Gulf Breeze High School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Gulf Breeze High School

675 GULF BREEZE PKWY, Gulf Breeze, FL 32561

http://www.santarosa.k12.fl.us/schools/gbh/

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Santa Rosa County School Board on 10/12/2023.

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.

Santa Rosa County and Gulf Breeze High School's mission is to love, educate, and prepare all students for graduation and a successful future.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Santa Rosa County District Schools and Gulf Breeze High School provides an environment that fosters each learner's potential, equips students for academic excellence, and promotes lifelong 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
Brothers, Danny	Principal	The Principal shall assume all administrative responsibility and instructional leadership for the planning, management, operation, and evaluation of the educational program of Gulf Breeze High School.
Barker, Sarah	Assistant Principal	The Assistant Principal shall be responsible for assisting the Principal in the administrative and leadership responsibilities for Student Services. Such duties include, but are not limited to, overseeing school wide student discipline, student attendance and truancy, student parking, student mental health programs, assessment coordination, instructional leadership, teacher evaluation, and any other duties assigned by the Principal, including acting on the Principal's behalf in his/her absence.
Keen, Patrick	Assistant Principal	The Assistant Principal shall be responsible for assisting the Principal in the administrative and leadership responsibilities for Curriculum and Guidance Services. Such duties include, but are not limited to, 504 and IEP's, academic records, ACCEL, appeals coordinator, master schedule, out of field reports, AP classes and testing, curriculum development, student registration, instructional leadership, teacher evaluation, and other duties as assigned by the Principal, including acting on the Principal's behalf in his/her absence.
Watts, Jon	Assistant Principal	The Assistant Principal shall be responsible for assisting the Principal in the administrative and leadership responsibilities for Administration Services. Such duties include, but are not limited to, accident reports, athletics, facilities, safety drills, FISH reports, insurance, leave approval, textbook accountability, volunteers, substitutes, custodial, instructional leadership, teacher evaluation, and any other duties as assigned by the Principal, including acting on the Principal's behalf in his/her absence.

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.

In analyzing GBHS' school assessment data from the 2022-2023 school year, the administrative team develops goals and strategies to address any learning gaps that are evident in our students. Once those goals are developed, they are shared with the School Advisory Council (SAC), which includes parents, students, faculty members, and community members. These stakeholders are given an opportunity to share their input toward those goals and strategies, as well as any gaps that they may see which need to be addressed. The SIP draft was sent to the SAC members for review and feedback on 8/11/23.

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 School Improvement Plan (SIP) is presented to the School Advisory Council (SAC) in the beginning of the school year, once the plan has been developed by school administration. This rough draft is provided to the SAC SIP sub-committee for review and input prior to SAC voting on approval (8/11/23).

Once SAC has approved the SIP and it has been submitted, it is shared with the faculty and staff, in addition to being shared publicly on the school website. We plan to monitor our SIP goals monthly through our MTSS meetings, as well as when assessment data is made available. Teacher observations will also be a method used for monitoring of goals, as well as Professional Learning Community (PLC) meeting minutes. A mid-year and end of the year review will also be provided to the SAC on the SIP goals.

Each semester the principal and assistant principal will meet with District leaders including the Superintendent, Assistant Superintendent of Curriculum and Instruction, Grade Level Director, Literacy/ Math/Science Coordinators, and the Director and Coordinator of Continuous Improvement. The purpose of the meeting will be o review current state progress monitoring data and to progress monitor the implementation of the School Improvement Strategies and Action Steps. Specific feedback will be provided, and discussion will occur as to any barriers in applying the strategies of the plan.

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	20%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	22%
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)* 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: A 2019-20: A 2018-19: A 2017-18: A
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review

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

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

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

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	61	55	50	68	58	51	69		
ELA Learning Gains				58			54		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				41			34		
Math Achievement*	62	49	38	68	41	38	67		
Math Learning Gains				53			43		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				38			38		
Science Achievement*	82	76	64	78	57	40	86		
Social Studies Achievement*	86	73	66	78	49	48	85		
Middle School Acceleration				40	44				
Graduation Rate	95	91	89	97	69	61	99		

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
College and Career Acceleration	72	66	65	73	74	67	70		
ELP Progress		57	45						

* In cases where a school does not test 95% of students in a subject, the achievement component will be different in the Federal Percent of Points Index (FPPI) than in school grades calculation.

