Lake Mary High School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Lake Mary High School

655 LONGWOOD LAKE MARY RD, Lake Mary, FL 32746

http://www.scps.k12.fl.us/schools/schoolinfopage.cfm?schoolnumber=0071

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.

Empowering RamNation to Be Responsible, Be Respectful, Be Engaged, and Be the Change we hope to see in the world.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Lake Mary High School will consciously work to establish a community of engaged educators and learners who will thrive in a safe and supportive environment. In the classroom, teachers will invest in and motivate students to help them achieve their personal best. Students will leave Lake Mary High School with a sense of purpose for their lives, equipped with tools and a plan for how to make an impact beyond high school.

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
Reynolds, Mickey	Principal	Ensuring School Improvement Plan is fully implemented and that all school board policy is followed to serve students with quality instruction and preparation for future success.
Ackley, Matthew	Assistant Principal	Principal Designee, Social Studies, PE, Facilities, Athletics/Booster Club, Emergency Procedures, Graduation, Minga Team Leader, Summer School Principal
Ayala-Cruz, Melisa	Assistant Principal	English, Reading, ESOL, Student Services, Master Schedule, Attendance, Clinic, Student/Teacher of the Month
Dukes, Datasha	Assistant Principal	Math, World Languages, Fleece, Support Staff, Substitutes, Textbooks, Acceleration Rate, Advanced Opportunities, Dividends/Mentors, Title IX, BCA Team Lead
Flory, Melissa	Assistant Principal	Science, Fine and Performing Arts, Professional Development, PTSA, Curriculum Leaders, Teacher/Employee of the Year
Southworth, Becca	Assistant Principal	ESE, CTE, Student Activities, Paraprofessionals, Discipline, Safety Guards, School Improvement Plan, MTSS, PBIS, School Advisory Council, Restorative Practices, BCA Team
Aslin, Kathy	Administrative Support	Testing Coordinator, AP Coordinator, Transition Program, GOAL/Plato, Media Center, Student Data Reports, Schedules and Calendars
Chamberlain, Shrell	Dean	Discipline, Parking, Truancy, BCA Team, Minga
Robinson, John	Dean	Discipline, Transportation, Lockers, BCA Team, Minga
Grigley, Winnola	School Counselor	Director of Student Services, Tutoring Program, Dual Enrollment
Motley, Ronald	Behavior Specialist	Behavior Interventionist, MTSS Lead, PBIS Lead, BCA Team
Weyers, Rick	Other	Athletic Director, Facilitron/Event Calendar, OJT Coordinator, Student Assistants
Barth, Nina	Instructional Coach	Literacy and Instructional Coach

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 Mary High School faculty and staff ascribe to an environment of open, productive communication to uphold all aspects of our mission statement, which is "Empowering RamNation to Be Respectful, Be Responsible, Be Engaged, and Be the Change we hope to see in the world". We engage all stakeholders at the very beginning of each year by encouraging them to get involved. Our PTSA, and School Advisory Council keeps parents and community members abreast of what is going on at the school, while collaborating on school improvement solutions. For students, Lake Mary High engages in Be the Change Student Open Forums and Inter Club Council. At these sessions, students have the opportunity to voice how internal stakeholders can improve in the way of ensuring meaning behind the purpose of Lake Mary High, thus establishing a positive culture for all. Student feedback is shared with leadership to improve practices. For parents and Community members, the plan is communicated through multiple venues, including School Messenger, the weekly Ram Report, social media platforms, SAC, and deliberate parent nights throughout the 2023-2024 school year, designed to address common high school concerns parents have.

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 closely monitored by Administration as we look at and analyze incoming assessment data. Our literacy coach will be able to take that data directly to PLCs to implement strategies that will assist in closing the achievement gap. Our PLCs will also include ESE support facilitators, who will look at how to differentiate instruction based on early assessment results. If we see that a plan needs to be added or revised, the leadership team will look to PLC leads for feedback and begin to put together PD support.

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	49%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	44%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	ATSI
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No

	Students With Disabilities (SWD)*
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	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*	54	55	50	59	57	51	58		
ELA Learning Gains				55			54		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				41			44		
Math Achievement*	34	39	38	43	40	38	40		
Math Learning Gains				44			31		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				48			36		
Science Achievement*	67	69	64	67	48	40	66		
Social Studies Achievement*	69	70	66	68	51	48	69		
Middle School Acceleration					48	44			
Graduation Rate	95	94	89	97	70	61	97		
College and Career Acceleration	56	60	65	56	71	67	61		
ELP Progress	65	59	45	70			62		

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	63
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	440
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	95
Graduation Rate	95

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	59
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	648
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	95
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	37	Yes	4	
ELL	40	Yes	1	
AMI				

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%
ASN	72			
BLK	43			
HSP	56			
MUL	56			
PAC				
WHT	71			
FRL	51			

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	38	Yes	3	
ELL	46			
AMI				
ASN	61			
BLK	43			
HSP	53			
MUL	65			
PAC				
WHT	65			
FRL	50			

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	54			34			67	69		95	56	65
SWD	17			15			29	26		20	7	56

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
ELL	19			7			36	33		40	7	65
AMI												
ASN	72			50			89	65		62	6	
BLK	36			14			39	44		31	6	
HSP	47			26			59	57		47	7	64
MUL	49			39			68	67			4	
PAC												
WHT	60			44			76	81		65	6	
FRL	39			22			52	53		37	7	64

