Choctawhatchee Senior High School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Choctawhatchee Senior High School

110 RACETRACK RD NW, Fort Walton Beach, FL 32547

[no web address on file]

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Okaloosa County School Board on 8/28/2023.

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.

We prepare all students to achieve excellence by providing the highest quality education while empowering each individual to positively impact their families, communities, and the world.

Provide the school's vision statement.

We inspire a lifelong passion for learning for all students and stakeholders.

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
Heck, Michelle	Principal	Administrative Evaluations, teacher evaluations, budget, crisis plan, ESE compliance, personnel, Public Relations, School Oversight, Leadership Team Facilitator, Special Projects, Threat Assessment Team
Lanpher, Ryan	Assistant Principal	Accreditation, Curriculum, FTE Oversight, IB Coordinator, Guidance Department, Master Schedule, MTSS, Registration, Teacher and Ed Support Evaluations
Donaldson, Brandon	Assistant Principal	9th Grade Team Leader, 11th and 12th Grade Discipline, Graduation, Student Training Program, Summer School, Teacher and Support Staff Evaluations
Beasley, Jennifer	Assistant Principal	AP Program Coordinator, Attendance and Truancy, Equitable Committee, FLDOE Accountability, FTE Attendance, SAC Facilitator, School Performance Plan

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.

Administrative Team and Department Heads collected teacher reflections and feedback regarding the 2022-2023 focus areas and began implementation.

Administrative Team met with each Department Head to discuss common threads and themes from their

departments regarding strategies and steps for implementation.

Department Heads, teachers and administrators met to write goals and strategies for achieving goals.

Administration, Department Heads and teachers met to analyze testing data to determine strengths and weaknesses.

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))

Systems are in place to monitor various data pieces: PR1,2,3 in ELA, as well as quarterly ELA assignments, Biology quarterly assessments, ELL student tutoring data and mentor group data. Quarterly data reviews will be analyzed by the administrative team and used to revise plans as needed.

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	43%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	52%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	ATSI
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD) English Language Learners (ELL)* Asian Students (ASN) Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: B 2019-20: B 2018-19: B 2017-18: 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	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	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	

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	0	0	0	

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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	0	0	0	284
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	80
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	89
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	146
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	261
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	231
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	261

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	373

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	155
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28

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	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	

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*	52	59	50	50	58	51	52		
ELA Learning Gains				46			45		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				45			35		
Math Achievement*	33	52	38	47	40	38	43		
Math Learning Gains				55			28		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				49			28		
Science Achievement*	62	70	64	67	59	40	64		
Social Studies Achievement*	74	75	66	66	57	48	74		
Middle School Acceleration					49	44			
Graduation Rate	91	93	89	91	72	61	95		
College and Career Acceleration	50	68	65	58	77	67	68		
ELP Progress	30	43	45	43			41		

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	56
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	392
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	94
Graduation Rate	91

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	56
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	617
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	93
Graduation Rate	91

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	46			
ELL	28	Yes	3	1
AMI				
ASN	67			
BLK	49			
HSP	44			
MUL	56			
PAC				
WHT	62			

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	49			

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	45			
ELL	39	Yes	2	
AMI				
ASN	72			
BLK	53			
HSP	49			
MUL	62			
PAC				
WHT	60			
FRL	54			

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	52			33			62	74		91	50	30
SWD	34			30			42	53		23	6	
ELL	19			19			19	24		25	7	30
AMI												
ASN	65			62			75				3	
BLK	44			23			51	54		33	6	
HSP	36			26			44	60		38	7	26
MUL	57			28			49	78		32	6	

| 2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS | | | | | | | | | | | |
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2021-22	C & C Accel 2021-22	ELP Progress
PAC												
WHT	57			39			70	80		56	7	37
FRL	44			29			54	66		37	7	29

| 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	50	46	45	47	55	49	67	66		91	58	43
SWD	26	43	36	40	48	36	48	65		85	20	
ELL	7	35	41	26	58	60	33	40		74	8	43
AMI												
ASN	56	59					91			92	64	
BLK	46	49	52	38	44	42	57	62		90	50	
HSP	35	45	42	39	57	58	46	57		86	42	36
MUL	45	45	53	57	67	58	71	63		93	64	
PAC												
WHT	56	46	42	54	55	46	75	76		92	62	52
FRL	45	50	47	47	54	47	59	65		86	48	44

| 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	52	45	35	43	28	28	64	74		95	68	41
SWD	31	42	32	37	33	34	49	54		88	52	
ELL	17	42	39	16	14	23	28	21		74	7	41
AMI												
ASN	69	73		50	30					100	73	
BLK	47	39	29	33	19	14	52	65		89	48	
HSP	37	44	36	26	25	31	46	43		90	48	43
MUL	45	43	38	37	32		61	65		100	55	
PAC												
WHT	57	47	38	51	31	29	72	84		96	78	31
FRL	43	40	36	37	30	24	50	61		92	59	39

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	55%	59%	-4%	50%	5%
09	2023 - Spring	45%	54%	-9%	48%	-3%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	28%	59%	-31%	50%	-22%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	37%	61%	-24%	48%	-11%

BIOLOGY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	59%	66%	-7%	63%	-4%

HISTORY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	70%	69%	1%	63%	7%

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.

