Lake Brantley High School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Lake Brantley High School

991 SAND LAKE RD, Altamonte Springs, FL 32714

http://www.scps.k12.fl.us/schools/schoolinfopage.cfm?schoolnumber=0491

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Seminole County School Board on 10/24/2023.

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.

The mission of Lake Brantley High School is to ensure that all students acquire the knowledge, skills, and attitudes necessary to be successful in adult life.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The Vision of Lake Brantley is to empower its students to achieve individual success through Respect, Responsibility and a Readiness to Learn.

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
Blasewitz, Brian	Principal	Campus-wide executive leadership, school safety and security, budgeting and allocations, primary community stakeholder liaison, and supervising all other functions of a comprehensive high school
Fields, Donald	Assistant Principal	Exceptional Student Education, Performing Arts, School Advisory Council, Parent-Teacher-Student Association, Transition Program, School Improvement Plan, Student Leadership, MTSS and Interventions, SAFE Team/Threat Assessment Vice-Chair
McIntyre, Jeralee	Assistant Principal	Social Studies, Physical Education, Health and First Aid, Athletic Training, Air Force JROTC, Discipline, Teacher Certification and Compliance, Teacher Induction Program, Interns and Student Teaching, Inventory, Textbooks, Department Chairs, Open House
Menta, Rachel	Assistant Principal	English, Reading, ESOL, Literacy Coaching, Professional Development, Graduation Coordinator, Pre-Advanced Placement Program, Accreditation
Sanchez, Jose	Principal	Principal's Designee, Mathematics, Science, World Languages, Computer Science, Clerical Staff, Summer School Principal, Attendance and Truancy, Clinic and Student Health and Wellness, Student Records, Risk Management, Equity Coordinator
Reyes, Patricia	Administrative Support	Discipline, School Safety Guards, Conflict Resolution, Student Parking, Custodial Staff, SAFE Team/Threat Assessment Chair, Dropout Prevention, RISE Drop-out Prevention Supervisor
Shafer, Brian	Administrative Support	Athletics, Discipline, Facilities and Rentals, Business Partners Liaison, Fundraising
Goe, Amanda	School Counselor	Coordinating Student Services events, including Student Orientation and 8th Grade Curriculum Night, Schedule Changes, School Counseling

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.

Lake Brantley High School will create a narrated slideshow presentation for parents and the community with relevant data from state and national assessments, 5 Essentials, School Safety, and Snapshot Surveys. The presentation will also review the draft goals and actions/strategies for the plan. This slideshow will be shared with the SAC and PTSA members, as well as on the school website and through social media. We will establish a feedback survey for families and the community to share their thoughts on the draft plan, which will then be considered for amendments as appropriate. Then, the final

draft will be presented to the PTSA and SAC committees before submission to the Assistant Superintendent.

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 be part of all periodic meetings with stakeholders, including weekly LBHS Leadership Team Meetings, monthly Department Chair Meetings, monthly SAC and PTSA Meetings, and quarterly Faculty and Staff Meetings. We will track and review key data points related to our Students with Disabilities, including attendance, service delivery/logs, IEP compliance, student discipline, state, county, and school formative assessments, and progress report and final grade failures. In addition to just reviewing the data, we will engage the entire school community in learning the significance of and the methods for measuring disparities in educational outcomes for subgroups of students, including Students with Disabilities. Using this new, more actionable approach to data analysis, we will track changes in the outcomes for students with disabilities and quarterly consider potential changes to the Action Plans around those goals.

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	52%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	49%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	ATSI
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD)* English Language Learners (ELL) Asian Students (ASN) Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: B 2019-20: B 2018-19: B

	2017-18: B
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*	52	55	50	54	57	51	57		
ELA Learning Gains				50			52		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				38			41		
Math Achievement*	39	39	38	40	40	38	39		
Math Learning Gains				46			29		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				44			30		
Science Achievement*	67	69	64	66	48	40	66		
Social Studies Achievement*	69	70	66	61	51	48	71		
Middle School Acceleration					48	44			
Graduation Rate	96	94	89	95	70	61	96		
College and Career Acceleration	60	60	65	60	71	67	67		
ELP Progress	71	59	45	85			72		

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

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

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	65

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	454
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	97
Graduation Rate	96

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	58
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	639
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	93
Graduation Rate	95

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	35	Yes	4	
ELL	46			
AMI				
ASN	86			
BLK	49			
HSP	57			
MUL	74			
PAC				
WHT	72			
FRL	55			

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	32	Yes	3	
ELL	46			
AMI				
ASN	75			
BLK	46			
HSP	52			
MUL	55			
PAC				
WHT	66			
FRL	52			

Accountability Components by Subgroup

Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school. (pre-populated)

