Cedar Key High School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Cedar Key High School

951 WHIDDON AVE, Cedar Key, FL 32625

http://www.levyk12.org/schools

School Board Approval

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

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.

Cedar Key School, in conjunction with the community, will provide an education for our students that will encourage them to become academically proficient, life-long learners, skilled communicators and problem-solvers, and productive citizens of their community.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Cedar Key School's vision is for all students to graduate career and college ready, possessing the skills for future success.

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
Slemp, Joshua	Principal	The principal works with the Lead Team to drive the educational plan of the school. The principal develops Lead Team members into School Improvement leaders: they study data, help assess progress towards goals, make course corrections, help implement change, and serve as liaisons between the faculty and the administration for open communication regarding school initiatives. principal conducts school improvement professional development sessions and holds regular data chats with individual teachers, teacher groups, and students. The principal implements, monitors, and makes adjustments to all school improvement initiatives.
Webb, Jeffrey	Dean	Mr. Jeffrey Webb is the Dean of Students; he supports the academic goals as well as the attendance and behavior goals of this SIP. Mr. Webb teaches math classes in addition to serving as dean, and he helps lead the math department in setting goals and implementing math initiatives.
Adams, Lauren	Reading Coach	Lauren, as the school's reading coach, is responsible for supporting ELA goals. She provides professional development, coaches and models in classes, and helps organize reading interventions across the grade levels.
Bishop, Kim	Math Coach	Kim is the school's middle school math teacher and part-time math coach;she is responsible for supporting math goals. She provides professional development, coaches and models in classes, and helps the school increase math achievement.
Andrews, Kearston	Teacher, K-12	Kearston is the fourth and fifth grade math and science teacher on staff and leads the elementary teachers in working toward our ELA and math goals. She attends district meetings on math initiatives and shares the information and training with our staff.

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Noyes, Kim	Teacher, ESE	Kim helps support the needs of our SWD population to help us meet our school goals.
Crosby, Jessica	Teacher, K-12	Jessica is our AVID Site Coordinator and serves as the lead member of our AVID Site Team. The AVID Site Team drives the AVID program at Cedar Key School and helps the faculty implement AVID strategies that are used for this SIP.

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.

CKS involves all of our stakeholders (teachers, staff, parents, SAC Members and community leaders). We involve the stakeholders in lead team, faculty meetings, SAC Meetings, the Annual Title I Meetings, approval of the CNA. We adjust these plans with feedback from these stakeholders. We do quarterly data chat meetings with students to go over their smart goals for every subject area.

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))

We will continue to monitor the impact of the SIP with the review of student data in all subject areas after every diagnostic that is given through iReady and IXL. We will also utilize LIA data to measure the effectiveness of the SIP. SIP goals will also be monitored through frequent classroom walkthroughs as well as MTSS monitoring using Branching Minds, Lead Team and faculty meetings.

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)	Combination School PK-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	Yes
2022-23 Minority Rate	9%

2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	100%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	N/A
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) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: A 2019-20: B 2018-19: A 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	3	0	2	0	0	2	4	3	14
One or more suspensions	0	2	0	3	1	0	1	1	1	9
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	2	1	0	2	0	0	5
Course failure in Math	0	0	2	0	0	2	0	1	0	5
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	3	0	1	1	3	1	9
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	3	0	1	1	3	1	9

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	4	3	2	4	3	2	1	3	3	37
One or more suspensions	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	6
Course failure in ELA	4	0	1	2	3	0	0	0	0	13
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	2	2	36
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	3	3	5	2	1	23
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	3	0	0	2	3	0	0	0	3	23

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	6	0	1	1	2	0	0	1	2	17

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	4	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	6
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	4	3	2	4	3	2	1	3	3	25
One or more suspensions	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4
Course failure in ELA	4	0	1	2	3	0	0	0	0	10
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	2	2	7
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	3	3	5	2	1	14
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	3	0	0	2	3	0	0	0	3	11

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	6	0	1	1	2	0	0	1	2	13

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	4	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	6
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*	61	39	53	61	40	55	49		
ELA Learning Gains				66			56		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				67			59		
Math Achievement*	68	45	55	54	35	42	42		
Math Learning Gains				66			42		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				69			41		

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
Science Achievement*	57	44	52	42	43	54	62		
Social Studies Achievement*	70	62	68	69	47	59	74		
Middle School Acceleration		68	70		42	51	69		
Graduation Rate	100	93	74	100	42	50	95		
College and Career Acceleration	92	53	53	93	63	70	95		
ELP Progress		32	55		65	70			

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)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	74
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	517
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	100