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	59	55	41	43	44	48	67	68		97	56	70
SWD	21	36	27	20	34	40	28	43		92	19	60
ELL	25	51	47	19	40	50	38	35		95	39	71
AMI												
ASN	58	57		35	29		61	92		97	62	
BLK	37	36	31	19	36	44	46	53		98	33	
HSP	50	53	38	36	44	43	58	55		97	46	67
MUL	54	56		54	33		70	89		100	60	
PAC												
WHT	69	60	49	54	48	54	78	75		97	66	
FRL	43	48	37	30	38	45	51	56		97	41	68

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	58	54	44	40	31	36	66	69		97	61	62
SWD	21	38	35	22	37	36	33	37		91	25	71
ELL	18	55	53	13	44	57	29	30		98	47	62
AMI												
ASN	77	57		50	45		83	67		100	81	

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
BLK	37	47	36	19	24	30	38	50		98	34	
HSP	43	50	50	30	30	44	54	65		96	52	64
MUL	61	54		56	36		77			100	64	
PAC												
WHT	68	57	41	50	32	34	75	77		98	69	
FRL	39	46	43	25	32	38	51	59		94	39	64

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS

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	58%	55%	3%	50%	8%
09	2023 - Spring	48%	54%	-6%	48%	0%

ALGEBRA

Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	21%	54%	-33%	50%	-29%

GEOMETRY

Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	41%	53%	-12%	48%	-7%

BIOLOGY

Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	66%	68%	-2%	63%	3%

				HISTORY		
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	67%	69%	-2%	63%	4%

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.

• Our 9th grade ELA went from 61% in 21-22 to 49% in 22-23, dropping 12 percentage points. There was a decline in PM3 of FAST.
• Our Algebra 1 still struggles with only a 21% pass rate.
• Geometry dropped 11 points this year, from a 52 in 21-22 to 41 in 22-23.

• We've looked at all the data, and we are unsure why ELA dropped, especially in PM3. There was solid improvement from PM1 and PM2,
• Algebra is seeing a slow improvement, but we are not where we would like to be. Unfortunately, with middle school acceleration, we are still seeing our lowest numbers in this subject.
• This year, liberal arts math was not offered, therefore all students had to take Geometry.

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

The greatest decline we had last year was a drop in 9th Grade ELA. We had a 61% pass rate in 2021-2022 which dropped 12 percentage points to 49% in 2022-2023. This was due to significant low scores in FAST PM3. At this time, we cannot explain the drop in scores. We have reviewed all of our data and see no correlation to specific factors.

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.

Algebra 1 and Geometry EOC scores have the greatest gap when compared to 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?

• U.S. History pass rate improved from 65.6% (21-22) to 67.1% (22-23).
• 10th grade ELA pass rate improved from 56% (21-22) to 58% (22-23).
• The # of AP tests administered rose this year. Our pass rate grew from 55.2 in 21-22 to 61.6 in 22-23

• Our Social Studies department has a very strong PLC.
• This past year, we held an AP Parent Night which resulted in increased participation.
• Our 10th grade teachers adopted B.E.S.T. standards this past year, in order to move the needle even further on 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- Focus on Conditions for Learning for Tier 1 students in order to increase student achievement.
2- Increase ELA 9th grade student achievement
3- Increase Algebra 1 student achievement.
4- Decrease the number of skipping referrals; keeping everyone in class and engaged in learning.
5- Building and celebrating our school culture; living by our motto- Be Respectful, Be Responsible, Be Engaged, and Be the Change.

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. To increase 9th grade ELA proficiency from 49% to 65% with specific focus on SWD.To increase Algebra 1 proficiency from 21% to 26% with specific focus on SWD

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:

Mickey Reynolds (mickey_reynolds@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 gains for our students. This strategy is aligned to having high expectations for all learners and teachers.

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.

ELA
1. English Teachers will meet weekly in PLCs to review data, curriculum, and instructional practices that will increase student achievement.
2. Continue to use Resources such as Study Sync and ELA Framework.

AI1. Common PLC planning- data chats to include support facilitators.
2. Specific teachers will focus solely on Algebra preps.
3. Put stronger teachers in those high needs classrooms. Include bilingual teacher(s) for ESOL students.
4. Review individual student data in PLCs, along with a breakdown of concepts not mastered. Develop a plan on how to differentiate instruction.
gebra 1

Person Responsible: Mickey Reynolds (mickey_reynolds@scps.k12.fl.us)

By When: Ongoing throughout the schoolyear

#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 results 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:

Mickey Reynolds (mickey_reynolds@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.

Trust Relationships
1. Build up our Ram Advocate Program. Teachers/staff will be assigned students and will hold quarterly check ins.
2. Students will identify a trusted adult on campus through a Rams Period Lesson at the beginning of the school year.
3. Using Restorative Practice in the classroom with fidelity.

Reduction of Skipping referrals
1. Implement the Minga Hall pass system.
2. Implement the Behavior Coaching Academy/Hierarchy of Consequences in the classroom and out in the hallway.
3. Set high expectations (by presentation) for our 9th and 10th grade students at the beginning of the year.

Person Responsible: Mickey Reynolds (mickey_reynolds@scps.k12.fl.us)

By When: Ongoing throughout the 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).