
Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	7
III. Planning for Improvement	12
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	23
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	0
VI. Title I Requirements	23
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

Bradford High School

581 N TEMPLE AVE, Starke, FL 32091

bradfordschools.org/bhs

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 Bradford High School is to provide our students with an environment that challenges all students academically to empower them to become life-long learners in a very diverse global community. To this end, we will provide a safe environment for all students emotionally and socially, while instilling pride, respect, and responsibility. We are Tornadoes!

Provide the school's vision statement.

Through our collective efforts all Bradford High School students will graduate with the skills necessary for a career, college/university, or the military.

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
Coffey , Christopher	Principal	
Williams, Crystal	Assistant Principal	
Duncan, David	Dean	
Griffis, Katrina	Administrative Support	
Jackson, Sampson	Other	
Stafford, Nichole	Other	
Cassels, Renee	Graduation Coach	
Murphy, Audrey	Curriculum Resource Teacher	

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.

A series of meetings were held to involved all stakeholders. A Comprehensive Needs Assessment was conducted on 4/4/23 and included administration, teachers, support staff, parents, and community members. The draft SIP was created with this information and then was presented to the SAC for further input. That information was used to finalize the SIP.

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 regularly monitored through classroom observations and through our weekly meeting schedule. We will meet on the first Wednesday of the month before school to do full faculty professional learning. We will meet on the 2nd and 4th Wednesday each month for collaborative planning sessions with each individual department. We will meet the 3rd Wednesday of each month to have department specific professional learning. Data review will take place on a weekly basis during Wednesday meetings and/or our MTSS meetings. Based on the data we will adjust our strategies and either build upon areas of growth or more intensely focus on areas of concern.

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	37%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	87%
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)* 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: C 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*	33	33	50	36	36	51	40		
ELA Learning Gains				45			45		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				42			34		
Math Achievement*	25	25	38	28	41	38	35		
Math Learning Gains				31			28		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				35			16		
Science Achievement*	52	52	64	45	28	40	62		
Social Studies Achievement*	57	57	66	69	31	48	82		
Middle School Acceleration					37	44			
Graduation Rate	78	78	89	85	45	61	90		
College and Career Acceleration	59	59	65	61	69	67	57		
ELP Progress			45						

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

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

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	51
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	304
Total Components for the Federal Index	6

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
Percent Tested	97
Graduation Rate	78

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	48
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	4
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	477
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	97
Graduation Rate	85

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	30	Yes	4	1
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	38	Yes	2	
HSP	47			
MUL	37	Yes	2	
PAC				
WHT	54			
FRL	46			

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				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	37	Yes	1	
HSP	33	Yes	2	
MUL	40	Yes	1	
PAC				
WHT	51			
FRL	44			

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	33			25			52	57		78	59	
SWD	17			10			30	27		22	6	
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	24			20			36	35		46	6	
HSP	47			30			65				3	
MUL	40			33							2	
PAC												
WHT	34			26			55	66		63	6	
FRL	30			21			49	55		51	6	

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21	ELP Progress
All Students	36	45	42	28	31	35	45	69		85	61	
SWD	13	42	43	13	28	28	17	33		74	26	
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	19	38	44	21	30	29	19	56		84	30	
HSP	41	56		15	18							
MUL	41	50		38	27		45					
PAC												
WHT	41	46	37	31	33	41	53	73		85	70	
FRL	27	46	52	22	26	38	37	63		82	50	

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	40	45	34	35	28	16	62	82		90	57	
SWD	8	22	17	21	20	7	22	64		74	31	
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	22	36	44	11	17	27	41	58		90	45	
HSP												
MUL	30	20		0								
PAC												
WHT	45	48	31	42	31	13	69	85		89	62	
FRL	30	31	24	24	21	27	55	82		89	49	

Grade Level Data Review– State Assessments (pre-populated)

The data are raw data and include ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data. The percentages shown here represent ALL students who received a score of 3 or higher on the statewide assessments.

An asterisk (*) in any cell indicates the data has been suppressed due to fewer than 10 students tested, or all tested students scoring the same.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
10	2023 - Spring	37%	37%	0%	50%	-13%
09	2023 - Spring	26%	26%	0%	48%	-22%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	13%	28%	-15%	50%	-37%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	33%	33%	0%	48%	-15%

BIOLOGY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	50%	50%	0%	63%	-13%

HISTORY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	55%	56%	-1%	63%	-8%

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.

Math Proficiency (26%) - Our incoming 9th grade group (non-algebra students) had a 15% proficiency rate in 8th grade so we know there are some foundational gaps coming from middle school. We also identified some room for improvement with exposing students to benchmark level assessments and ensuring they are graded appropriately.

