

Marion County Public Schools

Forest 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	10
III. Planning for Improvement	14
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	21
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	0
VI. Title I Requirements	0
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

Forest High School

5000 SE MARICAMP RD, Ocala, FL 34480

[no web address on file]

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.

Helping every student succeed on their journey to graduation.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The Forest High School educational environment encourages school-to-career skill development and post-secondary education by providing a wide variety of core and elective courses, as well as sports and activities.

Forest High School provides a safe learning environment in which students can be successful as individuals, as members of a team, and within the community.

Forest High School fosters open communication between the school and home, and encourages family involvement.

Forest High School teachers are provided staff development opportunities to master technologies and instructional strategies to improve student performance.

Forest High School promotes an equal opportunity learning environment and encourages all students to respect the cultural diversity of others.

Forest High School provides motivation and encouragement to students to help them achieve their goals.

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
Rembert, Bernard	Principal	Principal provides a common vision for the use of data-based decision-making. The Principal models the Problem Solving Process; supervises the development of a strong infrastructure; conducts assessment of the skills of school staff; ensures implementation of high yield instructional practices. Also, the Principal facilitates collaborative learning, intervention support and documentation; provides adequate professional learning opportunities; develops a culture of expectation with the school staff; ensures resources are assigned to those areas of most need. The Principal is a resource for the community, staff, students and parents.
Wade, Michael	Assistant Principal	The Assistant Principal assists the Principal in providing a common vision for the use of data-based decision making, assists in the development of a strong infrastructure of resources for the implementation of high yield instructional strategies. Further, they assist the Principal in the assessment of school staff, assist with the monitoring of implementation of intervention and necessary documentation, and assist with the delivery of professional development for effective instructional delivery. The Assistant Principal carefully monitors the additional academic support schedule to ensure all personnel are serving in their specified areas.
Moody, Tracy	Assistant Principal	The Assistant Principal assists the Principal in providing a common vision for the use of data-based decision making, assists in the development of a strong infrastructure of resources for the implementation of high yield instructional strategies. Further, they assist the Principal in the assessment of school staff, assist with the monitoring of implementation of intervention and necessary documentation, and assist with the delivery of professional development for effective instructional delivery. The Assistant Principal carefully monitors the additional academic support schedule to ensure all personnel are serving in their specified areas. Will work specifically with developing Professional Learning Plan for the school.
Willis, Tara	Assistant Principal	The Assistant Principal assists the Principal in providing a common vision for the use of data-based decision making, assists in the development of a strong infrastructure of resources for the implementation of high yield instructional strategies. Further, they assist the Principal in the assessment of school staff, assist with the monitoring of implementation of intervention and necessary documentation, and assist with the delivery of professional development for effective instructional delivery. The Assistant Principal carefully monitors the additional academic support schedule to ensure all personnel are serving in their specified areas.
Stopyra, David	Assistant Principal	The Assistant Principal assists the Principal in providing a common vision for the use of data-based decision making, assists in the development of a strong infrastructure of resources for the implementation of high yield instructional strategies. Further, they assist the Principal in the assessment of school staff, assist with the monitoring of implementation of intervention and necessary documentation, and assist with the delivery of professional development for

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		<p>effective instructional delivery. The Assistant Principal carefully monitors the additional academic support schedule to ensure all personnel are serving in their specified areas.</p>
Cook, Emily	Teacher, K-12	<p>The AVID Coordinator assists teachers with the Interpretation and implementation of the writing, inquiry, collaborative, organizational, and writing strategies that help produce successful students. Provides instructional support to include preparation of lesson plans, content alignment, content delivery methods and instructional modeling. Also assists in the design and implementation for progress monitoring, data collection, and data analysis, participates in the design and delivery of professional learning.</p>
Stopyra, Courtney	Instructional Coach	<p>The Content Area Specialist assists teachers with the Interpretation and implementation of the Florida Standards for Language Arts and Writing and provides instructional support to include preparation of lesson plans, content alignment, content delivery methods and instructional modeling. Also assists in the design and implementation for progress monitoring, data collection, and data analysis, participates in the design and delivery of professional development. Will also facilitate our new teacher orientation induction program.</p>
Telford, Ecliff	School Counselor	<p>The School Counselor participates in collection, interpretation, and analysis of data; facilitates development of intervention plans; provides support for intervention fidelity and documentation; assists with professional development for behavior concerns; assists in facilitation data-based decision making activities. Also provides quality services and expertise on issues ranging from IEP development to intervention with individual students. She communicates with child-serving community agencies to support the students' academic, emotional, behavioral, and social success. Ensures students are on a path to graduation.</p>
Fountain, Victoria	Dean	<p>The Student Services Manager provides teachers with classroom support and feedback to ensure a safe, cooperative environment for learning to take place. Resources, such as behavior contracts, for at-risk students are carefully considered and shared by the SSM. Coordinates efforts to use positive reinforcements to encourage more positive behavior choices by students. He also monitors and shares disciplinary/attendance data, and serves on the PBIS/ Safety committee. In addition, the SSM may act as a liaison with outside agencies that offer support to students and families.</p>