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	69
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	687
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	98
Graduation Rate	100

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	1	
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK				
HSP				
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	74			
FRL	72			

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	53			
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK				
HSP				
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	69			
FRL	56			

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	61			68			57	70		100	92	
SWD	38			32							2	
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK												
HSP												
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	60			68			57	68		100	7	
FRL	58			66			58	67		85	7	

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	61	66	67	54	66	69	42	69		100	93	
SWD	35	67		33	75							
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK												
HSP												
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	60	67	67	53	67	69	41	71		100	93	
FRL	57	66	64	48	64	62	29	54				

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	49	56	59	42	42	41	62	74	69	95	95	
SWD	29	33		30	29							
ELL												

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
AMI												
ASN												
BLK												
HSP												
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	49	57	59	43	41	38	60	74	69	95	95	
FRL	45	48	55	39	41	38	58	64		90		

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	25%	34%	-9%	50%	-25%
05	2023 - Spring	69%	49%	20%	54%	15%
07	2023 - Spring	73%	40%	33%	47%	26%
08	2023 - Spring	*	31%	*	47%	*
09	2023 - Spring	*	35%	*	48%	*
04	2023 - Spring	73%	51%	22%	58%	15%
06	2023 - Spring	67%	43%	24%	47%	20%
03	2023 - Spring	69%	50%	19%	50%	19%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	83%	54%	29%	54%	29%
07	2023 - Spring	*	52%	*	48%	*
03	2023 - Spring	69%	59%	10%	59%	10%
04	2023 - Spring	73%	53%	20%	61%	12%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	92%	48%	44%	55%	37%
05	2023 - Spring	75%	53%	22%	55%	20%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	40%	34%	6%	44%	-4%
05	2023 - Spring	63%	42%	21%	51%	12%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	50%	34%	16%	50%	0%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	48%	38%	10%	48%	0%

BIOLOGY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	63%	49%	14%	63%	0%

CIVICS						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	*	64%	*	66%	*

HISTORY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	53%	57%	-4%	63%	-10%

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.

Science is the lowest performing data component for the school. Specifically, 8th grade performed very low. The contributing factor for this performance is mainly due to the inability of spiraling all of the different standards from the year before.

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

Again it would be 8th grade science. This data component went down due to that cohort having a lot of difficulty with reading which hinders what they are doing in science because there is so much comprehension issues.

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.

8th grade science is 40%. The state average is 47%. The contributing factor for this performance is mainly due to the inability of spiraling all of the different standards from the previous years. This grade level is also the lowest performing on ELA.

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

Math improved immensely throughout the entire school. We added a math coach to push into classrooms and work with small groups of students and provide professional learning to teachers in the new math benchmarks and MTRs.

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

The 8th grade group has the most absences and they are highest in discipline incidents. They also are the group that is the most identified for academic achievement.

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

Improve science performance in 8th grade science and biology. Improve ELA performance in 8th grade.

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

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to

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.

We are using a school-wide focus to address individual student achievement in all sUbject areas. This goal will address the deficit in science achievement but will also address all subject areas. 100% of students K-5 will develop post-diagnostic personal "SMART" goals as evidenced by iReady growth. 100% of students 6-12 grade will develop three post-diagnostic personal "SMART" goals as evidenced by IXL growth and proficiency.

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

By May of 2024, 62% of Cedar Key School students will make at least one year's growth as evidenced by i-Ready diagnostic 3 or IXL snapshots in Reading.

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

After every diagnostic given teachers will conduct data chats with their students. Individual goal setting for students will take place after the first diagnostic. Teachers will review those students making progress towards their growth with leadership team at faculty or PST meetings. After every other diagnostic teachers will meet with their students and have data chats reflecting on the data. Students that meet their goals will be eligible for an incentive.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Joshua Slemp (joshua.slemp@levyk12.org)

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.)

We will utilize small group instruction in all subject areas. According to the What Works Clearinghouse, providing intensive, systematic instruction on up to three foundational reading skills in small groups to students who score below the benchmark score on universal screening has shown moderate evidence for student success. Small group instruction will be supported by the reading and math coach, as well as through the Problem Solving process.

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

Small group instruction allows the teacher to focus more closely on individual student needs and work on foundational skills students are lacking that cause them to have a gap in learning from grade level expectations.

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.

Small group instruction will take place in all subject areas. This will be facilitated by the instructional coaches on campus.

Person Responsible: Joshua Slemp (joshua.slemp@levyk12.org)

By When: Small group instruction will Begin 8/21/23 and continue until the end of the school year.

Monitor student progress in growth through PST meetings with leadership team and coaches.

