

Monroe County School District

Marathon School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	11
III. Planning for Improvement	17
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	24
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	0
VI. Title I Requirements	0
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

Marathon School

350 SOMBRERO BEACH RD, Marathon, FL 33050

<https://www.keysschools.com/domain/1071>

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 Marathon Middle/High School is to educate, empower, and enable all students to become responsible, caring, and contributing citizens.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The vision of Marathon Middle/High School is to promote engaging and rigorous educational opportunities that create life-long learners and productive citizens in our community and society as a whole.

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
Paul, Christine	Principal	Provide leadership, guidance, and supervision of all aspects of academic and extracurricular programming.
Belotti, Christina	Teacher, K-12	The Marathon High School leadership team is a peer elected body of colleague representative of subject area departments (English, math, science, social studies, ESE, electives, and middle school) and grade levels (6-12). The role of the building level planning team (BLPT) is to serve as instructional leaders, engage stakeholders, and collaborate in the school's decision-making processes. Christina Belotti is the ELA department BLPT member.
Murphy, James	Teacher, K-12	The Marathon High School leadership team is a peer elected body of colleague representative of subject area departments (English, math, science, social studies, ESE, electives, and middle school) and grade levels (6-12). The role of the building level planning team (BLPT) is to serve as instructional leaders, engage stakeholders, and collaborate in the school's decision-making processes. James Murphy is the Social Studies department BLPT member.
Hare, David	Teacher, ESE	The Marathon High School leadership team is a peer elected body of colleague representative of subject area departments (English, math, science, social studies, ESE, electives, and middle school) and grade levels (6-12). The role of the building level planning team (BLPT) is to serve as instructional leaders, engage stakeholders, and collaborate in the school's decision-making processes. David Hare is the ESE department BLPT member.
Winegardner, Haley	Teacher, K-12	The Marathon High School leadership team is a peer elected body of colleague representative of subject area departments (English, math, science, social studies, ESE, electives, and middle school) and grade levels (6-12). The role of the building level planning team (BLPT) is to serve as instructional leaders, engage stakeholders, and collaborate in the school's decision-making processes. Haley Townsend is the Math department BLPT member.
McDonald, Sean	Teacher, K-12	The Marathon High School leadership team is a peer elected body of colleague representative of subject area departments (English, math, science, social studies, ESE, electives, and middle school) and grade levels (6-12). The role of the building level planning team (BLPT) is to serve as instructional leaders, engage stakeholders, and collaborate in the school's decision-making processes. Sean McDonald is the Electives department BLPT member.
Driscoll, Robert	Teacher, K-12	The Marathon High School leadership team is a peer elected body of colleague representative of subject area departments (English, math,

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		science, social studies, ESE, electives, and middle school) and grade levels (6-12). The role of the building level planning team (BLPT) is to serve as instructional leaders, engage stakeholders, and collaborate in the school's decision-making processes. Robert Driscoll is the Science department BLPT member.
Gonzalez, Luis	Teacher, K-12	The Marathon High School leadership team is a peer elected body of colleague representative of subject area departments (English, math, science, social studies, ESE, electives, and middle school) and grade levels (6-12). The role of the building level planning team (BLPT) is to serve as instructional leaders, engage stakeholders, and collaborate in the school's decision-making processes. Luis Gonzalez is the Middle School department BLPT member.
Burns, Kirsten	Assistant Principal	The assistant principal role is to preform those tasks assigned by the building principal and assist the building principal in the development and continuous implementation of the a high school program which promotes the educational well-being of each student in the school. Kirsten Burns is one of two assistant principals at Marathon High School.
Keenum, Rebecca	Assistant Principal	The assistant principal role is to preform those tasks assigned by the building principal and assist the building principal in the development and continuous implementation of the a high school program which promotes the educational well-being of each student in the school. Rebecca Keenum is one of two assistant principals at Marathon High School.
Konrath, Teresa	Graduation Coach	The Graduation Coach works with junior and senior students to meet graduation requirements. Typically meeting graduation requirements includes getting caught up and attaining necessary assessment scores. The graduation coach also identifies at risk sophomores and freshmen. The graduation coach regularly meets with the 12th grade horizontal team.

Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Development

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

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

School achievement data is reported to all stakeholders. Teachers, department leaders, parents, and students participate in the development process through department, faculty, parent, and SGA meetings. Data will be reviewed monthly at BLPT, department, faculty, SAC and cluster meetings.

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))

Monitoring will take place through weekly classroom walkthroughs, progress monitoring, feedback through department and cluster meetings, as well as student and parent feedback from SGA and SAC. PLCs will study the impact of strategies on their respective students and propose and implement revisions to the plan in order to ensure continuous improvement.

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 6-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	60%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	55%
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) Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: B 2019-20: B 2018-19: B 2017-18: B
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

Using 2022-23 data, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:

Indicator	Grade Level										Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	15	14	39	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	6	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	5	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	45	57	33	135	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	35	32	16	83	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	11	9	27

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	2	0	2
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Prior Year (2022-23) As Initially Reported (pre-populated)

The number of students by grade level that exhibited each early warning indicator:

Indicator	Grade Level										Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	22	21	26	132	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	9	7	32	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	33	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	26	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	25	21	37	203	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	26	14	28	138	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		

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

Indicator	Grade Level										Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	14	19	95	

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	8

Prior Year (2022-23) Updated (pre-populated)

Section 3 includes data tables that are pre-populated based off information submitted in prior year's SIP.

The number of students by grade level that exhibited each early warning indicator:

Indicator	Grade Level										Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	22	21	26	69	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	9	7	19	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	4	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	25	21	37	83	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	26	14	28	68	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		

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

Indicator	Grade Level										Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	14	19	43	

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	2	0	2
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*	42	48	50	42	55	51	43		
ELA Learning Gains				45			41		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				33			28		
Math Achievement*	52	53	38	51	41	38	48		
Math Learning Gains				57			37		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				52			27		
Science Achievement*	50	71	64	52	47	40	43		
Social Studies Achievement*	74	73	66	66	51	48	68		
Middle School Acceleration	62			64	53	44	74		
Graduation Rate	82	92	89	94	64	61	88		
College and Career Acceleration	51	58	65	45	78	67	53		
ELP Progress	58	39	45	58			58		

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

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

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	59
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	471
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	82

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	55

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index

OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	659
Total Components for the Federal Index	12
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	94

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)**2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY**

ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	37	Yes	4	
ELL	39	Yes	1	
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	39	Yes	1	
HSP	54			
MUL	64			
PAC				
WHT	67			
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	37	Yes	3	
ELL	43			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	55			
HSP	51			

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%
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	58			
FRL	53			

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	42			52			50	74	62	82	51	58
SWD	23			30			32	54		8	6	
ELL	22			33			35	50		17	7	58
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	23			48			45				3	
HSP	36			43			47	71	62	38	8	57
MUL	45			82							2	
PAC												
WHT	51			62			56	76	68	63	7	
FRL	34			41			43	67	57	43	8	56

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	42	45	33	51	57	52	52	66	64	94	45	58
SWD	22	27	27	27	52	39	24	47		88	21	
ELL	29	39	30	37	47	37	21	53		80		58
AMI												
ASN												

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
BLK	39	47		40	83		30	92				
HSP	36	44	32	45	54	47	44	59	61	86	43	60
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	49	44	38	58	57	52	63	68	63	100	47	
FRL	36	42	33	46	54	60	45	64	62	91	37	68

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	43	41	28	48	37	27	43	68	74	88	53	58
SWD	18	18	10	19	25	23	23	31				
ELL	23	36	29	43	44	30	17	40		60		58
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	36	36		35	30		36					
HSP	34	37	24	42	36	27	35	60	69	82	49	60
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	56	49	44	61	42	35	55	76	79	93	60	
FRL	35	37	22	41	34	25	33	65	63	81	49	61

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	43%	49%	-6%	50%	-7%
07	2023 - Spring	41%	47%	-6%	47%	-6%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	29%	42%	-13%	47%	-18%
09	2023 - Spring	33%	43%	-10%	48%	-15%
06	2023 - Spring	35%	45%	-10%	47%	-12%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	48%	54%	-6%	54%	-6%
07	2023 - Spring	64%	60%	4%	48%	16%
08	2023 - Spring	23%	57%	-34%	55%	-32%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	23%	45%	-22%	44%	-21%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	35%	53%	-18%	50%	-15%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	76%	63%	13%	48%	28%