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2021-22	C & C Accel 2021-22	ELP Progress
All Students	52			39			67	69		96	60	71
SWD	19			17			36	29		19	6	
ELL	25			22			49	21		37	7	71
AMI												
ASN	73			79			89	85		88	6	
BLK	39			23			52	47		38	6	
HSP	40			30			55	59		45	7	72
MUL	62			48			77	78		77	6	
PAC												
WHT	61			50			78	80		68	6	
FRL	39			28			54	55		47	7	71

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	54	50	38	40	46	44	66	61		95	60	85
SWD	15	27	27	19	29	43	36	22		85	18	
ELL	29	50	45	13	30	37	39	26		94	62	85
AMI												
ASN	74	59		64	64		73	90		100	74	
BLK	35	46	42	28	46	50	42	45		94	36	
HSP	43	46	36	28	40	39	55	52		95	59	82
MUL	49	56	54	11	21		48	82		100	78	
PAC												
WHT	64	53	38	60	50	51	79	77		95	64	100
FRL	41	45	36	30	42	44	55	53		94	50	83

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	57	52	41	39	29	30	66	71		96	67	72
SWD	18	37	36	9	34	38	14	30		86	23	
ELL	22	52	48	15	38	41	34	29		100	62	72
AMI												
ASN	81	65		57	50		93	87		88	91	
BLK	37	40	30	17	17	18	43	56		94	45	
HSP	44	47	44	30	30	35	50	59		97	63	69
MUL	62	68		48	33		71	79		100	64	
PAC												
WHT	66	54	38	50	30	33	77	79		96	71	92
FRL	45	44	35	26	27	28	52	59		93	55	71

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	49%	55%	-6%	50%	-1%
09	2023 - Spring	55%	54%	1%	48%	7%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	23%	54%	-31%	50%	-27%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	51%	53%	-2%	48%	3%

BIOLOGY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	65%	68%	-3%	63%	2%

HISTORY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	68%	69%	-1%	63%	5%

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.

Overall Algebra 1 performance is very low, at 24%, and Students with Disabilities are performing much worse than their non-disabled peers at just 5% proficiency. In English, Students with Disabilities are also showing a significant opportunity gap, with a 46% difference between their outcomes and those of their non-disabled peers in English 1, and a 34% gap in English 2.

While Lake Brantley High School made significant improvements in disparities in outcomes for racial subgroups, the gaps remain, with Black students experiencing a 16% gap in English 1, 23% gap in

English 2, 11% gap in Algebra 1, and 29% gap in Geometry.

Last year, the focus for Lake Brantley High School's Professional Development Plan was on increasing teacher capacity to assist students coming from poverty in finding academic success. Given the correlation between socio-economic status and race, this is likely to have been a major factor in the improvements in performance for students of color.
To continue and accelerate these improvements, Lake Brantley High School will make formative assessment data analysis a central focus for the 2023-2024 school year. The administration and literacy coach will assist PLCs with learning how to take their data analysis beyond class averages and item analyses – teachers will learn to use subgroup and individual student data to provide differentiation and targeted interventions.

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

Algebra 1 proficiency for Students with Disabilities dropped from 15% in 2022 and an average scale score of 467 to 5% and an average scale score of 464. Among the factors that contributed to this decline are turnover in the Support Facilitator position, disproportionate student absences among 9th grade Students with Disabilities, and major disparities in school discipline for Students with Disabilities. The last factor, school discipline, stands out as having the strongest non-academic disparity for Students with Disabilities: they comprise 10% of the student population, but account for 24% of all days of suspension assigned for the 2022-2023 school year, a disparity factor of 2.34.

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.

10th grade ELA is 1 point below the state average. . Contributing factors include the low performance of students with disabilities.

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

In addition to the reductions in opportunity gaps for certain subgroups mentioned above, overall student achievement improved in English 1 (51% to 55%), Geometry (50.5% to 51.2%), and US History (65.6% to 67.9%).

In English 1, we initiated our trial of incorporating the Pre-AP English curriculum into our classes as a supplement to the BEST Standards to increase rigor and prepare all students for advanced studies. Unlike in English 2, where there was a significant slip in performance, the English 1 PLC infused Pre-AP into B.E.S.T. with greater reliance on the standards. This, combined with removing the traditional Honors/Standard tracking for English courses, likely contributed to the improvements in English 1.
In both Geometry and US History, our leadership set out to recruit and retain highly-qualified and motivated teachers for these roles. We also implemented the PLC process with greater fidelity in these two areas. These two factors are the most likely contributors to the growth in overall student achievement.

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. Increase Algebra 1 Proficiency for Students with Disabilities from 5% to 10%
2. Increase Grade 9 Reading Proficiency for Students with Disabilities from 14% to 20%
3. Reduce percent of overall population disparity in assigned suspensions for Black Males from a 3.14 (6% of population, but 18% of suspensions) to a 2.0 (6% of population, down to 12% of suspensions)
4. Reduce total number of repeat offenders (3+ referrals) who are on Free-or-Reduced Lunch by 5%, from 103 to 97
5. 100% of the 2024 Graduation Cohort will earn their ELA testing graduation requirement

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

#1. 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.

