

Orange County Public Schools

Sheeler High Charter School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	10
III. Planning for Improvement	14
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	23
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	0
VI. Title I Requirements	0
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

Sheeler High Charter

871 E SEMORAN BLVD, Apopka, FL 32703

yourdiplomayourway.com

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.

Sheeler High School is dedicated to helping at-risk students earn a standard high school diploma and prepare for post secondary success.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Sheeler High School understands that at-risk students have different needs, learn at different rates, and have diverse learning styles which cause many of these at-risk students to drop out of school. We believe that everyone deserves a quality education that meets his or her individual needs and aligns to their personal goals and ambitions. All students can be successful in high school and in life regardless of their life circumstances.

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
Owens, Jonathan	Principal	Responsible for: Budget, Emergency Shelter Operations, Enrollment Projections, Inter-rater Reliability, Marketing & Recognition, Media Contact, Personnel Decisions, Professional Development, School and District Assessments, Supervises and evaluates Assistant Principal, Instructional Staff, School Social Worker, Attendance Coordinator and support staff.
Green, Paul	Assistant Principal	Assistant Principal is responsible for assisting the school principal in the planning, organization, administration, and management of an assigned secondary school. Responsibilities: Manage computer services for the administration of the building: grading, academic history, GPA, master scheduling student information, and attendance as assigned by the building principal.
Dixon, William	Reading Coach	The Coach will focus on enhancing teachers' ability to provide instruction that builds students' sense of engagement in the ownership of learning. The Coach will also work with administrators and teachers to collect and analyze data, interpret, and use it to guide instructional decisions.
Howder, Keith	Other	The primary role of a Career Coach is to assist junior and seniors high school students with the preparation of necessary college entrance documentation and ensure that these students are meeting all requirements to enter a college upon graduating from high school.

Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Development

Describe the process for involving stakeholders (including the school leadership team, teachers and school staff, parents, students (mandatory for secondary schools) and families, and business or community leaders) and how their input was used in the SIP development process. (ESSA 1114(b)(2))

Note: If a School Advisory Council is used to fulfill these requirements, it must include all required stakeholders.

School data is discussed year-round with staff, families and during board meetings. We specifically discuss school goals for school improvement during pre-planning activities. Students and staff complete surveys twice a year, and the results are analyzed and discussed with all stakeholders.

SIP Monitoring

Describe how the SIP will be regularly monitored for effective implementation and impact on increasing the achievement of students in meeting the State’s academic standards, particularly for those students with the greatest achievement gap. Describe how the school will revise the plan, as necessary, to ensure continuous improvement. (ESSA 1114(b)(3))

Monthly collection and analysis of data to track student progress against target and goals.

Evaluate on a monthly basis the effectiveness of the interventions being utilized to know if is producing the intended student outcomes.

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 7-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Alternative Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	85%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	4%
Charter School	Yes
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)	Students With Disabilities (SWD)* English Language Learners (ELL)* Black/African American Students (BLK)* Hispanic Students (HSP)* 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: COMMENDABLE 2018-19: COMMENDABLE 2017-18: COMMENDABLE 2016-17: COMMENDABLE
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	0
One or more suspensions	0	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	0
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	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	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	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	0
Students retained two or more times	0	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
Absent 10% or more school days		
One or more suspensions		
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)		
Course failure in Math		
Level 1 on statewide FSA ELA assessment		
Level 1 on statewide FSA Math assessment		
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.		

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

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Students with two or more indicators		

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Retained Students: Current Year		
Students retained two or more times		

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 school days	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
One or more suspensions	0	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	0
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on statewide FSA Math assessment	0	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	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	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	0
Students retained two or more times	0	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*		49	50		49	51			
ELA Learning Gains									
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile									
Math Achievement*	10	34	38	5	36	38	0		
Math Learning Gains									
Math Lowest 25th Percentile									
Science Achievement*	36	66	64	21	31	40	0		
Social Studies Achievement*	28	66	66	27	43	48	20		
Middle School Acceleration					44	44			
Graduation Rate	9	87	89	15	62	61	14		
College and Career Acceleration	24	65	65	5	70	67	7		
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)	CSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	21
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	Yes
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	6
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	107
Total Components for the Federal Index	5
Percent Tested	94
Graduation Rate	9

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	CSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	15
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	Yes
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	6
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	73
Total Components for the Federal Index	5
Percent Tested	84
Graduation Rate	15

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	16	Yes	4	4
ELL	5	Yes	4	4
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	13	Yes	4	4
HSP	16	Yes	4	4
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	16	Yes	4	4

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	16	Yes	4	4

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	10	Yes	3	3
ELL	16	Yes	3	3
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	17	Yes	3	3
HSP	16	Yes	3	3
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	14	Yes	3	3
FRL	9	Yes	3	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				10			36	28		9	24	
SWD											1	
ELL											1	
AMI												
ASN												
BLK				6				24			3	
HSP				6			36	8		20	5	
MUL												

