

Leon County Schools

James Rickards 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	9
III. Planning for Improvement	13
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	18
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	0
VI. Title I Requirements	18
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	19

James Rickards High School

3013 JIM LEE RD, Tallahassee, FL 32301

<https://www.leonschools.net/rickards>

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 mission of James S. Rickards High School is to produce graduates with skills and competencies to succeed on local, state, national, and international levels and who are responsible, self-supporting, and productive members of our society.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The vision for James S. Rickards High School is to provide students with a caring, supportive learning environment that allows them to reach their maximum potential through quality programs, instruction and experiences.

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
Cook, Douglas	Principal	Mr. Cook develops standardized curricula, assesses teaching methods, monitors student achievement, encourages parent involvement, revises policies and procedures, administers the budget, hires and evaluates staff, and oversees facilities.
Barnes, Deborah	Assistant Principal	Assistant Principal for Curriculum: supervises the academic program under direction of the Principal. The AP for curriculum works with and coordinates the efforts of the academic Department Chairs and Math and Reading Interventionists to monitor and facilitate the academic progress of all students.
Coward, Chris	Assistant Principal	Assistant Principal of Attendance and Facilities: Assist the school principal in overall administration of instructional program and campus level operations, monitors student attendance and prepares reports and supervises the daily function of the school building.
Striplin, Sam	Assistant Principal	Assistant Principal of Student Affairs: Assist the school principal in overall administration of instructional program and campus level operations and coordinates assigned student activities and services.
Jones, Terraca	School Counselor	Chair of Guidance Department: Supervise guidance staff and delegates assignments, meeting the academic, career, and personal/social development of all students. Coordinate course and summer registration period along with the school counseling program
Mitchell, Altovise	Math Coach	Provides instructional support to Math teachers and students by co-teaching, mentoring and modeling in classrooms. Provides support in continual assessment development and the collection, management, and analysis of data.
Ross, Lisa	Reading Coach	Provides instructional support to all reading and ELA teachers and students by co-teaching, mentoring, and modeling in classrooms. Provides support for continual assessment development and the collection, management, and analysis of data.
Williams, Victoria	Instructional Coach	Provides instructional support to all reading, ELA teachers, IB teachers and students by co-teaching, mentoring, and modeling in classrooms. Provides support for continual assessment development and the collection, management, and analysis of data.

Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Development

Describe the process for involving stakeholders (including the school leadership team, teachers and school staff, parents, students (mandatory for secondary schools) and families, and business or community leaders) and how their input was used in the SIP development process. (ESSA 1114(b)(2))

Note: If a School Advisory Council is used to fulfill these requirements, it must include all required stakeholders.

Stakeholders are an essential component of the learning community and provide feedback towards the School Improvement Process (SIP). Their input is provided through the School Advisory Council (SAC) where components of the SIP are shared along with data to support the decisions made for continuous improvement. During the SAC meetings, teachers, parents, students, and community business partners vote upon the components of the SIP and come to a consensus on additional action steps needed to support student achievement.

SIP Monitoring

Describe how the SIP will be regularly monitored for effective implementation and impact on increasing the achievement of students in meeting the State’s academic standards, particularly for those students with the greatest achievement gap. Describe how the school will revise the plan, as necessary, to ensure continuous improvement. (ESSA 1114(b)(3))

The SIP will be monitored regularly by the curriculum leadership team as we use the assessment plan to monitor student achievement and surveys to gather feedback from stakeholders to plan for ongoing professional development, family engagement opportunities, and adjustments to student interventions.

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	94%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	94%
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: C 2019-20: B 2018-19: B 2017-18: C
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review

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

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

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	37	51	50	37	55	51	37		
ELA Learning Gains				44			33		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				32			19		
Math Achievement*	29	45	38	25	36	38	23		
Math Learning Gains				40			21		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				47			28		
Science Achievement*	77	65	64	63	47	40	56		
Social Studies Achievement*	72	77	66	66	46	48	69		
Middle School Acceleration					40	44			
Graduation Rate	83	89	89	95	67	61	96		
College and Career Acceleration	48	61	65	47	75	67	43		
ELP Progress	34	45	45	61			42		

* 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	54
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	380
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	96
Graduation Rate	83

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	51
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	557
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	94
Graduation Rate	95

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	40	Yes	4	
ELL	37	Yes	1	
AMI				
ASN	97			
BLK	51			
HSP	58			
MUL	43			
PAC				
WHT	78			

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	48			

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	41			
AMI				
ASN	92			
BLK	47			
HSP	54			
MUL	43			
PAC				
WHT	64			
FRL	45			

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	37			29			77	72		83	48	34
SWD	21			17			67	53		7	6	
ELL	17			26							4	34
AMI												
ASN	95									96	3	
BLK	27			24			69	70		38	6	
HSP	43			34			89	70		57	7	29
MUL	40			45							2	

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	64			58			91			83	5	
FRL	26			26			77	68		36	7	27