BIOLOGY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	65%	66%	-1%	63%	2%

CIVICS						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	57%	68%	-11%	66%	-9%

HISTORY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	67%	69%	-2%	63%	4%

III. Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis/Reflection

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

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

Overall ELA performance demonstrates the greatest need for improvement at every grade level. Math demonstrated a great need for improvement on the 8th Grade FAST Math and BEST Algebra assessments. Additionally, the SWD subgroup has continued to fall below the federal index. Contributing factors included the fact that these are new tests, new curriculum was implemented, interventions were inconsistent, and the school experienced a large influx of immigrant students.

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

The greatest decline in performance took place in ELA. Every grade level includes a large percentage of level 1 students. The factors that contributed to this decline include new curriculum, inconsistent supports, a new assessment, and a large influx of immigrant students.

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 demonstrated the lowest performance in all three areas, ELA, math, and science. In all cases, new curriculum, new assessments, and inconsistency in supports contributed to this gap.

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

Geometry achievement demonstrated double digit improvement. Standards based instruction, progress monitoring, and a strong focus on the Big M contributed to this improvement.

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

The primary area of concern is ELA performance at all grade levels with special emphasis on the SWD subgroup.

Grade 9 achievement is a concern in ELA, math, and science.

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

1. ELA Achievement (all grade levels)
2. SWD Subgroup (all grade levels)
3. Grade 9 Achievement (ELA, Math, & Science)

Area of Focus

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

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

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

The ESSA subgroup Students with Disabilities (SWD) is performing below the Federal Index of 41%. This group currently represents 12% of our student population distributed across all grade levels.

Measurable Outcome:

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

The ESSA subgroup Students with Disabilities (SWD) will demonstrate improved academic performance by reaching a target of 45 on the Federal Index.

Monitoring:

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

FAST ELA & Math Progress Monitoring

Student attendance

Gradebook and report card grades

Classroom walkthroughs- specifically look for evidence classroom and assessment accommodations are in practice.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Christine Paul (christine.paul@keysschools.com)

Evidence-based Intervention:

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

Case managers will;

- monitor attendance, gradebook grades, report card grades, & progress monitoring data,
- engage in data chats with their assigned students, &
- collaborate with core teachers to ensure classroom accommodations are provided with fidelity.

Reading Coach, ELA, & core content area teachers will;

Routinely use a set of comprehension-building practices to help students make sense of text by;

- building students' world and word knowledge,
- consistently provide students with opportunities to ask and answer questions to better understand text,
- teach students a routine for determining the gist of a short section of text, &
- teach students to monitor their comprehension as they read.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Student data is used to drive instruction and creates a more supportive and constructive school culture. Data chats promote student accountability and ownership for learning resulting in improved engagement and outcomes.

According to the WWC, routinely using a set of comprehension-building practices is an evidenced based practice provide ways for teachers to support students as they develop reading habits that will enable students to understand what they are reading.

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.

Assign case managers to all IEP students and develop plan for collecting data, engaging in data chats, and collaborating with other teachers.

Person Responsible: Christine Paul (christine.paul@keysschools.com)

By When: September 6, 2023.

Reading Coach will model comprehension-building practices for ELA and core teachers.

Person Responsible: Christine Paul (christine.paul@keysschools.com)

By When: September 6, 2023.

#2. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Other**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

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

Positive culture and environment is critical for academic achievement and healthy social development. In addition, positive culture and environment is correlated with higher teacher retention. A more positive culture and environment results in less disruptions and increased student engagement.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Student average daily attendance will improve to 95% by the end of the year.

Monitoring:

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

Attendance, discipline, and Panorama survey data will be monitored by the PBIS, behavioral data chats, & attendance teams.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Rebecca Keenum (rebecca.keenum1@keysschools.com)

Evidence-based Intervention:

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

The PBIS team will develop monthly PBIS events and pop-up PBIS to reinforce positive behaviors. The behavioral data chats and attendance teams will develop and implement interventions for tier 2/3 students.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Positive behavior interventions and support (PBIS) is shown to improve behaviors by recognizing and reinforcing desired behaviors. Positive behaviors help promote a positive culture resulting in increased engagement and attendance.