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

Our Social Studies proficiency dropped 13%. We lost two great US History teachers the last two years. We had a veteran teacher who was newer to US History and a brand new teacher that taught it as well. As such, we lacked some content knowledge, strong pedagogy, and assessment understanding.

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.

Our 9th grade ELA scores were 22% below state average. Through review, we have found numerous gaps in our curriculum.

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

Our Biology proficiency was up 8% from last year. The first thing that made a difference was working to generate emotional engagement rather than emotional buy-in. Restructuring all instruction around revising knowledge made a difference. The kids are so afraid of failure. They just won't try if they think there's even the slightest chance of not being perfectly correct. Second semester, all bell ringers presented something the kids had to do in response to a prompt. That day's instruction provided all info needed to do the bell ringer. Kids were given time at the end of each class to "make any changes to their work" before it was looked over. Using nearpod made it super easy for to see where they started and where they ended each day. Using collaborative boards for really tough ideas helped the struggling kids by giving them a jumping-off point for an answer, even if they didn't know why the answer was right. Being able to change their answers after learning the answer felt so much like googling an answer that the kids didn't realize they were learning. They just knew that if they paid attention they'd get the answer during the class. Even if it was a HIGH RIGOR and super complex prompt they had to respond to.

Also, the only assignments that were graded were the assessments. They knew they weren't being graded for the practice work (even independent practice) but that not doing it meant a lower grade on the assessment. Their grades are super important to them so it forced them to push, especially with fewer grades going in.

Getting help from NEFEC, trying new things that built autonomy in the kids, creating a structure that helped them have the courage to face being wrong, and holding them accountable made all the difference. We let go of how we always did things and reimagined everything we did to meet this new brand of kids where they were.

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

270 students are Level 1 in ELA
190 students are Level 1 in Math

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

1. Improve ELA proficiency and learning gains.
2. Improve Math proficiency and learning gains.
3. Build upon our PBIS team from last year to build a positive culture, reduce behavior incidents, and increase student attendance.

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 Black/African-American**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

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

Our African American/Black student subgroup has been under the 41% threshold for 1 year (at 37%).

Measurable Outcome:

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

Students from the African American/Black student subgroup will surpass the 41% threshold at the conclusion of the 23-24 school year.

Monitoring:

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

This will be regularly monitored through classroom observations and through our weekly meeting schedule. We will be utilizing the state's practice profiles protocol. We will meet on the first Wednesday of the month before school to do full faculty professional learning. We will meet on the 2nd and 4th Wednesday each month for collaborative planning sessions with each individual department. We will meet the 3rd Wednesday of each month to have department-specific professional learning. Data review will take place on a weekly basis during Wednesday meetings and/or our MTSS meetings. Based on the data we will adjust our strategies and either build upon areas of growth or more intensely focus on areas of concern.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Christopher Coffey (coffey.christopher@mybradford.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 study found that students who engaged in Reading Plus showed significantly greater improvements in reading proficiency than did control students who received other types of targeted reading instruction... The results of this study qualify Reading Plus for the ESSA 'Strong' category.

Tier 2/3 students will utilize the Reading Plus program through Intensive Reading courses.

Students using IXL experience significantly greater growth on the NWEA MAP assessments for math and ELA than students without IXL. With this study, IXL Math and IXL ELA meet the criteria for Tier II evidence-based interventions set by the U.S. Department of Education's Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

Our Tier 2/3 senior math students will utilize IXL in a Foundations of Math Skills course.

We will also bring in NEFEC (North Eastern Florida Educational Consortium) for coaching consultation.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Reading Plus was selected this year due to feedback about Lexia Power Up. Teachers and school admin met to review the possible research-based replacements and Reading Plus was unanimously selected.

IXL is a program that has a diagnostic feature where students can then be assigned practice to build their individual gaps. The team felt this program would be beneficial based on that information and the ESSA Evidence review.

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. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Hispanic**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.

Our Hispanic student subgroup has been under the 41% threshold for 2 consecutive years (at 33%).

Measurable Outcome:

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

Students from the Hispanic student subgroup will surpass the 41% threshold at the conclusion of the 23-24 school year.

Monitoring:

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

This will be regularly monitored through classroom observations and through our weekly meeting schedule. We will be utilizing the state's practice profiles protocol. We will meet on the first Wednesday of the month before school to do full-faculty professional learning. We will meet on the 2nd and 4th Wednesday each month for collaborative planning sessions with each individual department. We will meet the 3rd Wednesday of each month to have department-specific professional learning. Data review will take place on a weekly basis during Wednesday meetings and/or our MTSS meetings. Based on the data we will adjust our strategies and either build upon areas of growth or more intensely focus on areas of concern.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Christopher Coffey (coffey.christopher@mybradford.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 study found that students who engaged in Reading Plus showed significantly greater improvements in reading proficiency than did control students who received other types of targeted reading instruction... The results of this study qualify Reading Plus for the ESSA 'Strong' category.

