

Nassau County School District

West Nassau County High School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	8
III. Planning for Improvement	12
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	20
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	0
VI. Title I Requirements	0
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

West Nassau County High School

1 WARRIOR DR, 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.

Our 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.

Provide the school's vision statement.

West Nassau High School exists to cultivate college and career-ready life-long learners.

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
Pearce, Jimmie	Principal	
Jones, Sherida	Assistant Principal	Curriculum and Instruction
Eddy, Heather	School Counselor	School Counselor Department Chair
Eason, William	Teacher, K-12	Fine Arts
Grant, Sherrie	Teacher, K-12	World Languages
Kline, Gregg		AFJROTC
Branson, Tracey	Teacher, K-12	Science
McNeill, Cynthia	Teacher, K-12	Media Specialist/Testing Coordinator
Henderson, Jennifer	Teacher, K-12	English
Knott, Richard	Teacher, K-12	Social Studies
Whitehead, Jami	Teacher, K-12	Math
Roberts, Tammy	Teacher, K-12	Teacher, Career/Technical
Carollo, Ashley		

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 faculty and school leadership team were involved in the School Improvement Plan development process through faculty meetings as well as Academic Leadership Team Meetings. The input of the School Advisory Council was garnered at the organizational SAC meeting.

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))

Ongoing monitoring of the effective implementation of the School Improvement Plan will take place strategically throughout the course of the school year. The SIP will be a recurring agenda item in the Academic Leadership Team (ALT) meetings, Department PLCs, Faculty meetings, Grade Level Team meetings, and SAC Meetings. The team will monitor student achievement, attendance, and assessment data throughout the course of the school year, particularly that of learners with the greatest achievement gap. As problem-solving interventions are implemented to meet the needs of the learners, will revise the plan as necessary in response to the effectiveness of the interventions.

Demographic Data

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

2023-24 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	High School 9-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	11%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	41%
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	2021-22: B

*2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2019-20: A 2018-19: A 2017-18: A
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review

ESSA School, District and State Comparison (pre-populated)

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school or combination schools). Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school.

On April 9, 2021, FDOE Emergency Order No. 2021-EO-02 made 2020-21 school grades optional. They have been removed from this publication.

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	50	58	50	59	60	51	55		
ELA Learning Gains				50			52		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				43			42		
Math Achievement*	39	43	38	59	43	38	39		
Math Learning Gains				37			43		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				26			47		
Science Achievement*	65	74	64	70	57	40	66		
Social Studies Achievement*	68	75	66	73	42	48	75		
Middle School Acceleration					31	44			
Graduation Rate	96	94	89	98	73	61	97		
College and Career Acceleration	72	69	65	74	76	67	78		
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	65
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	390
Total Components for the Federal Index	6
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	96

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	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	589
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	98

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				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	54			
HSP	59			
MUL	53			
PAC				
WHT	66			

2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
FRL	59			

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	3	
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	32	Yes	1	
HSP	72			
MUL	68			
PAC				
WHT	59			
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	50			39			65	68		96	72	
SWD	12			9			23	51		37	6	
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK				20						43	3	
HSP	68			50			56	60			4	
MUL	47			20			70	75			4	

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2021-22	C & C Accel 2021-22	ELP Progress
PAC												
WHT	50			40			66	69		73	6	
FRL	40			31			59	62		64	6	

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	59	50	43	59	37	26	70	73		98	74	
SWD	20	41	43	30	25	19	30	48		100	33	
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	40	60		18	10							
HSP	63	60		81	58					100	71	
MUL	63	53		71	36					100	85	
PAC												
WHT	60	49	43	59	36	27	71	73		98	74	
FRL	49	46	39	46	34	25	65	68		97	61	

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	55	52	42	39	43	47	66	75		97	78	
SWD	24	33	25	29	42	38	35	44		100	56	
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK							50	77				
HSP	69	69						80				
MUL	50	56										
PAC												
WHT	56	52	40	39	43	48	67	75		97	80	
FRL	44	44	39	41	41	33	59	70		94	68	

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	48%	57%	-9%	50%	-2%
09	2023 - Spring	56%	61%	-5%	48%	8%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	20%	58%	-38%	50%	-30%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	51%	54%	-3%	48%	3%

BIOLOGY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	65%	74%	-9%	63%	2%

HISTORY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	67%	74%	-7%	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.

The Algebra data demonstrated the lowest performance with 20% of students demonstrating proficiency. This was 38% below the rest of the Nassau County School District and 30% below the state of Florida Comparison. Challenges with instructional personnel proved to be a challenge in this particular area. Other factors that contributed to this area need include the adoption of a new curriculum and new standards as well as student skill gaps that were further amplified with the task demands of the new B.E.S.T. standards.

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

Algebra and tenth-grade ELA demonstrated the greatest decline. Staffing was a challenge in both Algebra and ELA. There were two fairly new teachers in the mathematics classes. Additionally, there was a high turnover in tenth-grade English; there were a total of three teachers in that role, with varying levels of experience which contributed to the decline. The school experienced personnel challenges in ninth-grade ELA as well one of the primary instructors resigned, and the students were under the instruction of a long-term substitute for the duration of the school year. We experienced personnel changes in biology as well; we lost two experienced veteran instructors. The course was then taught by two first-year teachers and another with minimal experience with the content area.

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 Algebra data demonstrated the greatest gap when compared to the state average. This can be attributed to the students' skill gaps, coupled with changes in instructional personnel, standards, and curriculum.

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

Though it was not the greatest area of improvement, our school maintained the highest graduation rate in the district at 96%, and we exceeded the state graduation rate as well. This can be attributed to our school's efforts to closely monitor students' progress and provide timely interventions to address learners' areas of need.

