Nassau County School District

Hilliard Middle Senior High School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Hilliard Middle Senior High

1 FLASHES AVE, Hilliard, FL 32046

[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.

Hilliard Middle-Senior High School will educate, empower, and enable all students to become caring, contributing citizens who can succeed in an ever-changing world. HMSHS is committed to focusing on high expectations and individual academic success to create a community of respect and responsibility.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Inspire a passion for learning, excellence, and character.

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
Crawford, John	Principal	Oversees all school operations.
Smith, Jacqueline	Assistant Principal	Assists the principal in overseeing and managing all school operations.
Milligan, Lawrence	Dean	Oversees discipline.
Vanzant, Jobeth	School Counselor	Manages guidance in grades 6-8. Oversees MTSS in middle school.
Jarrett, Angela	School Counselor	Manages guidance in grades 9-12. Oversees high school MTSS.
Moore, Amanda	Reading Coach	Monitors data and assists administration in instructional decision making

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 administration works closely with the school leadership team to identify areas for improvement and plan for improvement. The School Advisory Council convenes to examine the School Improvement Plan, offer input, and ultimately approve the plan. The SAC is made up of students, parents, school support personnel, teachers, and community members/business leaders.

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))

Administration and the school leadership team will examine progress monitoring data monthly to ensure the strategies used to foster improvement are being implemented with fidelity and are working. The plan will be revised according to the data.

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	11%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	53%
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)* 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: A 2018-19: A 2017-18: A
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	18	22	21	61
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	9	16
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	1	4
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	3	6
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	11	18	34
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	11	16
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4	10
Two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5	12	23
Retained current year	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	2
Retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4	7

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	6	5	12	23

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	1	0	2
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4	7

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

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Prior Year (2022-23) 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	18	22	26	66
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	5	8
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	12	11	27
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	6	6	17
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	16	17	40
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	8	12	25
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	7	12	23

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	12	19	38

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	1	1	3
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	3	2	9

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*	63	58	50	61	60	51	61		
ELA Learning Gains				44			51		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				27			30		
Math Achievement*	72	43	38	74	43	38	69		
Math Learning Gains				59			42		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				45			40		
Science Achievement*	67	74	64	55	57	40	65		
Social Studies Achievement*	73	75	66	81	42	48	84		
Middle School Acceleration	33			70	31	44	60		
Graduation Rate	93	94	89	93	73	61	84		
College and Career Acceleration	88	69	65	84	76	67	77		
ELP Progress		45	45						

** 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	70
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	489
Total Components for the Federal Index	7

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	93

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	63
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	693
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	93

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	52			
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	61			
HSP	80			
MUL	62			
PAC				
WHT	71			
FRL	62			

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	39	Yes	1	
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	53			
HSP	70			
MUL	57			
PAC				
WHT	62			
FRL	59			

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	63			72			67	73	33	93	88	
SWD	28			48			34	42		60	6	
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	52			70							2	
HSP				80							1	
MUL	58			65							2	
PAC												
WHT	64			73			68	75	34	89	7	
FRL	56			67			57	66	27	79	7	

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21	ELP Progress
All Students	61	44	27	74	59	45	55	81	70	93	84	
SWD	23	22	13	41	38	24	31	62		89	44	
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	50	30		63	60	60	25	86				
HSP	70											
MUL	61	52		63	61	50						
PAC												
WHT	61	43	22	76	58	42	58	80	68	93	85	
FRL	53	37	26	68	54	41	48	75	72	91	80	

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	61	51	30	69	42	40	65	84	60	84	77	
SWD	34	38	28	39	37	25	33	60		75		
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	55	55		63	47							
HSP	82	80										
MUL	44	33		50	25							
PAC												
WHT	61	51	30	70	43	40	68	84	62	82	80	
FRL	53	44	27	59	39	39	60	80	49	75	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
10	2023 - Spring	64%	57%	7%	50%	14%
07	2023 - Spring	64%	60%	4%	47%	17%
08	2023 - Spring	62%	58%	4%	47%	15%
09	2023 - Spring	62%	61%	1%	48%	14%
06	2023 - Spring	63%	59%	4%	47%	16%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	94%	85%	9%	54%	40%
07	2023 - Spring	86%	83%	3%	48%	38%
08	2023 - Spring	71%	53%	18%	55%	16%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	63%	67%	-4%	44%	19%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	53%	58%	-5%	50%	3%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	63%	54%	9%	48%	15%

