

Nassau County School District

Callahan Middle School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

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

Callahan Middle School

450121 OLD DIXIE HWY, Callahan, FL 32011

[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.

Nassau County's mission is to develop each student as an inspired life-long learner and problem-solver with the strength of character to serve as a productive member of society.

At Callahan Middle School our mission is to provide students with high quality educational experiences that stimulate their desire to gain knowledge and equip students with the necessary skills to become productive citizens in a global society.

Provide the school's vision statement.

A caring faculty and staff at Callahan Middle School is committed to the facilitation of authentic student achievement through academic, social-emotional, and physical/developmental growth.

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
Shumate, Kim	Principal	
Goodwin, Jonathan	Assistant Principal	
Lundquist, Stephanie	School Counselor	
Berner, Amber	Instructional Coach	
Stevenson, Sheryl	Other	
Schinella, Patrick	Other	
Lee, Jana	Other	
Davidson, Heather	School Counselor	

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 process for involving stakeholders includes school leadership team meetings and School Advisory Council meetings. The process includes discussing/analyzing school data from various sources (FAST, SIP Surveys, etc.), assessing the needs of the school based on the data, planning to improve the needs, and then monitoring/evaluating the plans based on data to make any necessary adjustments. The CMS School Advisory Council meets all state requirements in terms of required stakeholders.

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))

CMS's SIP will be regularly monitored for effective implementation and impact on student achievement by the School Advisory Council and the school leadership team by reviewing progress monitoring data as well as surveys from all stakeholders. After analyzing and evaluating the progress monitoring data a minimum of three times annually, these teams of stakeholders will intentionally adjust plans as necessary to strive for continuous improvement throughout the school year.

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)	Middle School 6-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	11%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	48%
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) 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: A 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	48	60	72	180	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	30	29	67	
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	0	0	8	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	41	33	89	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	11	15	42	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	15	3	19	
	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	12	30	28	70

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	1	0	1	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	37	63	52	152	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	8	11	28	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	1	3	10	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5	7	15	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	33	49	94	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	16	33	56	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	8	19	37	

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	14	21	23	58

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	1	0	1

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	37	63	52	152	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	8	11	28	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	1	3	10	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5	7	15	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	33	49	94	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	16	33	56	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	8	19	37	

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	14	21	23	58

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	1	0	1

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*	60	61	49	64	64	50	66		
ELA Learning Gains				51			51		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				42			36		
Math Achievement*	83	80	56	80	34	36	80		
Math Learning Gains				59			53		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				54			52		
Science Achievement*	74	69	49	74	77	53	72		
Social Studies Achievement*	86	81	68	89	58	58	89		
Middle School Acceleration	85	83	73	83	44	49	78		
Graduation Rate					69	49			
College and Career Acceleration					83	70			
ELP Progress		35	40		82	76			

** 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	78
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	388
Total Components for the Federal Index	5

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
Percent Tested	98
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	66
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	596
Total Components for the Federal Index	9
Percent Tested	98
Graduation Rate	

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	50			
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	54			
HSP	77			
MUL	61			
PAC				
WHT	77			
FRL	69			

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	44			
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	48			
HSP	72			
MUL	66			
PAC				
WHT	67			
FRL	60			

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	60			83			74	86	85			
SWD	28			52			50	77	45		5	
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	62			46							2	
HSP	67			85			73	82			4	
MUL	57			65							2	
PAC												
WHT	59			84			74	86	84		5	
FRL	51			74			63	79	78		5	

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	64	51	42	80	59	54	74	89	83			
SWD	22	32	27	47	44	46	35	66	77			
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	44	47		50	50							
HSP	71	65		82	62		70	80				
MUL	55	45		81	83							
PAC												
WHT	64	51	41	81	59	55	76	90	85			
FRL	55	44	35	72	52	49	70	81	81			

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	66	51	36	80	53	52	72	89	78			
SWD	26	27	21	53	39	40	35	61	36			
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	50	47		63	43							
HSP	72	48		84	52							
MUL	71	56		88	63							
PAC												
WHT	66	51	38	80	52	52	73	89	77			
FRL	55	45	33	70	49	46	62	84	69			

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
07	2023 - Spring	59%	60%	-1%	47%	12%
08	2023 - Spring	53%	58%	-5%	47%	6%
06	2023 - Spring	63%	59%	4%	47%	16%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	88%	85%	3%	54%	34%
07	2023 - Spring	80%	83%	-3%	48%	32%
08	2023 - Spring	65%	53%	12%	55%	10%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	73%	67%	6%	44%	29%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	99%	58%	41%	50%	49%

CIVICS						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	85%	79%	6%	66%	19%

III. Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis/Reflection

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

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

The data component that showed the lowest performance is ELA. Specifically, 8th ELA which was only 6% above the state average and 5% below the district average. A contributing factor to last year's low

performance in ELA relates to the use of new curriculum by teachers and it's alignment in some cases to the B.E.S.T. standards. Another contributing factor was attendance by 8th grade cohort of students.