9th Grade ELL ELA students showed the lowest performance with only 2% earning proficient scores with 38% of 9th Grade ELL students with Learning Gains. Our increase in ELL students along with the number of 1st year teachers helped contribute to this decrease.

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

The data component that shows the greatest need is ELL ELA. We showed a decrease in Achievement as well as in ELA LG in both 9th and 10th grade ELA scores. Our increase in ELL students along with the number of 1st year teachers helped contribute to this decrease.

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 shows the greatest gap is ELL ELA. We showed a decrease in Achievement as well as in ELA LG in both 9th and 10th grade ELA scores. This gap can be attributed to attendance data.

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

Our US History Scores showed improvement improving from 69% proficient to 72% proficient as well as our 10th Grade ELA scores which improved from 48% proficiency to 55% proficiency. Collaborative planning among teacher teams helped contribute to this improvement.

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

Attendance data for our ELL students shows a concerning gap between our ELL students and other students. We need students in class in order to best serve them and increase achievement.

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

Our highest priorities are increasing achievement in both Math and ELA for our ELL population.

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.

Attendance data has shown a marked decline since the pandemic. Data shows that attendance is directly related to student achievement.

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

9th and 10th Grade average daily attendance with show a 5% increase.

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

Monthly review of attendance data with a specific focus on our ELL 9th and 10th grade students

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Brandon Donaldson (donaldsonb@okaloosaschools.com)

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

Mentoring groups will be set up with STAR goals and weekly monitoring. Letters will be sent home, phone calls will be made, the importance of attendance will be emphasized at our monthly ELL Parent Meetings.

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

research shows a direct link between relationships/mentoring programs and attendance.

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.

ELL Coordinator will build goal sheets for ELL students

Person Responsible: Ryan Lanpher (ryan.lanpher@okaloosaschools.com)

By When: Goal sheets will be in place and shared with team by August 31

Quarterly review of attendance data

Person Responsible: Brandon Donaldson (donaldsonb@okaloosaschools.com)

By When: The 1st Monday of the month.

#2. -- 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

#3. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to English Language Learners

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.

ELL Students represent a rapidly growing subgroup within our school and community. Achievement data shows the greatest need in ELA.

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

At least 43% of ELL Students will show Learning Gains in ELA

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

Monthly progress monitoring of Lexia and Duolingo data with school leadership

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jennifer Beasley (jennifer.beasley@okaloosaschools.com)

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

Content area vocabulary, text- marking, mentor sentence frames and Universal Design for Learning approaches will be implemented across the curriculum.

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

Content Area Vocabulary is critical for decoding content, students benefit from the use of sentence frame while they acquire a new language. These strategies are detailed in The Universal Design for Learning.

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.

A school based committee will review and update ELL Plans with targeted instructional strategies to support English Language Acquisition and proficiency level.

Person Responsible: Ryan Lanpher (ryan.lanpher@okaloosaschools.com)

By When: end of first month of school all will be checked

Teachers will utilize Focus to access updated ELL Student Plans with embedded correlations to WIDA Can Do descriptors to inform placement and instruction.

Person Responsible: Jennifer Beasley (jennifer.beasley@okaloosaschools.com)

By When: September 1

Duolingo for Schools will be used as a supplemental resource to support language acquisition in speaking, writing, reading and listening domains for students in WIDA Tiers A and B.

Person Responsible: Ryan Lanpher (ryan.lanpher@okaloosaschools.com)

By When: this will occur monthly beginning September 1

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).

1.Schools are provided a training and timeline from the Curriculum and Instruction Department to complete the School Improvement Plan (SIP). District offers collaborative opportunities for schools to meet:
• Facilitate sharing and presentation of district-level data.
• Support the inclusion of a variety of data sources; assist data collection efforts with district resources and connections.
• Bring schools together to focus on related priorities in order to pool expertise and resources.
2.Schools then conduct a needs assessment to stakeholders and prioritize needs to be included in SIP. District reviews school SIP and during review process ensures school identifies allowable funding sources that are not currently being utilized to implement the strategy(s) intended to improve learner outcomes; instructional coaches, tutoring, ESE resources, and professional learning. If funding does not match school's identified focus areas, the District will engage school in further conversation with inquiries such as;
• Connect schools with available statewide systems of support, including external facilitators and high quality professional development (FDLRS and FIN).
• Identify the necessary resources that are not currently available to ensure the strategy is implemented as intended.
• Determine what training is necessary for teachers to ensure the strategy is implemented as intended.
After District provides feedback to schools, the SIP will be refined and submitted. School district leadership will meet quarterly with schools for collaborative discussion, feedback, and progress monitoring updates on status of SIP focus areas.