Elevation High School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Elevation High School

4243 N US HIGHWAY 17-92, Sanford, FL 32773

elevationhs.com

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes (F.S.), requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a new, amended, or continuation SIP for each school in the district which has a school grade of D or F; has a significant gap in achievement on statewide, standardized assessments administered pursuant to s. 1008.22 by one or more student subgroups, as defined in the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), 20 U.S.C. s. 6311(b)(2)(C)(v)(II); has not significantly increased the percentage of students passing statewide, standardized assessments; has not significantly increased the percentage of students demonstrating Learning Gains, as defined in s. 1008.34, and as calculated under s. 1008.34(3)(b), who passed statewide, standardized assessments; has been identified as requiring instructional supports under the Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE) program established in s. 1008.365; or has significantly lower graduation rates for a subgroup when compared to the state's graduation rate. Rule 6A-1.098813, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.), requires district school boards to approve a SIP for each Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) school in the district rated as Unsatisfactory.

Below are the criteria for identification of traditional public and public charter schools pursuant to the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) State plan:

Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)
A school not identified for CSI or TSI, but has one or more subgroups with a Federal Index below 41%.

Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)
A school not identified as CSI that has at least one consistently underperforming subgroup with a Federal Index below 32% for three consecutive years.

Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)
A school can be identified as CSI in any of the following four ways: 1. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%; 2. Have a graduation rate at or below 67%; 3. Have a school grade of D or F; or 4. Have a Federal Index below 41% in the same subgroup(s) for 6 consecutive years.

ESEA sections 1111(d) requires that each school identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI develop a support and improvement plan created in partnership with stakeholders (including principals and other school leaders, teachers and parent), is informed by all indicators in the State's accountability system, includes evidence-based interventions, is based on a school-level needs assessment, and identifies resource inequities to be addressed through implementation of the plan. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as TSI, ATSI and non-Title I CSI must be approved and monitored by the school district. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as Title I, CSI must be approved by the school district and

Department. The Department must monitor and periodically review implementation of each CSI plan after approval.

The Department's SIP template in the Florida Continuous Improvement Management System (CIMS), https://www.floridacims.org, meets all state and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all ESSA components for a support and improvement plan required for traditional public and public charter schools identified as CSI, TSI and ATSI, and eligible schools applying for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) funds.

Districts may allow schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions to develop a SIP using the template in CIMS.

The responses to the corresponding sections in the Department's SIP template may address the requirements for: 1) Title I schools operating a schoolwide program (SWD), pursuant to ESSA, as amended, Section 1114(b); and 2) charter schools that receive a school grade of D or F or three consecutive grades below C, pursuant to Rule 6A-1.099827, F.A.C. The chart below lists the applicable requirements.

SIP Sections	Title I Schoolwide Program	Charter Schools
I-A: School Mission/Vision		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(1)
I-B-C: School Leadership, Stakeholder Involvement & SIP Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(2-3)	
I-E: Early Warning System	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-A-C: Data Review		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-F: Progress Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(3)	
III-A: Data Analysis/Reflection	ESSA 1114(b)(6)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(4)
III-B: Area(s) of Focus	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(i-iii)	
III-C: Other SI Priorities		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(5-9)
VI: Title I Requirements	ESSA 1114(b)(2, 4-5), (7)(A)(iii)(I-V)-(B) ESSA 1116(b-g)	

Note: Charter schools that are also Title I must comply with the requirements in both columns.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Department encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

I. School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

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

Provide the school's vision statement.

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

School Leadership Team, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring

School Leadership Team
For each member of the school leadership team, select the employee name and email address from the dropdown. Identify the position title and job duties/responsibilities as it relates to SIP implementation for each member of the school leadership team.**:**

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Taunton, Donald	Principal	Leadership and Vision; External Stakeholder Partnerships; Teacher Onboarding & Evaluation; Coaching & Instructional Support; and Positive Behavior & Discipline Intervention
Johnson, Jennifer	Assistant Principal	Academic Advisor; Scheduling & Grad Tracking; Edmentum/Apex Coordinator; Testing Coordinator; Technology Liaison; and Engagement & Incentive Lead
Pagan, Josephine	Other	Student Enrollment; Front Office Lead; Supplies and Ordering; School Tours Lead; and Hiring and Retention Support
Betancourt, Jessenia	Other	Student Enrollment; Data and Grad Tracking Support; Skyward Coordinator/ District Liaison; FLVS Liaison; and FTE Coordinator
Ruiz, Mario	School Counselor	Counseling & Emotional Support; Crisis Intervention; and Home Visit & Attendance Support
Kasse, Nicholas	Other	Attendance Lead; Home Visit Lead; and Engagement & Incentive Support
Bobadilla, Jose	Other	School Safety Lead; Facilities Support; and SRO Liaison and Support
Harrison, Donna	Teacher, Career/ Technical	Orientation Lead; Personal-Social Skills Course Teacher; and CTE Course Lead
Hargrave, Nicole	Teacher, ESE	Student Enrollment (ESE Compliance); Staffing Specialist; and Testing Accommodations & Support
Mills, Wanda	Reading Coach	Orientation; Reading Plus Coordinator; ESE and ESOL compliance; and Testing Support

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

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

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

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

Monthly collection and analasys of data to track student progress against target and goals.
Evaluate on a monthly basis the effectiveness of the interventions being utilized to know if is producing the intended student outcomes.