Increasing academic achievement of students with disabilities. ESSA Federal Percent of Points Index indicates this is a high priority need and focusing on the success of these students will reduce achievement gaps and prepare these students for future academic success.

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

Increase achievement and learning gains for students with disabilities. Increase Algebra 1 Proficiency for Students with Disabilities from 5% to 10%.Increase Grade 9 Reading Proficiency for Students with Disabilities from 14% to 20%

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

This area of focus will be monitored through classroom walk throughs, review of progress monitoring data and through data chats with professional learning communities.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Brian Blasewitz (brian_blasewitz@scps.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.)

The following evidence-based interventions are available to high schools to help them support students based upon the area of need of the individual student: CAR-PD, Achieve 3000, Corrective Reading, and Reading Mastery.

Math - The following evidence-based interventions are available to middle schools to help them support students based upon the area of need of the individual student: DreamBox, Transition to Algebra, Seminole Numeracy Project.

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

A variety of interventions are available to the schools to allow them to meet the needs of individual students. This allows all the areas of reading to be addressed from foundations to comprehension across the K-12 continuum.
All of the listed interventions have been approved by Just Read, Florida through the vetting process for the K-12 Comprehensive Evidence- Based Reading Plan.

Math- All the listed interventions have research-based evidence for efficacy.
Standards based lessons differentiated to meet the needs of these specific student groups and data driven deliberate action planning will improve achievement and learning

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Establish a pull-out Resource Room for direct, standards-based interventions with an ESE teacher.
Create a targeted focus group of 12-15 students with disabilities based on teacher observations to track and discuss explicitly in Algebra 1 and Foundations PLC.

Establish a pull-out Resource Room for reading extension interventions assigned by ELA and Reading teachers and facilitated by an ESE teacher.
Establish an ongoing partnership between Reading/ELA/Support Facilitation Teachers as a shared PLC to analyze individual student progress and provide enrichment or remediation as necessary to increase achievement.
Monitor student data through Achieve 3000 + Achieve 3000 Word Studio, FAST PM 1 & 2, Write Score, Benchmark Assessments, data chats, PSAT Scores, FAST/EOC Scores, celebration of student success.

Person Responsible: Brian Blasewitz (brian_blasewitz@scps.k12.fl.us)

By When: Ongoing throughout the school year

#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.

Students succeed when conditions for learning are optimized. A focus on campus safety, development of a culture where student voice and belonging are valued and sharing collective responsibility for the success of all students in the school increase student achievement.

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

Increase 5 Essentials Survey and SCPS Safety Survey indicating a high degree of trust, collective responsibility and academic personalism.

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

Conditions for Learning monitoring will occur during classroom walk through, PLC meetings, attendance and discipline data reviews.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:
Brian Blasewitz (brian_blasewitz@scps.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.)

The Multi-Tiered Support System (MTSS) process is a team-based approach that relies on a strong collaboration between families and professionals from a variety of disciplines regardless of the level implemented. MTSS provides a positive and effective means to support student learning, attendance and behavior.

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

MTSS methods are research-based and proven to positively impact school climate and increase academic performance.

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.

Inter-Club Council Student Activities Fairs and Lunchtime Tabling
Survey and track data on this question
Continue "Warm Demander" strategy practice and reinforcement with teachers
Establish a "How Can I Help?" Center outside the campus restaurant where key adults on campus hold lunchtime hours and are available to assist students during their lunches. This will include Certified School Counselors, School Social Worker, District Mental Health Counselor, Assistant Principals, the Principal, Athletic Director, and aspiring teacher leaders.

Adding an additional School Safety Guard to interact with students during classes, between classes, at lunch, etc.
Changing the bell schedule to reduce the amount of transition times and unstructured student time on campus (fewer opportunities for misconduct, tardies, etc.)
Provide Administrators with PD on having conversations around disparities through Conditions for Learning.
Continue to formalize tardy tracking and interventions
Establish a high-risk group schoolwide Teacher-Student Mentoring Program as a Tiered Behavioral Intervention.

Person Responsible: Brian Blasewitz (brian_blasewitz@scps.k12.fl.us)

By When: Ongoing throughout school year

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).

In collaboration with the Assistant Superintendent, school leaders identify and align resources to meet the needs of all students and maximize desired student outcomes. Evaluation of student achievement data and related early warning factors such as attendance and discipline referrals are at the core of this work. Principals review data with the school leadership team, staff, and other relevant stakeholders, then develop or modify goals and strategies to align with the school needs presented. These goals and strategies are then operationalized through action items within the annual School Improvement Plan. These specific interventions or activities are noted within the SIP, and funding resources are assigned (i.e., Title I, Part A, UniSIG).