BIOLOGY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	70%	74%	-4%	63%	7%

CIVICS						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	75%	79%	-4%	66%	9%

HISTORY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	68%	74%	-6%	63%	5%

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 was Algebra 1 with just 53% of students grading out as proficient. Looking closer at the data, 41 of 42 (98% proficiency) 8th grade students passed the end-of-course exam, whereas only 24 of 80 (30% proficiency) high school students passed. When examined separately, both of these outcomes placed us second in the district in middle school and high school respectively in Algebra 1. With that said, we will seek to improve our Algebra 1 proficiency level in high school through teacher professional development and student tutoring.

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

Our proficiency rating on the U.S. History End-of-Course exam dropped by 19% (87% proficiency to 67% proficiency from 2021-22 to 2022-23). In 2021-22, we had a veteran teacher in place who was adept at using cooperative learning strategies, whereas is 2022-23, our first-year teacher was learning to employ these strategies as the year progressed. We attributre these factors to the drop in proficiency.

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.

HMSHS had no data components lower than the state average. The largest gap between HMSHS and the state occurred in 6th grade math. The school produced 94% proficiency and the state average was 54%.

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 from 2022 to 2023 was biology, with HMSHS students increasing their proficiency level from 53% to 70%. We paired a novice biology teacher with an expert teacher, while also providing professional development that focused on cooperative learning strategies. We attribute these actions to the increase in proficiency in biology.

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

Attendance is a concern.

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

1. Improvement in ESSA category SWD.
2. Improvement in high school algebra.
3. Improvement in high school US History.

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.

This area of focus carries over from the 2021-2022 school year, as we transitioned in 2023 from the FSA to the FAST Progress Monitoring Assessment. The first year of FAST Progress Monitoring did not provide a measure of Federal Index points, therefore we continue with our current strategies to increase this figure with the subgroup, “Students with Disabilities,” from 39% in 2022 to 41% or above in 2024.

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

The measurable outcome for this Area of Focus is that ELA and Math learning gains and lowest quartile learning gains for SWD's will increase by 5-7%.

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

The underperforming subgroup will be progress monitored with intervention-specific assessments such as Star and FAST to make adjustments to prescriptive interventions. These interventions will be carried out during small group instruction provided by ESE support facilitators and during intentional and prescriptive pull-out interventions by our ESE resource teacher.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

John Crawford (crawfordjo@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.)

Differentiated, skill-based instruction will be used to meet the specific needs of the underperforming subgroup. Students will be instructed at their reading level to increase proficiency with skills.

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

Implementing differentiated instruction while focusing on reading skills will build confidence and increase student motivation. Teachers will use LLI, which is a differentiated and leveled reading program, as the basis for this instruction and group students accordingly. Differentiating skills-based instruction at the students’ reading level will increase proficiency and learning gains among this subgroup.

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. Refine the instructional model for reading and math to enhance differentiated instruction to meet the needs of students with disabilities.
2. Provide ESE teachers with collaborative planning time to model and discuss evidence-based practices, co-plan standards-based lessons, and analyze data with the general education teacher(s) to which they

are assigned.
3. Enlist ESE teachers in professional development to a) enhance their understanding of the new BEST standards; and b) teach them how to design lesson plans that focus on spiraling back and reinforcing standards being covered by the general education teacher.
4. Administer Literacy intervention programs such as LLI and Sonday to bridge the gap between current reading level and on-grade reading level of SWDs.
5. Employ a math spiral math review as part of the daily routine to support the general education teacher.
6. Offer tutoring for middle school and high school reading and math students.
6. Progress monitor students with disabilities and make necessary adjustments based on varying needs.

Person Responsible: Jacqueline Smith (smithja13@nassau.k12.fl.us)

By When: Ongoing beginning in September 2023.

#2. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Teacher Retention and Recruitment

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.

Hilliard Middle-Senior High School experienced a 23% turnover of its faculty from 2022 to 2023 and has seen a 33% turnover of its faculty since 2021. We believe this revolving door has contributed to the drop in proficiency by our students with disabilities. Administration must initiate intentional, deliberate strategies to increase teacher retention. Our culture and environment must be examined.