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

Two potential areas of concern that we have, based on the EWS data, are the performance of students with disabilities as well as African-American learners.

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

Our highest priorities for improvement this school year are as follows:

- 1.) Students with disabilities
- 2.) African American learners
- 3.) Algebra
- 4.) ELA
- 5.) Science

Area of Focus

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

#1. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Early Warning System

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

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

ESSA data review shoes that African American students and students with disabilities have fallen below the federal guidelines. Additionally, data demonstrates an increase in student absences as well as students who have experienced behavioral infractions that have resulted in suspension. Between the 2018-2019 school year and the 2022-2023 school year, the number students with suspensions increased from 59 to 101. Similarly, the number of students with less than 90% attendance increased from 94 to 332.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Decrease the number of students with less than 90% attendance to 90 and decrease the number of students with suspensions to 60.

Monitoring:

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

Student attendance and discipline data will be monitored through the Focus portal on a weekly basis.

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.)

The student services team and the and administrative team will meet weekly to identify and discuss at risk students and develop action plan(s) to address the identified areas of need. Systems for checking in and checking out with trusted adults and incentivizing attendance and improved discipline will be in place to help curtail issues in the identified areas of concern.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

To best support students who have been identified as at-risk through the Early Warning System.

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

#2. 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.

Though math achievement increased from 39 to 59 between 2020-2021 and 2021-2022, there has, math learning gains of decreased from 43 to 37, and the lower 25% learning gains in math decreased from 47 to 26.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Increase the mathematics learning gains for the lowest quartile by 25% to 45% by the end of the 2023-2024 school year.

Monitoring:

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

Student progress will be monitored through district provided tools including Math Nation Check for Understanding and Edge XL, iXL skills assessments, and USA test prep assessments aligned to the BEST math standards.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jimmie Pearce (jimmie.pearce@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.)

Multi-tiered student support through differentiated reading instruction to address individual student needs identified through analysis of progress monitoring data.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Multi-tiered support provides the most efficient means for meeting individual student learning needs. Regular assessments will be utilized to measure student growth and identify areas of strengths and weaknesses.

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. Mathematics teachers will participate in district provided Math Nation professional development, as well as school level professional development, focused on the effective implementation of the curriculum to maximize student growth.

Person Responsible: Jimmie Pearce (jimmie.pearce@nassau.k12.fl.us)

By When: May 2024.

2. Teachers will work collaboratively to refine progress monitoring instruments, analyze student data, and address continued areas of need. Teachers will focus on intentional and targeted implementation of the PLC model as a best practice for planning and delivering meaningful instruction to promote student growth.

Person Responsible: Jimmie Pearce (jimmie.pearce@nassau.k12.fl.us)

By When: Weekly, by May 2024.

3. Provide additional instruction for level I learners through instructional office hours, before school as well as after school. Additionally, further support will be offered through mathematics boot camps. Students receive support during the school day, through scheduling provisions.

Person Responsible: Jimmie Pearce (jimmie.pearce@nassau.k12.fl.us)

By When: Weekly, by May 2024.

#3. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Black/African-American

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.

School data demonstrates that the growth of Black/African American students at West Nassau County High School has fallen below federal Guidelines.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Outcome of 41% or higher on ESSA criteria.

Monitoring:

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

Regular teacher led data chats for progress monitoring Student data analysis of ESSA criteria with student services and MTSS Team

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.)

Differentiated instruction, including small group instruction, implementation of targeted tiered interventions. Incorporation of supplemental instructional aids focused on areas of deficit in order to close learning gaps.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

To best support individual learning needs, identified through data analysis and progress monitoring as well as their, standards based, local and state-based assessment data.

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

#4. 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.

ESSA data review indicated outcomes for students with disabilities have fallen below 41%.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Outcome of 41% or greater on ESSA criteria.

Monitoring:

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

Regular teacher data chats regarding student progress. Collaboration between general education instructors, ESE teachers, student services, administration, and parents to best meet the needs of learners.

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.)

Differentiated instruction, including small group instruction, implementation of instructional accommodations, and ESE support facilitation within the content area classrooms.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

To best support individual learning needs, identified through students Individual Education Plans as well as their, standards based, local and state-based assessment data.

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

#5. 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.

Although ELA Achievement increased from 55% to 59%, the learning gains for ELA decreased from 52% to 50%.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Increase ELA Achievement to 62% FAST PM3 and increase ELA learning gains to 60%.

Monitoring:

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

Prescriptive progress monitoring through quarterly district Reading assessments. Beginning PM1, middle PM2, progress monitoring results prior to establishing baseline with end of year PM 3 FAST progress monitoring assessment.

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.)

Multi-tiered student support through differentiated reading instruction to address individual student needs identified through analysis of progress monitoring data.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Multi-tiered support provides the most efficient means for meeting individual student learning needs. Regular assessments will be utilized to measure student growth and identify areas of strengths and weaknesses.

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

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)).

A team of stakeholders reviewed the attendance, academic, and attendance for the 2021-2022 academic year and the 2022-2023 academic year. Additionally, the team examined the progress monitoring data, using the Cambium Dashboard as well as the FLDOE PK-12 Public School Data Publication and Reports. Stakeholders determined the areas of need for the current school year through analysis of the trend data over the last three years, in specific subgroups (students with disabilities and African American learners), content areas, and areas of deficit. As the needs assessment was completed, stakeholders determined how to allocate resources to provide meaningful interventions and activities to meet the needs of learnings, including opportunities for tutoring, engagement, and investment in school culture.