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											1	
FRL										22	2	

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				5			21	27		15	5	
SWD										10		
ELL										16		
AMI												
ASN												
BLK							15	25		15	14	
HSP								33		14	0	
MUL												
PAC												
WHT										14		
FRL										13	4	

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				0			0	20		14	7	
SWD										4		
ELL										10		
AMI												
ASN												
BLK										16	0	
HSP										13	0	
MUL												
PAC												
WHT										13		
FRL										10	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	3%	49%	-46%	50%	-47%
09	2023 - Spring	*	46%	*	48%	*

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	7%	47%	-40%	50%	-43%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	7%	45%	-38%	48%	-41%

BIOLOGY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	28%	63%	-35%	63%	-35%

HISTORY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	25%	62%	-37%	63%	-38%

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.

Students taking the Algebra EOC had a higher percentage of level 1 scores this past year. Of the 150 students, 120 had a level 1 in math. The majority of students come to Sheeler with foundational deficits which have contributed to why they are behind their cohort.

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

Student performance in the math state assessment. We do not have many first time test takers for the Algebra 1 EOC, so many students count on a concordance score from another exam. Students were able to use the PERT assessment and the concordance score for PERT was raised.

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 graduation rate for on-time graduates has a large gap with the state average. Sheeler is a school for students that need extra time and a different instructional model. We serve at-risk students, and the majority of our students come to us two or more years behind their cohort.

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

Students taking the state reading assessment and using our own diagnostics showed growth literacy growth. Sheeler made a concerted effort to integrate reading skills daily. Reading Plus was required of all students, and our Reading Coach monitored data and supported the teachers so they could provide proper instruction.

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

The number and percentage of students with two or more early warning factors. Our students come to us behind, so many have failed multiple courses and still need to pass state assessments to graduate. Attendance is also a factor.

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

Raising our graduation rate, with a concentration of more students graduating with their cohort.

Increasing daily average attendance rate. Students cannot learn if they are not here.

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 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.

Student satisfaction surveys are given twice a year. Sheeler had very positive results. The two categories with the most disagreements were as follows:

I feel successful at school. 86% agree to strongly agree. 14% disagree to strongly disagree.

My school considers students opinions when planning ways to improve the school. 84% strongly agree to agree. 16% disagree to strong disagree.

Measurable Outcome:

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

By the fall survey, we will raise the amount of agree to strongly agree by 2%. By spring, we will raise the amount by 5%.

Monitoring:

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

We will monitor strong participation in the surveys, both fall and spring. We will have check-ins with students that include questions about how we can improve. Our family support specialist will support classroom teachers in how to build relationships and create a positive environment. We will offer more ways for students to offer their opinions.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jonathan Owens (jonathan.owens@ocps.net)

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.)

To work towards a more positive climate for students, all students will participate in a one-on-one psycho-social needs assessment within 30 days of enrollment. The assessment and associated scales (ACES, Likert and Resiliency) are administered by a licensed/license-eligible clinician or by a clinical intern under the supervision of a licensed/license-eligible clinician.

Based on scores of scales and areas of needs identified during the research-based assessments, an individual student support plan will be created for every student. This plan may include referrals to community providers for off-site and/or on-site services to address student specific needs.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Knowing the individual needs of students will allow us to create more positive experiences. Conducting the assessment within the first month of enrollment will ensure the student has a positive experience and will feel more comfortable in stating needs, opinions and ideas.

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.

Conduct the comprehensive psycho- analysis for each student within first 30 days of enrollment.

Person Responsible: Jonathan Owens (jonathan.owens@ocps.net)

By When: First 30 days of enrollment. Our enrollment is rolling, so it is different for each student.

Conduct Fall and Spring Surveys. Ensure participation of every student.

Person Responsible: Jonathan Owens (jonathan.owens@ocps.net)

By When: November 2023 and April 2024

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Small Group Instruction**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 school uses a self-paced curriculum. Students are at individual levels and stages in each content area. The majority of our students come to us below grade level in reading and math. We will focus on small group instruction to allow students more teacher-led interaction with the content and foundational skills.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Our graduation rate for 2022-23 was 15%. With the expansion and improvement of small group instruction, our goal is to increase our graduation by 5% to 20%.

Monitoring:

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

Teachers will engage in professional development, participate in professional learning communities and attend biweekly and structured data meetings with administration. Small group instruction will be part of the teachers deliberate practice plans and monitored through classroom walkthroughs and observations. Reading Plus and IXL for Math are used as supports, and the data will be monitored closely and part of teacher and student data meetings.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jonathan Owens (jonathan.owens@ocps.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:

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

We will use two intervention programs to guide and assess the use of small group instruction.