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	37	44	32	25	40	47	63	66		95	47	61
SWD	18	24	19	16	19	28	43	58		92	15	
ELL	24	52	45	20	45							61
AMI												
ASN	92	76								100	100	
BLK	29	40	32	24	38	49	62	64		94	42	
HSP	41	49	31	33	50			85		92	42	67
MUL	35	36		32	38					100	15	
PAC												
WHT	63	64		43	50		64			96	65	
FRL	26	37	31	21	36	45	57	63		93	32	57

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	37	33	19	23	21	28	56	69		96	43	42
SWD	21	25	15	21	30	40	60	71		93	3	
ELL	19	27		27	42							42
AMI												
ASN	86	61								100	100	
BLK	28	28	19	20	20	29	61	67		96	36	
HSP	43	40	21	26	23					100	67	41
MUL	44	36		21	7							
PAC												
WHT	73	41		57	57			73		95	68	
FRL	23	24	19	17	18	21	52	66		95	32	

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	33%	51%	-18%	50%	-17%
09	2023 - Spring	37%	50%	-13%	48%	-11%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	24%	58%	-34%	50%	-26%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	40%	58%	-18%	48%	-8%

BIOLOGY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	83%	65%	18%	63%	20%

HISTORY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	74%	75%	-1%	63%	11%

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.

According to the 2022–2023 Spring BEST data, only 23% of students were proficient in Algebra 1. When compared to the 2021–2022 FSA state results, there was a 7-percentage point decrease in Algebra 1, from 30% to 23%. The contributing factor for this year's low performance can be attributed to a teacher shortage because the students in Algebra 1B did not have a full-time teacher until the second nine weeks of school. Another contributing factor would be the lack of consistency in implementing differentiated instruction and understanding the new BEST standards in the classroom.

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

According to the 2022–2023 Spring BEST data, only 23% of students were proficient in Algebra 1. When compared to the 2021–2022 FSA state results, there was a 7-percentage point decline in Algebra 1, from 30% to 23%. The contributing factor for this year's low performance can be attributed to a teacher shortage because students in Algebra 1B did not have a full-time teacher until the second nine weeks of school. Another contributing factor would be the lack of student attendance and the standards-aligned instruction in the classroom.

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.

According to the 2022–2023 Spring BEST data, only 23% of students were proficient in Algebra 1. Compared to the state average of 59%, our student performed 36% below the state average in Florida. The contributing factor for this year's low performance can be attributed to a teacher shortage. Many students enrolled in Algebra 1B did not have a full-time teacher until the second nine weeks of school. Another contributing factor would be the lack of student attendance and standards-aligned instruction in the classroom.

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

According to the 2022–2023 Spring BEST data, 40% of students were proficient in geometry. When compared to the 2021–2022 FSA state results, there was an 18-percentage point increase in geometry, from 40% to 22%. Implementing data-driven instruction contributed to the improvement of this content area. Teachers and students understood their data by creating goals throughout the year for each progress monitor.

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

According to the EWS data, the number of Level 1 students in math and student attendance well below 90 percent are potential areas of concern.

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

Performance of Students with Disabilities
Student Attendance
Performance in Math

Area of Focus

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

#1. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Early Warning System**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

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

Student attendance has not fully rebounded to pre-pandemic levels. Lack of motivation and parental involvement with respect to student attendance has caused nearly a doubling of chronic student absenteeism. Post-pandemic, average daily student attendance was nearly 90%, compared to only 81% last school year.

Measurable Outcome:

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

James S. Rickards will increase the average daily attendance rate for this school 81.9% to 87.5% as reported on the end-of-the year average daily attendance report.

Monitoring:

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

This Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome by having a designated committee monitor student attendance reports on a weekly basis to provide early interventions so students do not accumulate excessive absences.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Chris Cowart (cowartc@leonschools.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.)

Family engagement

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Family engagement in schools contributes to positive student outcomes, including improved child and student achievement, decreased disciplinary issues, improved attendance, improved parent-teacher and teacher-student relationships, and an improved school environment.

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 individuals who will serve on the Attendance Review Committee. Based on this, the committee will be able to closely monitor student attendance and develop attendance incentive programs.

Person Responsible: Chris Cowart (cowartc@leonschools.net)

By When: Weekly, Monthly, Ongoing

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

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

Data shows that the subgroup of students with disabilities underperformed, receiving 33% of federal index points, which is below the 41% needed to meet state performance levels.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Rickards High School will increase the federal index percentage from 33% to 41% for the underperforming subgroup, students with disabilities, on the 2024 state assessment.

Monitoring:

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

The underperforming subgroup will adhere to progress monitoring with intervention-specific assessments to make adjustments to prescriptive interventions.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Chris Cowart (cowartc@leonschools.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.)

Differentiated instruction will be used to meet the specific needs of the underperforming subgroup.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

In the journal article "Teachers and differentiated instruction," the study concluded that, given the increasing diversity of the student body, teachers are called to appropriately address students' various learning needs by means of differentiated instruction (DI).

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.