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.

The School Advisory Council meets six times each year. The Council is made up of administration including the Principal, as well as staff, parents, students, and business partners. The council vets the school improvement plan, vets any changes, and then votes to accept it as a guiding document.

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 reviewed on a quarterly basis with data conversations based on academic, attendance and discipline data. The data will help guide any adjustments that need to be made of the plan. The leadership team will review this data and any changes will be communicated to stakeholders.

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

2023-24 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	High School 9-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	44%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	68%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	ATSI
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD)* English Language Learners (ELL) Asian Students (ASN) Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: B 2019-20: B

	2018-19: B 2017-18: B
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

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*	47	44	50	55	46	51	54		
ELA Learning Gains				53			52		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				41			41		
Math Achievement*	45	32	38	38	38	38	37		
Math Learning Gains				45			22		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				46			27		
Science Achievement*	65	59	64	57	31	40	64		
Social Studies Achievement*	63	67	66	64	41	48	67		
Middle School Acceleration					41	44			
Graduation Rate	93	86	89	94	54	61	95		
College and Career Acceleration	67	63	65	72	67	67	87		
ELP Progress	50	46	45	57			48		

** 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	61
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	430
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	96
Graduation Rate	93

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	57
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	622
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	94
Graduation Rate	94

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	31	Yes	4	1
ELL	35	Yes	1	
AMI				
ASN	74			
BLK	42			
HSP	54			
MUL	60			
PAC				
WHT	71			

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	52			

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	34	Yes	3	
ELL	44			
AMI				
ASN	81			
BLK	42			
HSP	54			
MUL	53			
PAC				
WHT	63			
FRL	49			

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	47			45			65	63		93	67	50
SWD	18			20			16	21		21	6	
ELL	10			27				18		18	6	50
AMI												
ASN	59			73						64	4	
BLK	26			28			28	44		40	6	
HSP	33			39			54	55		59	7	47
MUL	48			40			52	68		58	6	

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2021-22	C & C Accel 2021-22	ELP Progress
PAC												
WHT	58			53			77	70		75	6	
FRL	35			36			51	49		54	7	45

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21	ELP Progress
All Students	55	53	41	38	45	46	57	64		94	72	57
SWD	18	36	28	21	44	41	16	21		85	29	
ELL	15	45	45	19	50	56	21	20		100	52	57
AMI												
ASN	76	73								100	73	
BLK	28	40	37	14	38	44	30	44		88	57	
HSP	46	54	52	35	42	46	49	62		95	64	54
MUL	53	54	25	41	47		57	68		96	38	
PAC												
WHT	64	56	40	49	49	52	68	77		95	81	
FRL	41	45	36	30	43	41	45	54		92	65	50

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20	ELP Progress
All Students	54	52	41	37	22	27	64	67		95	87	48
SWD	19	34	26	14	16	23	35	24		82	47	
ELL	20	32	24	10	23	24	37	18		100	95	48
AMI												
ASN	73	62					92			100	93	
BLK	32	45	41	20	23	34	42	43		87	87	
HSP	49	49	29	37	21	19	59	61		97	87	46
MUL	60	52	15	45	9		67	54		94	94	
PAC												
WHT	62	55	50	42	23	29	69	74		96	88	
FRL	39	45	35	27	21	28	49	52		91	83	50

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%	44%	3%	50%	-3%
09	2023 - Spring	49%	43%	6%	48%	1%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	34%	44%	-10%	50%	-16%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	53%	43%	10%	48%	5%

BIOLOGY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	64%	57%	7%	63%	1%

HISTORY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	64%	65%	-1%	63%	1%

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.