See [Florida School Grades, School Improvement Ratings and DJJ Accountability Ratings](#).

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	76
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	458
Total Components for the Federal Index	6
Percent Tested	98
Graduation Rate	95

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	65
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	652
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	97
Graduation Rate	97

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	42			
ELL				
AMI				
ASN	83			
BLK	50			
HSP	71			
MUL	76			
PAC				
WHT	77			
FRL	63			

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	34	Yes	1	
ELL				
AMI				
ASN	81			
BLK	40	Yes	1	
HSP	63			
MUL	70			
PAC				
WHT	65			
FRL	58			

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	61			62			82	86		95	72	
SWD	21			27			35	53		28	6	
ELL												
AMI												
ASN	67			75			82	100		73	6	
BLK	54			45							2	
HSP	49			62			70	86		64	6	
MUL	59			65			79	86		76	6	
PAC												
WHT	62			62			84	86		73	6	
FRL	43			49			70	83		49	6	

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS

Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21	ELP Progress
All Students	68	58	41	68	53	38	78	78		97	73	
SWD	20	24	20	22	26	24	32	40		97	38	
ELL												
AMI												
ASN	82	74		88	80		83	80				
BLK	40			40								
HSP	64	56	41	64	46	35	77	71		91	81	
MUL	70	64	75	63	31		79	80		89	75	
PAC												
WHT	68	57	39	69	55	39	79	79		97	72	
FRL	54	51	31	59	49	39	71	72		92	62	

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	69	54	34	67	43	38	86	85		99	70	
SWD	18	17	10	15	28	21	41	71		100	25	
ELL												

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
2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
AMI												
ASN	81	63		85	58		89			100	90	
BLK												
HSP	75	63		74	45		81	79		100	50	
MUL	71	48		63	42		81	75		100	54	
PAC												
WHT	69	54	36	67	42	36	86	86		99	72	
FRL	54	39	27	50	34	27	76	73		99	49	

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	61%	55%	6%	50%	11%
09	2023 - Spring	63%	55%	8%	48%	15%

			ALGEBRA			
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	60%	58%	2%	50%	10%

			GEOMETRY			
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	68%	55%	13%	48%	20%

BIOLOGY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	82%	73%	9%	63%	19%

HISTORY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	86%	70%	16%	63%	23%

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 preliminary 22-23 FAST English/Language Arts (ELA) data, we have seen a consistent drop in our ELA scores (9th & 10th Grades). From the 18-19 data, ELA scores were at 76%, with 62% 22-23 ELA scores. Contributing factors include post-COVID academic deficit of ELA skills, turnover in the ELA and Reading positions, and new standards/curriculum.

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

Based on the preliminary 22-23 FAST ELA data, there was a decline in ELA scores from 68% to 62%. One of the factors could be the new test format (from FSA to FAST). Other contributing factors include post-COVID academic deficit of ELA skills, turnover in the ELA and Reading positions, and new standards/curriculum.

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.

All GBHS preliminary 22-23 ELA FAST, Biology, US History, Algebra I, and Geometry assessment data scores are higher than the state average.

22-23 School Year Assessment Results:

ELA FAST-
State average: 48%
GBHS average: 62%

Biology EOC-
State average: 63%
GBHS average: 82%

US History EOC-

State average: 63%
GBHS average: 86%

Algebra I EOC-
State average: 50%
GBHS average: 60%

Geometry EOC-
State average: 48%
GBHS average: 68%

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

Based on the preliminary 22-23 US History EOC data, this component showed the most improvement from 78% in 21-22 to 86% in 22-23. The new action that was taken in the 22-23 school year was having our Advanced Placement US History students take the US History EOC. This is aligned with all other high schools in Santa Rosa County. Another new action taken was through the Social Studies Professional Learning Community (PLC). The teachers who taught US History met monthly to study past EOC questions and also created a pre test for their students on these skills. The teachers were able to use those pre-tests to focus on the students' learning deficits and to drive their instruction.