Reading Plus is an adaptive literacy solution that improves fluency, comprehension, vocabulary, stamina, and motivation. Reading Plus produces 2.5 years of growth in just 60 hours of personalized instruction. Our school has a certified Reading teacher that works with all students and provides professional development for teachers.

IXL has comprehensive K-12 curriculum, individualized guidance, and real-time analytics, IXL meets the unique needs of each learner.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Reading Plus and IXL will give us a diagnostic look and real time data regarding the students' individualized needs. From there, teachers will be able to use the data to create small group lessons and monitor progress.

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.

Create a schedule and expectations for small group instruction.

Person Responsible: Jonathan Owens (jonathan.owens@ocps.net)

By When: September 2023

Monitor small group instruction and data from Reading Plus and IXL.

Person Responsible: Jonathan Owens (jonathan.owens@ocps.net)

By When: September 2023 through end of year.

#3. 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.

Of the 24 students identified as SWD, 19 of the students had two or more early warning indicators. 16 of the 24 scored at level 1 in Reading, and 15 of the 24 scored at level 1 in Math.

Measurable Outcome:

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

We will increase the number of students identified as SWD who pass the math assessment by 5%,

Monitoring:

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

We will use Math IXL to strengthen skills and monitor progress during the year.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jonathan Owens (jonathan.owens@ocps.net)

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.)

IXL has comprehensive K-12 curriculum, individualized guidance, and real-time analytics, IXL meets the unique needs of each learner.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Math IXL can differentiate instruction and give a specific plan for each student. Students with IEPs will be able to have individualized plans that the math teacher and math interventionist can use to create a blend of direct instruction, small group and individual work.

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.

Monitor IEP compliance. As students enter the school, ensure accommodations are relayed to teachers and ESE specialist. Create a schedule for ESE teacher and Math Interventionist to have small group or individual instruction.

Person Responsible: Jonathan Owens (jonathan.owens@ocps.net)

By When: September 2023 and throughout the year.

#4. 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.

Our ELL population scored below the district and state average in state assessments and graduation rate. Many of our ELL students come directly from their home country with little to no English Language skills.

Measurable Outcome:

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

We will increase our ELL students performance on state assessments and/or a concordance score by 5%.

Monitoring:

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

We will use Reading Plus, Math IXL and Wilson Reading to get daily, consistent data. This data will be analyzed to focus instruction and determine interventions.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jonathan Owens (jonathan.owens@ocps.net)

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 who struggle to read fluently need a lot of practice. Wilson Basic supplements the reading curriculum by providing additional reading practice with explicit fluency instruction. This program provides emerging readers with fluency practice at a student’s instructional reading level.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Wilson Reading combined with daily use of Reading Plus gives ELL students foundational skills and decoding, so they can not only learn the content but to learn the English language.

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.

Train teachers on Wilson Reading

Person Responsible: Jonathan Owens (jonathan.owens@ocps.net)

By When: September 2023

Monitor use of Wilson Reading and determine proper accommodations for students.

Person Responsible: Jonathan Owens (jonathan.owens@ocps.net)

By When: Monthly

#5. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups

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 subgroups White, Black, Hispanic, Multiracial and Economically Disadvantaged all scored below the state average and threshold of 42%.

Measurable Outcome:

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

We will increase the scores on state assessments of these subgroups by 5%

Monitoring:

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

We have multiple data points available to monitor progress of our students. We can determine how the students are succeeding in math and reading, as well as credit earning. Through diagnostic testing (GAIN), Reading Plus and Math IXL, students will have multiple data points and will be monitored to consistent improvement.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jonathan Owens (jonathan.owens@ocps.net)

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.)

GAIN measures basic English and math skills – from basic literacy and numeracy, to advanced skills taught in secondary schools as defined by the NRS' Educational Functioning Levels. GAIN's two forms can be used for pre-, progress-, or post-testing to show progress in skill development

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Since our enrollment is rolling and students come throughout the school year, the GAIN test allows us to determine where the student is upon enrollment, develop a plan and measure final progress.

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.

Create a plan for GAIN testing for each student during orientation.

Person Responsible: Jonathan Owens (jonathan.owens@ocps.net)

By When: September 2023

Monitor and analyze GAIN data by subgroup to determine individual and group needs.

Person Responsible: Jonathan Owens (jonathan.owens@ocps.net)

By When: Monthly

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).

Sheeler High School administration analyzes data during the summer and creates plans based on need. Our budget is created with a collaborative team, and there are monthly meetings with the finance team and grants department. The principal develops the areas of focus, based on data and surveys. After the area of focus is determined, the principal determines what interventions are needed. We purchase programs for interventions that are evidence-based and vetted through our educational platforms team and regional directors.