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

The data component that showed the greatest decline from the prior year is the same data component that showed the lowest performance, 8th ELA. The contributing factors to this decline are described in question #1.

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

The data component that had the greatest gap when compared to the state average was 8th ELA . 8th ELA was only 6% above the state average. That data component was the smallest gap between the school and state averages. The factors that contributed gap are described in question #1.

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

The data component that showed the most improvement was Math proficiency across the grade levels. The new action that we took relates to using math curriculum that aligns with the B.E.S.T. benchmarks/ standards.

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

One of the potential concern areas based on the EWS data is the number of ELA Level 1 students on the state assessment. This concern correlates with the data component identified in questions #1 and #2. Another potential area of concern is students with attendance below 90%.

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

Instruction practice for ELA is our highest priority based on the data from F.A.S.T. PM 3.

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.

ELA instruction practice was identified as a crucial need based on the 2023 F.A.S.T PM 3 data. Specifically, 7th ELA which was 1% below the district average but 12% above the state average. And, 8th ELA which 5% below the district average but 6% above the state average.

Measurable Outcome:

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

The specific measurable outcome that Callahan Middle plans to achieve through improving ELA instruction is to improve ELA proficiency in each grade by 3 to 5%.

Monitoring:

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

This area of focus will be monitored for the desired outcome by monitoring student's grades on standards based assessments, STAR progress monitoring data, and F.A.S.T. progress monitoring data. By triangulating this data classes, teachers, and students will be identified that need interventions adjusted so that desired outcome will be achieved.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Kim Shumate (shumateki@nassau.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.)

The evidence-based intervention being implemented for the area of focus relates is a follows:

1. Intentional professional development for ELA teachers
2. Intentional instructional practices
 - a. Small group instruction where scaffolding and differentiation happens daily through adjustments to content, process, and learning strategies.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The rationale for selecting these specific strategy is because of the strong evidence of these interventions as described in the "Just Read Florida" practice profiles.

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.

1. Professional Development for ELA Teachers
 - a. A total of 4 ELA teachers from 6th, 7th, and 8th will complete the 60 hour micro-credential reading course.

- b. 6th and 7th teachers will peer observe 5th ELA at CIS.
- c. All ELA teachers will participate in monthly mini PD's related to the reading practice profiles specifically related to differentiation and scaffolding.

Person Responsible: Amber Berner (berneram@nassau.k12.fl.us)

By When: This step will be completed by February 2024.

2. Intentional Differentiation and Scaffolding in teacher-led small groups as evidenced by classroom observations, lesson plans, and student progress monitoring data.

Person Responsible: Kim Shumate (shumateki@nassau.k12.fl.us)

By When: This step will be completed by May 2024.

#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 was chosen as an area focus so that the new components of resiliency education could be incorporated into our school culture.

Measurable Outcome:

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

The specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve is have all 6th grade students enrolled in a semester course of Rambler 101 also known as Engaged Citizenship which will incorporate in depth instruction related to all 8 of the resiliency skills identified by the state.

Monitoring:

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

This area of focus will be monitored for the desired outcome by grades, participation, and a capstone project that each student will complete at the end of the course.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Kim Shumate (shumateki@nassau.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.)

The evidence-based intervention being implemented for this area of focus is explicit instruction and using high-yield engagement strategies to teach the resiliency skills.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The rationale for selecting these specific strategies are because they are evidence based instructional strategies that have a effect size.

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.

1. Organize master schedule to ensure all 6th grade students are enrolled in Rambler 101 the first semester.

Person Responsible: Kim Shumate (shumateki@nassau.k12.fl.us)

By When: This step will be completed by July 2023.

2. Create pacing guide of content and associated daily lesson plans for teachers to use in Rambler 101.

Person Responsible: Jonathan Goodwin (goodwinjo@nassau.k12.fl.us)

By When: This step will be completed by December 2023.

3. Monitor student progress and student outcomes from this course, and then adjust lessons and pacing as needed.

Person Responsible: Jonathan Goodwin (goodwinjo@nassau.k12.fl.us)

By When: This step will be completed by May 2024.

#3. -- Select below -- 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.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Monitoring:

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

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

[no one identified]

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.)

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

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

No action steps were entered for this area of focus