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

n/a

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

1. Improving professional development support and opportunities provided to all teachers on the following three areas: peer observations and feedback, using Progress Learning for data driven instruction, and student-led academic teams.
2. Increasing ELA scores for both 9th and 10th grades- we will be providing additional support to ELA level 1's & 2's through weekly intensive small group instruction pull-out, provided by a certified teacher.
3. Increasing subgroup achievement scores for Students with Disabilities through small groups and student-led academic teams.
4. Focusing on supporting new teachers, which will decrease teacher turnover.
5. Every classroom enforcing school-wide cell phone policy during instructional time to increase student engagement.

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 Teacher Retention and Recruitment

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

In summer of 2023, the administrative team focused on hiring experienced and highly qualified teachers that held their professional certification. The GBHS Teacher Induction Program (TIP) will be led this year by the GBHS librarian, who is trained in mentoring new teachers. New teachers to GBHS will be assigned an experienced teacher as a mentor from their department.

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

The measurable outcome for this area of focus is that 100% of all teachers are retained for the 24-25 school year.

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

TIP meetings will be held monthly to provide support to new teachers for the 23-24 school year. Additionally, all teachers will be a part of a department team and a Professional Learning Community to improve instructional outcomes and teacher community, both of which will meet monthly.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Danny Brothers (brothersd@santarosa.k12.fl.us)

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

Research shows that new teacher programs that include mentoring increases teacher retention: "high-quality induction programs that reduce attrition include mentoring with observation and feedback, time for collaborative planning with colleagues, a reduced teaching load, and a focus on high-leverage activities—such as analyzing student work and discussing instructional strategies" (1).

1. https://learningpolicyinstitute.org/sites/default/files/product-files/Teacher_Turnover_REPORT.pdf

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

Frequent teacher turnover affects student achievement, which has been shown in our ELA score decrease. It also has a negative impact on the overall school culture and climate.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention
(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 4 - Demonstrates a Rationale

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.

Monthly Teacher Induction Program meetings for all teachers new to GBHS.

Person Responsible: Sarah Barker (barkers@santarosa.k12.fl.us)

By When: Monthly

Every new teacher to GBHS will be assigned a teacher mentor in their department and will meet for support.

Person Responsible: Sarah Barker (barkers@santarosa.k12.fl.us)

By When: Monthly, or more frequent as needed.

Individual new teacher & mentor meetings with the principal.

Person Responsible: Danny Brothers (brothersd@santarosa.k12.fl.us)

By When: Monthly

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Instructional Coaching/Professional Learning

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.

Based on the teacher observation data from the 22-23 school year, the two areas of Standards Based Instruction and Conditions for Learning in the Marzano Focused Teacher Evaluation Model had an average score of 3.76% and 3.82% respectively.

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

The goal for the 23-24 school year is for the Standards Based Instruction to maintain an average score of 3.65-3.85% and for Conditions for Learning to maintain an average score of 3.75%- 3.85%.

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

This focus area will be monitored with every teacher receiving an administrative observation every nine weeks of the school year by all four administrators.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Danny Brothers (brothersd@santarosa.k12.fl.us)

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

Research shows that providing specific observation feedback tied to learning goals for teachers can increase student achievement outcomes in the classroom (1).

1. Leverage Leadership 2.0 by Bambrick-Santoyo (chapter 3)

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

Observation and feedback provides opportunities for growth in instructional strategies. From the Leverage Leadership 2.0 book by Bambrick-Santoyo, "the real purpose of observation and feedback is not to evaluate teachers but to develop them" (1).

1. Leverage Leadership 2.0 by Bambrick-Santoyo (chapter 3)

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 2 - Moderate 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.

Every teacher will receive an observation every nine weeks of the school year for a total of four.

Person Responsible: Danny Brothers (brothersd@santarosa.k12.fl.us)

By When: Quarterly

Teachers will identify an instructional strategy that they would like to improve. Administration will set up a time for the teacher to observe an effective teacher in that identified strategy and to provide feedback for improvement (peer observations).