Tier 2/3 students will utilize the Reading Plus program through Intensive Reading courses.

Students using IXL experience significantly greater growth on the NWEA MAP assessments for math and ELA than students without IXL. With this study, IXL Math and IXL ELA meet the criteria for Tier II evidence-based interventions set by the U.S. Department of Education's Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

Our Tier 2/3 senior math students will utilize IXL in a Foundations of Math Skills course.

We will also bring in NEFEC (North Eastern Florida Educational Consortium) for coaching consultation.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Reading Plus was selected this year due to feedback about Lexia Power Up. Teachers and school admin met to review the possible research-based replacements and Reading Plus was unanimously selected.

IXL is a program that has a diagnostic feature where students can then be assigned practice to build their individual gaps. The team felt this program would be beneficial based on that information and the ESSA Evidence review.

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

#3. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Multi-Racial**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.

Our Multi-Racial student subgroup has been under the 41% threshold for 1 year (at 40%).

Measurable Outcome:

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

Students from the Multi-Racial student subgroup will surpass the 41% threshold at the conclusion of the 23-24 school year.

Monitoring:

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

This will be regularly monitored through classroom observations and through our weekly meeting schedule. We will be utilizing the state's practice profiles protocol. We will meet on the first Wednesday of the month before school to do full-faculty professional learning. We will meet on the 2nd and 4th Wednesday each month for collaborative planning sessions with each individual department. We will meet the 3rd Wednesday of each month to have department-specific professional learning. Data review will take place on a weekly basis during Wednesday meetings and/or our MTSS meetings. Based on the data we will adjust our strategies and either build upon areas of growth or more intensely focus on areas of concern.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Christopher Coffey (coffey.christopher@mybradford.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 study found that students who engaged in Reading Plus showed significantly greater improvements in reading proficiency than did control students who received other types of targeted reading instruction... The results of this study qualify Reading Plus for the ESSA 'Strong' category.

Tier 2/3 students will utilize the Reading Plus program through Intensive Reading courses.

Students using IXL experience significantly greater growth on the NWEA MAP assessments for math and ELA than students without IXL. With this study, IXL Math and IXL ELA meet the criteria for Tier II evidence-based interventions set by the U.S. Department of Education's Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

Our Tier 2/3 senior math students will utilize IXL in a Foundations of Math Skills course.

We will also bring in NEFEC (North Eastern Florida Educational Consortium) for coaching consultation.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Reading Plus was selected this year due to feedback about Lexia Power Up. Teachers and school admin met to review the possible research-based replacements and Reading Plus was unanimously selected.

IXL is a program that has a diagnostic feature where students can then be assigned practice to build their individual gaps. The team felt this program would be beneficial based on that information and the ESSA Evidence review.

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. 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.

Our Students with Disabilities student subgroup has been under the 41% threshold for 3 consecutive years (at 32% last year).

Measurable Outcome:

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

Students from the Students with Disabilities student subgroup will surpass the 41% threshold at the conclusion of the 23-24 school year.

Monitoring:

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

This will be regularly monitored through classroom observations and through our weekly meeting schedule. We will be utilizing the state's practice profiles protocol. We will meet on the first Wednesday of the month before school to do full-faculty professional learning. We will meet on the 2nd and 4th Wednesday each month for collaborative planning sessions with each individual department. We will meet the 3rd Wednesday of each month to have department-specific professional learning. Data review will take place on a weekly basis during Wednesday meetings and/or our MTSS meetings. Based on the data we will adjust our strategies and either build upon areas of growth or more intensely focus on areas of concern.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Christopher Coffey (coffey.christopher@mybradford.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 study found that students who engaged in Reading Plus showed significantly greater improvements in reading proficiency than did control students who received other types of targeted reading instruction... The results of this study qualify Reading Plus for the ESSA 'Strong' category.

Tier 2/3 students will utilize the Reading Plus program through Intensive Reading courses.

Students using IXL experience significantly greater growth on the NWEA MAP assessments for math and ELA than students without IXL. With this study, IXL Math and IXL ELA meet the criteria for Tier II evidence-based interventions set by the U.S. Department of Education's Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

Our Tier 2/3 senior math students will utilize IXL in a Foundations of Math Skills course.