Person Responsible: Joshua Slemp (joshua.slemp@levyk12.org)

By When: Ongoing

Monitor student progress in growth through PST meetings with leadership team and coaches.

Person Responsible: Joshua Slemp (joshua.slemp@levyk12.org)

By When: Ongoing

#2. 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.

The school will have a goal of all students attending 90% of the time. This is a continuation from the previous years goal.

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

For the 2023-2024 school year, Cedar Key School will improve attendance to 90% for all students.

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

Daily attendance reports will be run and attendance will be monitored. Also monthly attendance will be tracked and students that meet the goal will be eligible for incentive drawings.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Joshua Slemp (joshua.slemp@levyk12.org)

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.)

By improving attendance student performance should increase across the school.

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

Absenteeism is a huge problem when looking at academic performance. Students who miss a lot of school do not perform well.

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.

Monthly attendance will be monitored for all students and students that meet the goal for attendance will be eligible for incentives throughout the year.

Person Responsible: Joshua Slemp (joshua.slemp@levyk12.org)

By When: September 1 through the end of the school year.

Communication regarding attendance will be communicated to families using materials from Attendancematters.org to help get parents to play a role in obtaining our goal.

Person Responsible: Joshua Slemp (joshua.slemp@levyk12.org)

By When: September 1 through the end of the school year.

Title I Requirements

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.

Our SIP will be shared throughout the school year starting with Annual Title 1 Meeting in August 2023, We will also share the SIP through our monthly SAC/PTO meetings starting in August 2023-May 2024. Our SIP plan is also posted on our district school website @ levyk12.org. All school stakeholders have input into the SIP and edits can be made as data supports those changes 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))

We will foster relationships with our parents through meet the teacher, parent conferences, IEP's, 504's and EP meetings. Community events like the Seafood and Arts Festivals, fall carnivals, and classroom communications home will also engage the community in building relationships. Our main communication to parents is Remind and Skyward notifications for parents and families. Student family nights and college and careers nights will also be held to engage parents in their child's education and learning.

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))

Cedar Key staff will work with students to reach their independent goals that they have set for themselves. Students will take responsibility for their academic success through the setting of independent learning goals in all of their subject areas as well with graduation requirements. Students are provided opportunities for advanced coursework through AP courses and dual enrollment.

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))

Our school collaborates wit Federal Programs such as Title II for teacher professional learning, Title III for ELL support, McKinney Vento for students experiencing homelessness, Carl D PErkins for CTE opportunities, Levy County Prevention Coalition, Levy County Schools Foundation as well as School House Budget.

Describe how the school ensures counseling, school-based mental health services, specialized support services, mentoring services, and other strategies to improve students' skills outside the academic subject areas. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(I))

Counseling, social emotional learning, mentoring, social skills are provided by the guidance counselor and with the Levy County Prevention Coalition. Counseling specifically is provided through an outside agency.

Describe the preparation for and awareness of postsecondary opportunities and the workforce, which may include career and technical education programs and broadening secondary school students' access to coursework to earn postsecondary credit while still in high school. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(II))

Cedar Key School is an AVID School. We stress the importance of being college and career ready. We have an extremely strong CTE Program which provides opportunities at workforce readiness. We also have dual enrollment at multiple sites to provide accelerated coursework for our students.

Describe the implementation of a schoolwide tiered model to prevent and address problem behavior, and early intervening services, coordinated with similar activities and services carried out under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. 20 U.S.C. 1400 et seq. and ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(III).

Cedar Key School utilizes early intervention to get ahead of the behaviors. Positive incentives are staggered throughout the year to encourage students to behave and participate academically.Students that need tier 2 and 3 interventions for behaviors are put on a schedule to be checked in with and behavior goals are created with incentives built into the plans.

Describe the professional learning and other activities for teachers, paraprofessionals, and other school personnel to improve instruction and use of data from academic assessments, and to recruit and retain effective teachers, particularly in high need subjects. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(IV))

CKS does frequent AVID based trainings on best practices. The student goal setting also makes teachers have to look at data more frequently. Our Math and Reading coaches help plan and model in all classes as needed. Paraprofessionals are included in all professional learning provided to teachers, as well as those who serve ESE students are able to partake in specialized training for their students.

Describe the strategies the school employs to assist preschool children in the transition from early childhood education programs to local elementary school programs. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(V))

Our Pre-K is on campus and those students interact a great deal with the other elementary students. Teachers in KG get to know the Pre-K students so that they already develop a relationship with those students.

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: Instructional Practice:	$0.00
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Early Warning System	$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