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

We plan to decrease teacher turnover from 23% to 15% or below in 2023-24.

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

After sending out our letters of intent for the 2024-2025 school year, we will conduct "stay" interviews for those who have expressed that they may not return.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

John Crawford (crawfordjo@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.)

We will focus on providing deliberate and organized mentorship, improving the school climate, and providing growth opportunities for our new teachers in an effort to retain them.

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

Recent research shows that the highest rate of turnover occurs within the first five years of a teacher's career. We must provide them with strong mentors who will help them grow into seasoned teachers while also providing a positive climate.

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. Provide structured opportunities for teacher collaboration.
2. Provide professional development to increase efficacy.
3. Provide growth and shared leadership opportunities.
4. Provide opportunities for teacher feedback.

Person Responsible: Jacqueline Smith (smithja13@nassau.k12.fl.us)

By When:

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Student Engagement

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.

Proficiency on the U.S History End-of-course exam fell from 87% in 2022 to 68% in 2023. Students must be
adequately equipped to perform on state assessments through the employment of more intentional small-group instruction and cooperative learning strategies that are bolstered by hands-on learning experiences and promote student engagement.

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

Increase the percentage of students scoring at level 3 or above on the U.S. History EOC to 75%.

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

Administrators will lead on-campus professional development that will provide the U.S History teacher with intentional cooperative learning strategies that focus on student engagement. Clear expectations will be put in place regarding the use of these strategies. We will engage in instructional observations to observe these expectations and attend meetings to examine data and observe data-based planning strategies.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

John Crawford (crawfordjo@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.)

High engagement instruction is evident and compliments standards-based instruction aligned to the curriculum pacing guide. District progress monitoring assessments are implemented and analyzed for standards mastery and instructional decisions. Teachers participate in instructional rounds to view best instructional practices, receive explicit instructional coaching, and effectively implement recommendations.

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

Aligning instruction directly with prescribed standards, high student engagement, and intentional assessments are best practices for improving 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.

1. Coaching of instructional best practices that target cooperative learning/high engagement instruction, classroom environment, and standards-based, data-driven planning.

Person Responsible: John Crawford (crawfordjo@nassau.k12.fl.us)

By When: Ongoing beginning September 2023

2. Collaborative planning within the social studies department, as well as providing opportunities to observe planning and instruction from high performing peers within the district.

Person Responsible: John Crawford (crawfordjo@nassau.k12.fl.us)

By When: Ongoing beginning September 2023

3. Cross-curricular observation of instruction by high-performing peers in other departments on campus.

Person Responsible: John Crawford (crawfordjo@nassau.k12.fl.us)

By When: Ongoing beginning September 2023

#4. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

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

Only 30% of high school Algebra students passed the end-of-course exam, compared to 98% of 8th graders who were proficient. The difference in the courses is that 8th graders are on a blocked math schedule (96 minutes per day), while high school math students have math for 48 minutes per day. To bridge this instructional time gap, we will offer Algebra tutoring both before and after school. We will also utilize the expertise of the veteran middle school Algebra teacher to assist the high school math teacher during common planning opportunities.

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

We will increase proficiency in high school Algebra from 30% to 40%.

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

We will use FAST and Math Nation EdgeXL progress monitoring data to make adjustments to instruction throughout the school year.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

John Crawford (crawfordjo@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 we will implement is before- and after-school Algebra tutoring.

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

Given the reduced minutes high school students have to learn Algebra compared to middle school students, we will attempt to bridge the gap by offering tutoring.

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. Assistant principal will take input from teachers to construct a tutoring schedule.
2. Assistant principal will collaborate with teachers to identify candidates for tutoring.
3. Principal will coordinate collaborative planning sessions for high school and middle school Algebra teachers.
4. Administration and teacher will engage in data chats and adjust instruction accordingly.

Person Responsible: Jacqueline Smith (smithja13@nassau.k12.fl.us)

By When: Ongoing beginning in October, 2023.

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 administrative team will use progress monitoring tools such as Star and Fast to identify the students most in need of remediation and gap instruction. This data will be used to formulate a tutoring plan using allocated funds and these students will be the primary targets of tutoring instruction.