

Walton County School District

South Walton High School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	8
III. Planning for Improvement	13
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	20
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	0
VI. Title I Requirements	0
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	20

South Walton High School

645 GREENWAY TRL, Santa Rosa Beach, FL 32459

<http://swh.walton.k12.fl.us/>

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Walton County School Board on 9/19/2023.

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.

Our mission is to have all students college and career eligible upon graduation.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Challenging expectations increase individual student performance.

A safe and disciplined environment enhances learning and is the responsibility of the entire South Walton High School student body and staff.

Students not only need to demonstrate their understanding of essential knowledge and skills but also need to be actively engaged in solving problems and producing quality work.

Teachers, administrators, family, and the community share the responsibility for promoting South Walton High School's mission of college and career readiness.

Assessments of student learning should provide students with a variety of opportunities to achieve.

Community service brings relevance to learning and develops students as good citizens.

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
Tibbetts, Alexis	Principal	
Borthwick, Nina	Assistant Principal	
Michie, Brian	Assistant Principal	
Miller, Elizabeth	Teacher, Adult	
Leopold, Fred	SAC Member	Community Member
Betts, Alyssen	Teacher, ESE	
Harris, Ann	School Counselor	
Harp, Lindsey	SAC Member	Parent
Mary Bess, Wilson	SAC Member	Parent
Carr, MH	SAC Member	Parent
Richardson, Michelle	SAC Member	Parent
Roberts, Juliette	SAC Member	Student
Hardeman, Mallory	SAC Member	Student
Critzer, Scott	SAC Member	Community Member
Canody, Stacie	SAC Member	

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 leadership team meets monthly as the PLC leaders to support stakeholders and accountability areas.

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))

Student data will be monitored by teachers and administration. Decisions will be made in leadership meetings,

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	24%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	21%
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: 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*	70	63	50	75	63	51	75		
ELA Learning Gains				63			64		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				55			57		
Math Achievement*	74	70	38	66	47	38	61		
Math Learning Gains				60			38		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				40			43		
Science Achievement*	92	85	64	85	65	40	86		
Social Studies Achievement*	85	83	66	86	61	48	85		
Middle School Acceleration					43	44			
Graduation Rate	99	99	89	98	80	61	97		
College and Career Acceleration	66	72	65	66	82	67	59		
ELP Progress	62	58	45	51			54		

* 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	78
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	548
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	99

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	68

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	745
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	98

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	65			
ELL	56			
AMI				
ASN	91			
BLK				
HSP	68			
MUL	79			
PAC				
WHT	84			
FRL	70			

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	48			
ELL	30	Yes	1	1
AMI				
ASN	90			
BLK	69			
HSP	53			

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	76			
PAC				
WHT	74			
FRL	60			

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	70			74			92	85		99	66	62
SWD	36			59			85	73		36	6	
ELL	18			36			73	73		29	7	62
AMI												
ASN	91										1	
BLK												
HSP	48			55			89	74		46	7	65
MUL	65			92							2	
PAC												
WHT	74			79			93	87		69	6	
FRL	47			56			84	85		58	7	63

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	75	63	55	66	60	40	85	86		98	66	51
SWD	35	53	42	34	33	15	71	62		100	36	
ELL	20	38	38	13	30	30	14	35				51
AMI												
ASN	90											

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	79	69		60								
HSP	56	49	49	34	42	27	58	67		96	55	51
MUL	82	65		86	62		83					
PAC												
WHT	79	66	59	73	64	47	91	90		99	69	
FRL	58	52	56	53	58	35	79	80		98	49	47

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	75	64	57	61	38	43	86	85		97	59	54
SWD	31	31	13	43	33		55	73		92	17	
ELL	13	52	47	27	50	44	54					54
AMI												
ASN												
BLK												
HSP	47	56	46	44	40	38	76	79		94	73	54
MUL	83			70								
PAC												
WHT	79	66	61	66	37	44	88	86		97	59	
FRL	60	64	59	46	42	45	80	90		89	45	60

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	71%	62%	9%	50%	21%
09	2023 - Spring	65%	59%	6%	48%	17%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	60%	75%	-15%	50%	10%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	80%	71%	9%	48%	32%

BIOLOGY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	93%	80%	13%	63%	30%

HISTORY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	85%	78%	7%	63%	22%

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.

Algebra 1B was the lowest performing area. The contributing factor was the ELL students and math supports in place in the master schedule.

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

ELA 9th and 10th proficiency decreased from 76% to 68%. The contributing factor was new staff, standards, test, and training on progress monitoring.

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.

ELL students showed the biggest GAPS with ELA and Math proficiency. This was a result in the master schedule not having structures in place and intervention classes not progress monitoring student growth with fidelity.

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

Science (Biology) showed the most improvement. Action steps progress monitoring district made test. PLC focus was standard based focused on a small group of the 3 Biology teachers. Tutoring, credit recovery class, and bootcamps.

