Okaloosa Technical College School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Okaloosa Technical College

1976 LEWIS TURNER BLVD, 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.

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
Aucoin, Patricia	School Counselor	To help maintain student enrollment, monitor student sources, parent contact, and social emotional referrals.

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.

Needs assessments and overall performance data are reviewed by the School Advisory Counsel, whose members include the OTC director, school secretary and other educational support staff, instructors, students, parents, and community and business partners within Okaloosa County. These reviews are conducted on a quarterly basis in order to maintain constant improvement.

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))

The SIP will regularly be monitored during the quarterly SAC meetings and bi-annually by OTC administration, school counselor, and teachers. This will include monitoring of student achievement to determine those students with the greatest achievement gaps in order to provide these students with additional learning supports to increase their achievement. OTC administration will work with the SAC committee to determine any necessary revisions which will be applied to the SIP by OTC administration.

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 7-Adult
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Alternative Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	45%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	49%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	CSI
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)	White Students (WHT)* Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)*
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	
School Improvement Rating History	2021-22: I 2018-19: MAINTAINING 2017-18: UNSATISFACTORY 2016-17: MAINTAINING
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	1	2	3
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	1	1
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	3
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	2
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	1	2	3

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	1	3	4

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

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	1	1	7	36
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	6
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	5	10
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4	18
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	5	10

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	1	2	8	22

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	2	0	7	37
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	7	45

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	1	1	7	9
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	4	4
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	4
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	5	7
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4	6
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	5	7

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	1	2	8	11

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	2	0	7	9
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	7	11

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*	0	59	50	6	58	51	14		
ELA Learning Gains							33		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile									
Math Achievement*		52	38		40	38			
Math Learning Gains									
Math Lowest 25th Percentile									
Science Achievement*		70	64		59	40			
Social Studies Achievement*		75	66		57	48			
Middle School Acceleration					49	44			
Graduation Rate	36	93	89	35	72	61	41		
College and Career Acceleration		68	65	36	77	67	24		
ELP Progress		43	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)	CSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	18
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	Yes
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	36
Total Components for the Federal Index	2
Percent Tested	
Graduation Rate	36

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	CSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	26

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	Yes
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	77
Total Components for the Federal Index	3
Percent Tested	
Graduation Rate	35

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				
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK				
HSP				
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	45			
FRL	45			

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				
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK				
HSP				

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	33	Yes	3	
FRL	37	Yes	3	

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	0									36		
SWD												
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK												
HSP												
MUL												
PAC												
WHT											1	
FRL											1	

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	6									35	36	
SWD												
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21	ELP Progress
BLK												
HSP												
MUL												
PAC												
WHT										33		
FRL										43	30	

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	14	33								41	24	
SWD	10									31		
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK												
HSP										54		
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	17									29		
FRL										38	8	

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	*	59%	*	50%	*
08	2023 - Spring	*	57%	*	47%	*

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
09	2023 - Spring	*	54%	*	48%	*

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	*	61%	*	44%	*

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

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

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

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

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.

Based on the data, the lowest performance component appears to be in graduation rates. This is most likely since the population of students within grades 9-12 decreased from the 2021-2022 school year.

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

Graduation rate showed the greatest decline from the previous year. This can be contributed to the population of students within grades 9-12 decreasing from previous school years.

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 ELA testing appeared to have the greatest gap when compared to state average. Contributing factors to this gap include a decrease in student population and lower attendance rates during the school year.

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

The data component that showed the most improvement was student attendance which decreased from 9 students to 3 students being absent for 10% or more days. Teachers, the school counselor, and administration increased communication with parents.

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

The biggest area of concern, according to the EWS data, is attendance.

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

Graduation rates
Student attendance

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

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to 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.

Our role is to give students who have fallen behind an opportunity to catch up to their cohort so that they are able to graduate with their same age peers. Students who catch up feel as if they have a chance at success which has the potential to encourage them to pursue a post-secondary education which is beneficial to both the students and the community.

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

Our goal is that at least 80% of our students that begin the program at a middle school level will be promoted to at least 9th grade so that they are able to return to the high schools.

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

Student course completions will be monitored to ensure that students are completing the required courses that will put them on track to return to their cohort group.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Patricia Aucoin (patricia.aucoin@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.)

Students are enrolled in an alternative setting and small class size where work is individualized, pace of course is individualized, and highly-qualified teachers are present. These teachers develop relationships with students as well as parents and goals and expectations are clearly defined.

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

We are future-minded and goal oriented, with that said, we have chosen a strategy to help students attain their goals of returning to their cohort while also getting them to think about the next steps in their future.

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. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Other

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

The Fast Track program not only provides students with an opportunity to return to their cohort, it also provides them with an opportunity to develop habits that will allow them to be successful when they return to the high school environment. Parent involvement is an essential part of ensuring that our campus has a positive culture that encourages students to be successful in our program.

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

All parents will be contacted a minimum of 1 time per week to provide updates on student performance and address any concerns that the parent or teachers may have regarding the student.

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

Parent communication is to be logged in the FOCUS platform by the instructor each time contact with the parent is made. This information is monitored by the school counselor and administration to ensure that these goals are being met.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Patricia Aucoin (patricia.aucoin@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.)

The evidence-based intervention being implemented is parent contact being made regularly. This contact will be made by the teacher once per week minimally. This contact is most often made by phone, but may include email or other forms of contact agreed upon by the teacher and parent.

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

Regular communication between teachers and parents has been shown to improve school culture and environment in a positive way which results in increased rates of success among students.

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 Economically Disadvantaged

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.

Being a dropout prevention program, attendance is one of the more critical issues, especially with economically disadvantaged students.

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

Increase attendance so that fewer that 50% of economically disadvantaged students are absent more than 10% of the time.

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

Attendance within our program will be recorded by our Fast Track teachers through the FOCUS system and verified by administration.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Patricia Aucoin (patricia.aucoin@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.)

Teachers will maintain parent contact weekly, in addition, the school counselor will monitor attendance and make phone calls home when student are habitually absent. Administration will also discuss with students and parents the importance of regular attendance in the success of the student.

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

Teachers will maintain parent contact weekly, in addition, the school counselor will monitor attendance and make phone calls home when student are habitually absent. Administration will also discuss with students and parents of the economically disadvantaged the importance of regular attendance in the success of the student.

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 White

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.

Being a dropout prevention program, attendance is one of the more critical issues and this is no different between subgroups of students.

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

Increase attendance so that fewer that 50% of economically disadvantaged students are absent more than 10% of the time.

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

Attendance within our program will be recorded by our Fast Track teachers through the FOCUS system and verified by administration.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Patricia Aucoin (patricia.aucoin@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.)

Teachers will maintain parent contact weekly, in addition, the school counselor will monitor attendance and make phone calls home when student are habitually absent. Administration will also discuss with students and parents the importance of regular attendance in the success of the student.

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

Many of the strategies that we implement within our program are recommended from the National Dropout Prevention Center. Parent involvement is one of the areas that is most often emphasized by this organization as it has been shown to increase student academic success.

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).

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.
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.