As of now, the lowest performing area was ELA proficiency. 48 percent of our students scored proficient on FAST vs 55 percent on the FSA. This may have been due to a shift in assessment and benchmarks.

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

As of now, the largest decline was in ELA proficiency. This may have been due to a shift in assessment and benchmarks. This may be due to a limited understanding of the rigor of the new benchmarks.

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.

As of now, the largest gap is between our Algebra score and the state average. There is a 16 point deficiency with the state average. Tutoring will be available in Math on campus before and after school. Intensive Math instructor and specifically scheduled classes targeting the bottom quartile. The use of district provided interventions Math.

Instructional Rounds for peer collaboration and review of instructional practice.

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

Our greatest gain as of now was in Math proficiency. Our teachers in that department collaborated and tailored instruction based off of student data they gathered.

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

Referrals related to attendance.

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

1. Literacy
2. Increasing proficiency for students with disabilities
3. Improving proficiency in U.S. History
4. Reducing the amount of Level I Attendance referrals

Area of Focus

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

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

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed.

One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Our current level of performance is 48%, as evidenced in 2022-2023 proficiency on the FAST ELA assessment . We expect our performance level to be 51% by the end of the 2023-2024 school year. The area of concern is occurring because of the high percentage of students who are scoring below the proficiency level on the FAST ELA when entering high school. If the rigor of instructional practices aligned to the appropriate level of standards would occur, and our teachers implement with fidelity AVID writing, inquiry, collaboration, organization, and reading strategies, then we should notice an increase in our FAST State assessment scores from 48% to 51%. There will be a specific focus on Reading Comprehension strategies and Writing strategies in all classrooms. This focus on literacy will also impact our BIOLOGY and US History EOC scores in a positive (increase by 3% in proficiencies) manner.

Measurable Outcome:

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

If teachers embed the literacy strategies from AVID as well as continue to align their tasks with the rigor of the BEST Standards, then the percent of all students achieving ELA proficiency will increase from 48% to 51%, as measured by the FAST ELA assessment. Specifically, students in the ESSA subgroup of SWD students will increase their proficiency level by 8%.

Monitoring:

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

Collaborative planning sessions facilitated by members of the leadership team and grade level instructional leads focused on student data, task alignment, and standard focused instruction. Data chats with students and all teachers on intervention data/progress for Intensive Reading. Tutoring provided for students in need for ELL and ESE students.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Bernard Rembert (bernard.rembert@marion.k12.fl.us)

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.)

Teachers will utilize collaborative teaching approaches that include hands on learning, collaborative learning, reading/writing strategies, and formative assessment to monitor progress. ELA and Reading teachers will utilize a deeper understanding of the BEST standards to align tasks/assessments to the benchmarks. Additional collaborative planning time will be given to Intervention teachers. Data digs will be utilized often to assess progress, and make necessary changes.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Innovative teaching styles are proven to work with students approaching proficiency. Collaborative planning time for teachers is a best practice and lends itself to student success in the classroom. Using data to plan next lesson steps is a research based strategy to enhance 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.

Working with our teachers during collaborative planning sessions, data digs, and through feedback to facilitate conversations on how students will be taught and selecting tasks that are aligned to the standards.

Person Responsible: Tracy Moody (tracy.moody@marion.k12.fl.us)

By When: Bi-weekly

Utilizing the AVID WICOR Strategies of; Writing, Inquiry, Collaboration, Organization, and Reading on a daily basis to push the level of rigor to the depth of the standard so that standards based mastery can be achieved. Professional Learning will have these strategies embedded in the work.

Person Responsible: Emily Cook (emily.cook@marion.k12.fl.us)

By When: Quarterly

Provide professional learning for our staff during our whole group faculty meetings and utilizing aP BIS system that will strengthen our staff's ability to develop relationships with their students so that they are accurately able to make learning relevant to our students.