Person Responsible: Danny Brothers (brothersd@santarosa.k12.fl.us)

By When: First and second nine weeks.

Provide professional development on using student rubrics and scales in the classroom. Require teachers to use them with their students.

Person Responsible: Danny Brothers (brothersd@santarosa.k12.fl.us)

By When: First grading period, then monitored quarterly.

Create a PLC on student-led academic groups (as a book study using "The Power of Student Teams" to start).

Person Responsible: Sarah Barker (barkers@santarosa.k12.fl.us)

By When: 1st semester of school.

#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.

Based on 21-22 ESSA data:
Our Students with Disabilities subgroup decreased 11 points overall (Federal Index) from 45% in 20-21 to 34% in 21-22. The decrease dropped this subgroup below the 41% threshold.

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

Our SWD subgroup will improve by 5% points in the overall Federal Index score.

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

ESE teachers, partnered with regular education teachers, will monitor student progress through classroom assessments, Progress Learning, FAST assessments, and IEP goals.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:
Danny Brothers (brothersd@santarosa.k12.fl.us)

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

Small groups will be utilized to reteach concepts, review lessons, and provide differentiated instruction. These groups will be used in the Learning Strategies classes and the core content classes.

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

Students that do not show proficiency on classroom assessments will need reteaching. Small groups allow for a more individualized setting to learn those retaught concepts, review lessons, and they also provide an opportunity for differentiated instruction. John Hattie provides reasoning on why it's important for students to have the opportunity to verbalize their learning to their peers and teacher: "teachers should continually look for evidence of the impact their actions are having on their students' thinking and products and should use this evidence to decide if instructional changes are needed" (1).
1. The Power of Student Teams by Toth and Sousa

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 3 - Promising 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.

ESE teachers and general education teachers that are partnered for inclusion classes will plan collaboratively.

Person Responsible: Patrick Keen (keenp@santarosa.k12.fl.us)

By When: Weekly

IEP goals will be written for students based on progress monitoring data.

Person Responsible: Patrick Keen (keenp@santarosa.k12.fl.us)

By When: As needed as dictated by the IEP frequency.

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

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

Based on 21-22 ESSA Federal Index data, our Black/African American subgroup decreased to 40% in 21-22. The decrease dropped this subgroup below the 41% threshold by one percentage point.

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

Our Black/African American subgroup will improve by 5% points overall.

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

Our MTSS team will be monitoring the 51 students in this subgroup, using FAST PM1 and PM2 results for ELA, and Progress Monitoring results for Algebra I and Geometry. These results will also be provided to the students' teachers so they can address these instructional deficiencies in class.

Teachers will use these assessments results to create their student learning rubrics in their daily lesson.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Danny Brothers (brothersd@santarosa.k12.fl.us)

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

Teachers will using their progress monitoring data (FAST PM1, FAST PM2, and Progress Learning assessments) to address the instructional deficiencies of this subgroup. Teachers will use the assessment results to create student learning rubrics so students can monitor their own learning progress.

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

Assessments must be used by teachers to plan instruction and intervention for students. "Assessments are the starting point for instructional planning" (1). Learning rubrics will also be created based on these assessment results so students can monitor their learning progress. (2).

(1) Leverage Leadership 2.0 by Bambrick-Santoyo
(2) The Marzano Focused Teacher Evaluation Model, 2017 https://www.marzanocenter.com/wp-content/uploads/sites/4/2019/04/FTEM_Updated_Michigan_08312017.pdf

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 4 - Demonstrates a Rationale

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.

FAST PM1 & PM2 and Progress Monitoring assessments will be provided to students in the testing windows.

Person Responsible: Sarah Barker (barkers@santarosa.k12.fl.us)

By When: During assigned testing windows.

Teachers will be trained on how to use data from assessments to drive their instruction.

Person Responsible: Patrick Keen (keenp@santarosa.k12.fl.us)

By When: Preplanning and PLC meetings

Teachers will be trained on how to develop learning scales/rubrics based on progress monitoring assessments results.

Person Responsible: Patrick Keen (keenp@santarosa.k12.fl.us)

By When: Preplanning and PLC meetings