Demographic Data
Only ESSA identification and school grade history updated 3/11/2024

2023-24 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	High School 7-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Alternative Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	62%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	69%
Charter School	Yes
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	CSI
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)*
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	
School Improvement Rating History	2021-22: COMMENDABLE
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*	8	55	50	32	57	51			
ELA Learning Gains									
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile									
Math Achievement*	5	39	38	36	40	38			
Math Learning Gains									
Math Lowest 25th Percentile									
Science Achievement*	53	69	64		48	40			
Social Studies Achievement*	61	70	66		51	48			
Middle School Acceleration					48	44			
Graduation Rate	23	94	89		70	61			
College and Career Acceleration	22	60	65		71	67			
ELP Progress		59	45						

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

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

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	CSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	29
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	Yes
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	5
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	172
Total Components for the Federal Index	6
Percent Tested	86
Graduation Rate	23

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	CSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	34

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	Yes
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	68
Total Components for the Federal Index	2
Percent Tested	95
Graduation Rate	

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	28	Yes	1	1
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	14	Yes	1	1
HSP	22	Yes	1	1
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	26	Yes	1	1
FRL	23	Yes	2	2

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD				
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK				
HSP				

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
MUL				
PAC				
WHT				
FRL	9	Yes	1	1

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	8			5			53	61		23	22	
SWD											1	
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	7										2	
HSP											1	
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	9			10				59			4	
FRL	4			8				59		25	5	

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	32			36								
SWD												
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21	ELP Progress
BLK												
HSP												
MUL												
PAC												
WHT												
FRL	9											

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												
SWD												
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK												
HSP												
MUL												
PAC												
WHT												
FRL												

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	24%	55%	-31%	50%	-26%
09	2023 - Spring	20%	54%	-34%	48%	-28%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	5%	54%	-49%	50%	-45%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	16%	53%	-37%	48%	-32%

BIOLOGY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	33%	68%	-35%	63%	-30%

HISTORY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	51%	69%	-18%	63%	-12%

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 2021-22 performance data from FLDOE report card, students taking 10th Grade ELA assessment had the lowest performance. 68.4% of students scored a level 1. The majority of our students enroll with significant deficits in reading comprehension which have contributed to why they are behind district and state averages.

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

Assessment data for both 10th grade ELA and Algebra 1 saw a decline. More students enrolling at Elevation High School have not yet earned their necessary scores in order to graduate. Due to attendance issues at their prior schools, many are taking the FAST/FSA/SAT/ACT for the first time and need significant remediation to ensure they pass these tests and are able to graduate. Based on Reading Plus and GAIN data, many of our students reading and math levels are below their peers.

Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends.

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

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

We had 43 total graduates during the 2022-23 school year - this was an increase from 27 students the prior year. Increased average attendance rate of 71% and average rate of credits earned up to 62%. 54% of students made reading gains in Reading Plus.

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

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

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

Raising our graduation rate, with a concentration on more students graduating with their cohort. Ensuring proper support is in place for students to pass their ELA and Algebra 1 assessments in order to graduate. Increasing daily average attendance rate.

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.

Based on FLDOE report card, 24% of our prior year students are SWD. Based on enrollment data, we believe this number will increase this school year. Our school wide data determined a need to increase ELA/reading support for all students - with an emphasis on SWDs. In total 68% of our student earned a level 1 on the ELA assessment.

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

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

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

We will use Reading Plus to strengthen skills and monitor progress during the year.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Wanda Mills (wanda.mills@als-education.com)

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

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

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

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

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement
List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

#2. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Other

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

Student satisfaction surveys are given twice a year. Elevation HS had very positive results. The two categories
with the most disagreements were as follows:
-My school shares information about schools success with family and support. 83% strongly agree to agree. 17% disagree to strong disagree.
- My school considers students opinions when planning ways to improve the school. 76% strongly agree to
agree. 23% disagree to strong disagree.

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

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

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

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

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Donald Taunton (donald.taunton@als-education.com)

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

To work towards a more positive climate for students, all students will participate in a one-on-one psychosocial needs assessment within 30 days of enrollment. The assessment are administered by a licensed/license-eligible clinician or by a clinical intern under the supervision of a licensed/license-eligible clinician. Based on scores of scales and areas of needs identified during the research-based assessments, an individual student support plan will be created for every student. This plan may include referrals to community providers for off-site and/or on-site services to address student specific needs.

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

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

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement
List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

CSI, TSI and ATSI Resource Review

Describe the process to review school improvement funding allocations and ensure resources are allocated based on needs. This section must be completed if the school is identified as ATSI, TSI or CSI in addition to completing an Area(s) of Focus identifying interventions and activities within the SIP (ESSA 1111(d)(1)(B)(4) and (d)(2)(C).

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