"...an approach to behavior support that includes an ongoing process of research-based assessment, intervention and data-based decision making focused on building social and other functional competencies, creating supportive contexts, and preventing the occurrence of problem behaviors. PBS relies on strategies that are respectful of a person's dignity and overall well-being and that are drawn primarily from behavioral, educational, and social sciences, although other evidence-based procedures may be incorporated. PBS may be applied within a multi-tiered framework at the level of the individual and at the level of larger systems (e.g., families, classrooms, schools, social service programs, and facilities)."

Kincaid, Dunlap, Kern, Lane, Bambara, Brown, Fox and Knoster, 2016

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.

Survey students. Develop PBIS event calendar and plans for Pop up PBIS.

Person Responsible: Rebecca Keenum (rebecca.keenum1@keysschools.com)

By When: August 30, 2023

Analyze data monthly during regularly scheduled Behavioral Data Chats meetings. PBIS teams will develop school wide Tier 1 practices. Behavioral Data chats teams will develop and implement Tier 2/3 interventions for students needing support.

Person Responsible: Rebecca Keenum (rebecca.keenum1@keysschools.com)

By When: Monthly.

#3. 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.

Reading achievement has been significantly declined post pandemic. Improvement in reading achievement is of critical importance for success across content areas.

Measurable Outcome:

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

The percentage of students achieving a level three or higher on the FAST PM 3 will increase from 36% (2023) to 50%.

Monitoring:

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

FAST ELA progress monitoring data

WICOR strategies & Comprehension-Building Practices as evidenced by classroom walkthroughs

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Kirsten Burns (kirsten.burns@keysschools.com)

Evidence-based Intervention:

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

School wide AVID WICOR strategies will be implemented to provide a common structure to support literacy in ELA and across content area courses. The initial focus will be on "O" for organization. All students in every classroom will have an AVID binder utilized across all classrooms.

Implement the AVID critical reading process to provide teachers with strategies to support the development of reading tasks and content area vocabulary before students engage in the reading process.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

AVID provides a learning model that promotes literacy and critical thinking to engage students in more complex understanding of concepts and ideas. WICOR is writing, inquiry, collaboration, organization, and reading. AVID WICOR strategies will be used across the curriculum to increase rigor. The AVID critical reading process supports reading in the content area, rigorous text selection, and vocabulary building.

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.

Ensure all students have an AVID binder. The AVID site team will train all teachers to use WICOR as a learning model in all classrooms beginning with an initial emphasis on "O" for organization.

Person Responsible: Kirsten Burns (kirsten.burns@keysschools.com)

By When: September 6, 2023.

Implement the AVID Critical Reading Process as a routine to improve comprehension.

Person Responsible: Kirsten Burns (kirsten.burns@keysschools.com)

By When: Ongoing. Critical reading process will be emphasized and modeled for teachers through the AVID Site team, PLCs, and faculty professional learning.

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).

The process of reviewing school improvement funding allocations and ensuring resources are allocated based on needs typically involves several steps to ensure fairness, transparency, and effectiveness. At Marathon High School, the Building Leadership Planning Team identifies and gather data on the specific needs and challenges of the school. Once identified, BLPT will meet with their teams to discuss the priorities of the school. Stakeholders work together to discuss what resources are needed to support the needs of the school. School administration develops a clear and transparent framework for allocating resources, taking into consideration student population, academic performance trends, and specific improvement goals. Feedback and revisions are made to the budget proposal. The budget proposal is then presented to the district administration team and the school board for approval. Once approved, the budget allocation on plan is implemented, making sure that the allocated resources are used effectively and as intended. School administration continuously monitors the progress of the allocated resources in addressing the identified needs, regularly assesses the impact of the investments on student outcomes and school improvement, and makes adjustments to the allocation plan if necessary. We continue to keep all stakeholders informed about the allocation process, progress, and outcomes. School administration regularly communicates updates and successes to maintain transparency and build trust within the school community.