9th grade students very early in their high school career. Areas of focus will be GPA, course semester grades and quarterly recognition of 9th grade students meeting graduation requirements.

**Measurable Outcome:**

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

In June of 2024, 85% of 9th grade students (class of 2027) will be on track to graduate with a GPA of 2.0 or higher.

**Monitoring:**

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

Quarterly grades will be reviewed by administration, school counselors, MTSS Lead and social worker. Individual conversations with student and parents will be scheduled and held by Principal. Identify students with disabilities that fall into the ESSA goal for school improvement. At semester GPA and course failures of all 9th grade students will be reviewed. Students below a 2.0 will be referred to Back on Track to practice standards and information not achieved. Students meeting all graduation standards each quarter/semester will have an incentive/reward.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Kaitlyn Cotrell (kaitlynco@leeschools.net)

**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.)

Time for Practice will be implemented into the school day for relearning of subject matter not mastered each quarter/semester.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:**

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

This strategy was chosen to allow students time in the school day and or after school to relearn and master standards that students were not successful with.

**Tier of Evidence-based Intervention**

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

**Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?**

No

**Action Steps to Implement**

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

***No action steps were entered for this area of focus***



**#2. Graduation specifically relating to Graduation****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.

Graduation rate for 12th grade was a concern based on the number of students in 12th grade that have not met proficiency on state assessments to include ELA and Algebra.

**Measurable Outcome:**

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

In June 2024, graduation rate will be 94% or higher as measured by state assessments, GPA and credits earned.

**Monitoring:**

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

Students are monitored by area of need. Students missing ELA graduation requirement are scheduled into Intensive Reading. Students missing Algebra 1 graduation requirement are scheduled into Intensive (Double Block) Math. These students will be provided with bootcamps and intensives leading up to various testing opportunities. Students who are LY less than 2 years are cohorted into a separate reading section to allow them multiple opportunities to meet testing requirements. Students missing credits or below GPA are scheduled into during the day E2020 to make-up missing course work. In addition, students may participate in in Back on Track or bootcamps after school for additional prep. The counselors, MTSS lead, and the Career Coach will meet regularly with these students who are at-risk to ensure they are making progress towards getting on track.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Kristina Morgan (kristinamor@leeschools.net)

**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.)

Time for Practice will be implemented into the school day for relearning of subject matter not mastered each quarter/semester.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:**

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

This strategy was chosen to allow students time in the school day and or after school to relearn and master standards that students were not successful with.

**Tier of Evidence-based Intervention**

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

**Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?**

No

**Action Steps to Implement**

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

***No action steps were entered for this area of focus***

### #3. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

#### Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

For 3 consecutive years SWD have performed below 41% proficiency.

#### Measurable Outcome:

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

In June of 2024, SWD will be at 41% proficiency or higher as measured by state assessments.

#### Monitoring:

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

CT teachers will monitor performance on exemplars in ELA 9th and 10th grade and support benchmarks that need reteaching in learning strategies classes. For those SWD that are not scheduled into learning strategies courses, small group instruction will take place in the regular classroom by CT teacher. Exemplar data review will take place biweekly in PLC's to further support benchmarks that will be focused on in small group instruction.

#### Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Kristina Morgan (kristinamor@leeschools.net)

#### 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.)

Reteaching-practice will be used in small group instruction to target benchmarks that students are not proficient in.

#### Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Small group instruction for reteaching - practice will give a intense focused approach for students who are not proficient on a benchmark.

#### Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

#### Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

#### Action Steps to Implement

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

***No action steps were entered for this area of focus***

**#4. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA****Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Pacing and use of instructional guides with an emphasis on rigor for 9th and 10th grade ELA teams will continue to be a focus.

**Measurable Outcome:**

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

By June 2024, ELA 10th grade proficiency as measured by state assessments will be 51% or higher.

**Monitoring:**

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

Use of pacing and instructional guides will be monitored by Administration through PLC time on Wednesdays. In addition classroom walkthrough data.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Kristina Morgan (kristinamor@leeschools.net)

**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.)

High Yield strategies to include high order thinking, text dependent questioning and writing to raise achievement.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:**

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Strategies that yield a high rate of student achievement.

**Tier of Evidence-based Intervention**

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

**Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?**

No

**Action Steps to Implement**

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

***No action steps were entered for this area of focus***

## #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.

Student attendance shows that excessive absences continues to be a concern for a small population of our students.

### Measurable Outcome:

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

90% of students will miss less than 10 days by June 2024.

### Monitoring:

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

Monitoring will take place by MTSS lead, Social Worker and Administration by using attendance reports from focus and parent communication regarding attendance.

### Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Tamika Massey (tamikarm@leeschools.net)

### Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

PBIS with attendance challenges ie. dog bone school wide challenge.

### Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Positive culture and encouragement proves to have an impact on student performance,

### Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

### Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

### Action Steps to Implement

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

**No action steps were entered for this area of focus**

## 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).

Leadership will review allocated funds with Administration. Funds will be used to purchase The New Art and Science of Teaching and will be used for professional development to support teachers with new strategies to increase student achievement.