We will also bring in NEFEC (North Eastern Florida Educational Consortium) for coaching consultation.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Reading Plus was selected this year due to feedback about Lexia Power Up. Teachers and school admin met to review the possible research-based replacements and Reading Plus was unanimously selected.

IXL is a program that has a diagnostic feature where students can then be assigned practice to build their

individual gaps. The team felt this program would be beneficial based on that information and the ESSA Evidence review.

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. 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.

A total of 349 of our 778 students (or 45%) are flagged on our EWS report as being below 90% attendance.

Measurable Outcome:

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

We will reduce the % of students below the 90% threshold by 15%.

Monitoring:

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

We will monitor this during our monthly PBIS meetings. We will use a YTD metric to measure if we are on track to improve and meet our objective outcome.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Crystal Williams (williams.crystal@mybradford.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 implementation of PBIS (Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports) school wide is an evidence based decision to raise student attendance. PBIS focuses on encouraging students and staff in a positive way every day in relation to behavior, academics, social and emotional interactions through a variety of ways.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

There are several research based literature examples on why PBIS helps improve school attendance, grades and behaviors. PBIS is supported by the U.S. Department of Education, there are published results being achieved by many states, and evidence shared by PBIS experts. The PBIS website has a multitude of research based resources, tools, and targeted supports to help school improvement efforts.

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.

Provide continued PL to staff on implementing Tier 1 PBIS strategies into their daily classroom routines. Communicate with students and families about the school wide PBIS events and attendance requirements to participate. Continue to monitor attendance regularly and implement attendance recognition and incentives through PBIS.

Person Responsible: Crystal Williams (williams.crystal@mybradford.us)

By When: Monthly PBIS meetings starting in September that will focus on data and implementation review. Monthly attendance recognition and incentives school wide.

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 began this process with a Comprehensive Needs Assessment on 4/4/23. During this meeting we discussed strengthening academic achievement, reviewed programs used during 22-23 and proposed programs for 23-24, parent and family engagement, professional development needs, our homeless education needs, college & career readiness initiatives, Title 4 needs, discipline data, attendance, and summer tasks. The team of administrators, support staff, teachers, parents, and community members provided feedback and suggestions on each topic. A need was identified for a CRT and some parent and family engagement incentives. Both of these were worked into our Title 1 budget and are planning for the 23-24 school year.

Title I Requirements

Schoolwide Program Plan (SWP) Requirements

This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A SWP and opts to use the SIP to satisfy the requirements of the SWP plan, as outlined in the ESSA, Public Law No. 114-95, § 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

Provide the methods for dissemination of this SIP, UniSIG budget and SWP to stakeholders (e.g., students, families, school staff and leadership and local businesses and organizations). Please articulate a plan or protocol for how this SIP and progress will be shared and disseminated and to the extent practicable, provided in a language a parent can understand. (ESSA 1114(b)(4))

List the school's webpage* where the SIP is made publicly available.

The SIP will be disseminated through the School Advisory Council. We will meet to discuss progress on our goals no less than three times during the school year. The team will consist of faculty/staff, parents, students, and community members and will align as closely to our demographics as we can get. All parents and students will be invited to join our SAC during Open House.

<https://www.bradfordschools.org/Domain/8>

Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission, support the needs of students and keep parents informed of their child's progress.

List the school's webpage* where the school's Family Engagement Plan is made publicly available. (ESSA 1116(b-g))

Parents and families want to stay informed about their children and the school. We will accomplish this through weekly newsletters and callouts, multiple parent nights where we will offer flexible scheduling through a virtual option, attending local functions to build and strengthen community relationships, and our general interactions with families.

<https://www.bradfordschools.org/Domain/8>

Describe how the school plans to strengthen the academic program in the school, increase the amount and quality of learning time and help provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum. Include the Area of Focus if addressed in Part III of the SIP. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)ii)

We have applied for and been accepted as a Cambridge International School. We will welcome our first two cohorts this year! This program helps us align with our mission to offer academically challenging opportunities for our students. We will also accomplish this through our Wednesday collaboration planning (diving deeper into benchmarks and creating benchmark-aligned assessments), full staff PL (strengthening tier 1 instruction), and department-specific PL.

If appropriate and applicable, describe how this plan is developed in coordination and integration with other Federal, State, and local services, resources and programs, such as programs supported under ESSA, violence prevention programs, nutrition programs, housing programs, Head Start programs, adult education programs, career and technical education programs, and schools implementing CSI or TSI activities under section 1111(d). (ESSA 1114(b)(5))

While we worked on the SIP we began working on our Title 1 plan to ensure alignment between the two of them.