Person Responsible: David Stopyra (david.stopyra@marion.k12.fl.us)

By When: Monthly

Provide specific focus to the ESSA subgroups mentioned in the area of focus by using all the strategies listed above and gearing the data chats, collaboration, and professional development to focus on these groups. Utilizing personnel that work specifically with the subgroup to motivate and monitor progress will occur. Subgroup will be discussed in relevant meetings.

Person Responsible: Bernard Rembert (bernard.rembert@marion.k12.fl.us)

By When: Monthly

#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.

If FHS provides professional development for our staff during our whole group faculty meetings and utilizing a PBIS system that will strengthen our staff's ability to identify and intervene with habitually absent students, and develop positive relationships then we can reduce the number of chronically absent students by 5 percent.

Measurable Outcome:

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

We plan to decrease the amount of students who are chronically absent by 5 percent (from 23% to 18%).

Monitoring:

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

Attendance data will be reviewed by the leadership team on a bi-weekly basis. This data will be used to create Child study and problem solving meetings to intervene when an attendance issue arises with a student.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

David Stopyra (david.stopyra@marion.k12.fl.us)

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.)

Establishing routine data checks with interventions in mind will reduce chronic attendance. The implementation on a site-wide PBIS plan will put the positive supports in place to motivate students to attend school on a more regular basis.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Focusing on Teacher/Student relationships has a positive effect on student learning at an average of .72 as defined by Hattie's Visible Learning. The PBIS program's focus on this relationship piece will positively impact attendance and 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.

Data Based Decision Making

Data will be collected bi-weekly to analyze specifically our focus of attendance. This will allow for us to address students quicker that may be showing an attendance issue before an adverse effect occurs on their academic progress. We will then analyze the effectiveness of our interventions on a quarterly basis.

Person Responsible: David Stopyra (david.stopyra@marion.k12.fl.us)

By When: Bi weekly

Schedule CST and/or PST meetings based on the data received. Leadership team as well as Social Work Assistants will be involved in order to problem solve each case.

Person Responsible: David Stopyra (david.stopyra@marion.k12.fl.us)

By When: As needed

#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.

If teachers and students are provided consistent support, are afforded professional development in critical thinking strategies, and lessons are chunked into smaller instructional units, then the federal index for students with a disability will increase from 34 to 41 percent.

Measurable Outcome:

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

The measurable outcome is to improve from 34 to 41 percent in the subgroup of students with disabilities as measured by ESSA. The proficiency rates and standards will be monitored throughout the year using the data from the ongoing progress monitoring of FAST data and the Insight test given 3 times a year. Teachers will also use effective writing, inquiry, collaborative, organizational and reading strategies to improve student achievement. The use of formative and summative assessments throughout the year in order to intervene when necessary so that remediation or enrichment can occur.

Monitoring:

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

The data for the assessments will be monitored by administration and teachers. This data will be used in collaborative planning and action steps will be created to address the results.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Bernard Rembert (bernard.rembert@marion.k12.fl.us)

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.)

Students will utilize Writing, Inquiry, Collaboration, Organization, and Reading in every class every day. General Education, Inclusion and Self contained teachers will collaboratively plan and implement standards-based instruction while monitoring and revising instruction and as needed utilizing the accommodations stated in the IEP..

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Teachers will collaborate and analyze data to monitor task alignment and assessments. The results will allow for targeted instruction based on needs as well as differentiation of instruction.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

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

Teachers will collaborate with focused subjects to plan and implement standards-based instruction utilizing WICOR and CAR PD Instructional Strategies in their instruction.

Person Responsible: Michael Wade (michael.wade@marion.k12.fl.us)

By When: Monthly

Provide and promote tutoring during student success time for students as well as before/after school tutoring..

Person Responsible: Courtney Stopyra (courtney.stopyra@marion.k12.fl.us)

By When: Weekly

Our new Intervention Teacher, AVID Coordinator, and Assistant Principal of Instruction will support our ELA, and Reading teachers while providing literacy based professional learning and support schoolwide.

Person Responsible: Tracy Moody (tracy.moody@marion.k12.fl.us)

By When: Monthly

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).

Our students with disabilities have access to the same district provided resources as their non-disabled peers. The administration team along with the guidance department have conversations on the best use of resources for support in classrooms. Forest High School has added two additional Inclusion Teachers to work with our students in their classroom settings.