Enhance and provide additional support in the classroom to provide opportunities for small group instruction to properly implement differentiated instruction.

Person Responsible: Chris Cowart (cowartc@leonschools.net)

By When: Ongoing

#3. 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.

Our main area of focus will be to increase the passing score on the Algebra 1 End of Course Exam from 23% to 33%. It is imperative that our students meet their graduation requirement in the Algebra 1 assessment. In comparison to 2021-2022 and 2022-2023, a decline in our student graduation requirement from 95% to 83% means we must focus on the number of students who need their Algebra 1 testing requirement, which will increase our graduation rate.

Measurable Outcome:

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

With the implementation of standard-aligned instruction, our goal is for an additional 10-percentage point gain with Algebra 1 students, from 23% to 33%, scoring at or above grade level in Algebra 1 on the 2023–2024 state assessment by June 2024.

Monitoring:

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

Teachers will monitor student progress by analyzing daily work samples, assessing grades earned on assessments, and providing daily feedback.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Altovise Mitchell (mitchella2@leonschools.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.)

Our school will utilize the evidence-based strategy "Standards-Aligned Instruction", by supporting teachers in executing lessons based on the standards and learning targets and ensuring that all student products and teaching techniques are aligned to the intended standards. After collaborative planning of standards, teachers will deliver planned lessons to guide students through the demands of the standards and learning targets. Students will show evidence of mastering the lesson objective(s) through their work samples and tasks.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Standards-aligned instruction will ensure that teachers are planning effective lessons according to B.E.S.T. standards and district pacing guides, thereby improving student academic achievement. This will be monitored through quarterly common assessments and district benchmark assessments.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

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

Teachers will engage in weekly collaborative planning to plan for end products for targeted Algebra 1 and Geometry benchmarks. Based on the weekly collaborative planning opportunities, teachers will develop and execute lessons and assessments that are benchmark-aligned.

Person Responsible: Altovise Mitchell (mitchella2@leonschools.net)

By When: Ongoing

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).

A team of Stakeholders reviewed academic, behavioral, and attendance data, both from EOY 2022 and 2023, and ongoing progress monitoring. Stakeholders determined areas of needed improvement for the current school year as well as trends that have developed over the past three to five years in specific grade levels, content areas, and underperforming subgroups. As the school improvement goals were established, the team determined that within the comprehensive needs assessment—how Title I dollars should be spent to best support the indicated areas of concern.

Title I Requirements

Schoolwide Program Plan (SWP) Requirements

This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A SWP and opts to use the SIP to satisfy the requirements of the SWP plan, as outlined in the ESSA, Public Law No. 114-95, § 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

Provide the methods for dissemination of this SIP, UniSIG budget and SWP to stakeholders (e.g., students, families, school staff and leadership and local businesses and organizations). Please articulate a plan or protocol for how this SIP and progress will be shared and disseminated and to the extent practicable, provided in a language a parent can understand. (ESSA 1114(b)(4))

List the school's webpage* where the SIP is made publicly available.

Dissemination protocol includes: availability on the school website(<https://www.leonschools.net/rickards>), hard copies in the front office, during monthly Community Meetings by request, SIP goals and progress shared at Title 1 parent engagement night, and evaluated at informal stakeholder meetings both during and after school hours throughout the school year.

Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission, support the needs of students and keep parents informed of their child's progress.

List the school's webpage* where the school's Family Engagement Plan is made publicly available. (ESSA 1116(b-g))

JSRHS uses a variety of means to support strong communications with stakeholders. A weekly message via listserv is shared with stakeholders to update them regarding vital information; the website has updated events and calendars; surveys are used regularly for stakeholder input; classroom newsletters, flyers, and group messages are ongoing; and parent engagement events are planned monthly.

Describe how the school plans to strengthen the academic program in the school, increase the amount and quality of learning time and help provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum. Include the Area of Focus if addressed in Part III of the SIP. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)ii)

Given student needs across grade levels, our staff will consistently implement differentiated instruction by using supplemental units, technology, instructional materials, and professional development to increase proficiency on state assessments in 2024 by 5% in each area. Resource teachers in each content area will focus on modeling in the classroom, lesson planning, data reviews with teachers, school-wide communication of family engagement events, and small group instruction with students identified as being within an underperforming subgroup. Accountability measures are used to ensure students receive consistent learning opportunities.

If appropriate and applicable, describe how this plan is developed in coordination and integration with other Federal, State, and local services, resources and programs, such as programs supported under ESSA, violence prevention programs, nutrition programs, housing programs, Head Start programs, adult education programs, career and technical education programs, and schools implementing CSI or TSI activities under section 1111(d). (ESSA 1114(b)(5))

JSRHS's school improvement plan is developed in coordination and integration with the state F.T.E. guidelines, Leon County-supported materials, instructional guides, and assessments in alignment with benchmarks outlined in the BEST standards.

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: Positive Culture and Environment: Early Warning System	\$0.00
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities	\$0.00
3	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.

No