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

Area of concern would be the pass rate in ELA and Math for our ELL students. This will eventually effect their graduation opportunities since ELL students are making minimal growth.

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

1. ELL model interventions in the master schedule with grade level supported curriculum.
2. Teachers teaching the depth of the standards for student achievement.
- 3.) Progress monitoring monthly with PLC leaders and accountability areas to show areas on concern and interventions needed.

Area of Focus

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

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA**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.

Measurable Outcome:

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

At the end of the 2021-2022 school year South Walton High Schools Learning Gains for English was 63%. By the end of the 2023-2024 school year South Walton High Schools Learning Gains in ELA will be 70%

Monitoring:

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

Teachers will collaborate on progress monitoring student growth with common assessments and collaboration with intensive reading teachers and 9th and 10th ELA teachers. AVID strategies will be implemented in the classroom as a tool to support students learning the depth of the standards.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Nina Borthwick (borthwickni@walton.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.)

Evidence-based intervention will be using Springboard in the core ELA classes and intervention support with Common lit and Exact Path for skill area improvement.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

ELA teachers need to collaborate more with the remediation teachers to align their lesson for intentional student support. This will be done with ELL, ESE, and regular 9th and 10th grade remediation courses.

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.

Action step will be to make sure that all 9th and 10th grade intensive reading courses separated by grade level.

Create a master schedule for push in model with ELL and ESE students.

Person Responsible: Nina Borthwick (borthwickni@walton.k12.fl.us)

By When: At the end of PM2 there should be growth in ESE, ELL, and Intensive reading students.

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math**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.

Measurable Outcome:

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

At the end of the 2021-2022 school year South Walton High Schools Learning Gains for math was 60%. By the end of the 2023-2024 school year South Walton High Schools Learning Gains in math will be 70%.

Monitoring:

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

Area of FOCUS will be the Algebra 1B and students in Fundamentals Geometry and Algebra. Students will be in a class to focus on skill specific areas that correspond with their classes standard expectations. AVID strategies will be implemented in the classroom as a tool to support students learning the depth of the standards.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Nina Borthwick (borthwickni@walton.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.)

Interventions being used will be exact path and study island. This will be a plan to remediate areas that are specific to deeper understanding of the EOC expectations.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Math classes need to teach to the depth of the standards and often their are skills that need additional support. The rationale is to provide support needed to students to be able to process and complete problems on the EOC.

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.

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

#3. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Early Warning System**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.

Measurable Outcome:

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

At the end of the 2022-2023 school year 16 parents participated in the school Cognia Survey. By the end of the 2023-2024 school year South Walton High School will increase parent participation to 250 parents.

Monitoring:

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

The school will create a survey earlier in the school year to allow parents the opportunity at parent nights and events to complete the survey.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Brian Michie (brian.michie@walton.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.)

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Have the parent involved and able to see adequate feedback, the SIP and SAC committee can make adequate decisions for areas of improvement.

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

#4. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Career & Technical Education**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.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Predicated acceleration for the 2022-2023 is 70%. By the end of the 2023-2024 school year the predicated acceleration will be 75%.

Monitoring:

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

The area will be monitored by pulling a list of students not receiving an acceleration point and advising a plan in their schedule to give students the opportunity.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Brian Michie (brian.michie@walton.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 intervention for the area of focus will be using FOCUS and teacher feedback & surveys to see areas of interest for students.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

We want to allow for all student to be college and career ready.

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

#5. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to English Language Learners**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

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

School wide all teachers of ELL students will train on differentiated and AVID strategies. ELL students will be monitored in the MTSS process to provide additional support if Language is not the barrier. ELL schedules will be supported, but placed in regular courses.

Measurable Outcome:

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

At the end of the 2023-2024 school year ELL students will score 41% on the ESSA.

Monitoring:

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

ELL students will be progress monitored through FAST, Exact Path, and formative assessments that are standard based throughout the school year.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Nina Borthwick (borthwickni@walton.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.)

Interventions in place will be implemented through the MTSS process for students identified as not having a language barrier. Students will also be exited from the program meeting the required components to be successful while still receiving 2 years of support. All ELL students will receive interventions through the reading and math based on the needs from their progress monitoring results.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

ELL students are a transient subgroup. As a result, the students need to be closely monitored to be placed in the appropriate interventions.

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.

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).

We meet with the SAC committee to propose, discuss, and vote to approve the following expenditures to meet the needs of our school improvement goals.

Budget to Support Areas of Focus

Part VII: Budget to Support Areas of Focus

The approved budget does not reflect any amendments submitted for this project.

1	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	\$0.00
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math	\$0.00
3	III.B.	Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Early Warning System	\$0.00
4	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Career & Technical Education	\$0.00
5	III.B.	Area of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: English Language Learners	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00

Budget Approval

Check if this school is eligible and opting out of UniSIG funds for the 2023-24 school year.

No