Martin County School District

South Fork High School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

South Fork High School

10000 SW BULLDOG WAY, Stuart, FL 34997

martinschools.org/o/sfhs

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Martin 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.

Every student at South Fork High School will graduate with their cohort, equipped with the skills to be college or career ready.

Provide the school's vision statement.

All students will graduate with pride and confidence, prepared for success in post-secondary endeavors.

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
Aitken, Tim	Principal	Assemble SIP Leadership Team Delegate areas of SIP as it relates to expertise Communicate goals and action steps to all stakeholders Monitor Implementation with fidelity.
Thompson, Jaime	Assistant Principal	Assemble SIP Leadership Team Delegate areas of SIP as it relates to expertise Communicate goals and action steps to all stakeholders Monitor Implementation with fidelity. Collect Data and Build Goals with Stakeholders Narrow Goals to Specific Focus Gain insight on barriers Gather feedback for action steps
Geiger, Edmund	Assistant Principal	Assemble SIP Leadership Team Delegate areas of SIP as it relates to expertise Communicate goals and action steps to all stakeholders Monitor Implementation with fidelity. Collect Data and Build Goals with Stakeholders Narrow Goals to Specific Focus Gain insight on barriers Gather feedback for action steps Provide feedback on student athletes and student activities.
Herd, Jamie	Assistant Principal	Assemble SIP Leadership Team Delegate areas of SIP as it relates to expertise Communicate goals and action steps to all stakeholders Monitor Implementation with fidelity. Collect Data and Build Goals with Stakeholders Narrow Goals to Specific Focus Gain insight on barriers Gather feedback for action steps
McMurry, Diane	Assistant Principal	Assemble SIP Leadership Team Delegate areas of SIP as it relates to expertise Communicate goals and action steps to all stakeholders Monitor Implementation with fidelity. Collect Data and Build Goals with Stakeholders Narrow Goals to Specific Focus Gain insight on barriers Gather feedback for action steps Provide insight on student attendance and discipline data
Wonnell , Kathleen	Dean	Assemble SIP Leadership Team Delegate areas of SIP as it relates to expertise Communicate goals and action steps to all stakeholders Monitor Implementation with fidelity.

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		Collect Data and Build Goals with Stakeholders Narrow Goals to Specific Focus Gain insight on barriers Gather feedback for action steps Provide insight on student attendance and discipline data

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.

Stakeholder involvement in the SIP development is critical and began in the summer with the school leadership team reviewing our data and determining areas of strength and weakness. We will be using the pre-school days to involve the staff and allow for dialogue and input. We have also begun to rewrite our vision and mission statements to more align with our goals and to obtain stakeholder input. The SAC will be included in the first meeting to ensure we are gathering their input. We further plan to review the SIP on curriculum night with the greater part of our parent and student population in attendance.

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 monitored quarterly through various measures to include testing teams quarterly intentional planning days centered around their lagging and leading data, monthly updates to the School Advisory Committee, review of progress monitoring data with collaborative learning teams and leadership team, and time for revisions to the plan as necessary. We will monitor growth on formative assessments and action plan around results. Special focus will be placed on our students with disabilities and ELL students as that is our greatest area of need.

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	50%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	51%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification	ATSI

*updated as of 3/11/2024	
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD)* English Language Learners (ELL)* Asian Students (ASN) Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: B 2019-20: B 2018-19: B 2017-18: B
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

Using 2022-23 data, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that have two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Prior Year (2022-23) As Initially Reported (pre-populated)

The number of students by grade level that exhibited each early warning indicator:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	527
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	27
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	400
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	419
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	378

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24

Prior Year (2022-23) Updated (pre-populated)
Section 3 includes data tables that are pre-populated based off information submitted in prior year's SIP.

The number of students by grade level that exhibited each early warning indicator:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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*	46	52	50	49	57	51	49		
ELA Learning Gains				52			44		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				41			38		
Math Achievement*	37	43	38	38	41	38	35		
Math Learning Gains				47			20		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				51			23		

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
Science Achievement*	66	74	64	61	44	40	63		
Social Studies Achievement*	63	69	66	56	47	48	59		
Middle School Acceleration					44	44			
Graduation Rate	95	94	89	96	66	61	96		
College and Career Acceleration	58	61	65	55	71	67	59		
ELP Progress	39	41	45	52			52		

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	58
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	404
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	98
Graduation Rate	95

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	54
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	598
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	97
Graduation Rate	96

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	41			
ELL	31	Yes	4	1
AMI				
ASN	64			
BLK	53			
HSP	49			
MUL	55			
PAC				
WHT	69			
FRL	50			

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	39	Yes	3	
ELL	33	Yes	3	
AMI				
ASN	84			
BLK	47			
HSP	46			
MUL	57			
PAC				
WHT	62			
FRL	46			

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	46			37			66	63		95	58	39
SWD	22			25			33	47		23	6	
ELL	11			14			17	20		27	7	39
AMI												
ASN	64										1	
BLK	41			35			57	59		38	6	
HSP	37			31			54	48		41	7	38
MUL	45			37			82				3	
PAC												
WHT	54			43			76	73		68	6	
FRL	36			32			57	50		44	7	40

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	49	52	41	38	47	51	61	56		96	55	52
SWD	16	41	53	25	36	56	24	22		95	18	
ELL	8	32	32	11	30	44	23	21		89	25	52
AMI												
ASN	88	79										
BLK	33	42	40	28	51	69	47	38		96	29	
HSP	34	48	36	31	39	45	43	49		92	43	51
MUL	40	43		47			73			94	47	
PAC												
WHT	61	56	50	44	53	52	74	62		99	66	
FRL	35	46	39	29	40	49	42	46		94	42	46

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	49	44	38	35	20	23	63	59		96	59	52
SWD	13	26	25	18	19	30	34	24		96	35	
ELL	14	30	32	15	15	15	37	28		87	19	52

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
AMI												
ASN	94	56					100					
BLK	28	41	41	24	16	21	53	40		96	22	
HSP	32	37	36	23	18	22	50	45		92	41	51
MUL	55	33		23	30		80			100	58	
PAC												
WHT	62	51	40	48	22	23	71	69		99	73	
FRL	34	38	39	26	18	19	53	52		95	41	56

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	44%	51%	-7%	50%	-6%
09	2023 - Spring	49%	50%	-1%	48%	1%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	34%	55%	-21%	50%	-16%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	42%	51%	-9%	48%	-6%

BIOLOGY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	64%	69%	-5%	63%	1%

HISTORY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	64%	67%	-3%	63%	1%

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.

Lowest performance was in Algebra 1 proficiency for ELL and SWD populations along with reading proficiency. New curriculum in math and lack of remedial support were contributing factors. Hiring and retaining staff to support our ELL students was also a factor last year.

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

ELL and SWD in reading proficiency has experienced the greatest decline. We did not have a full ELL support staff and many vacancies in our ELA teaching positions throughout the year.

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 greatest gap compared to the state was in the Algebra 1 EOC scores and proficiency. SFHS scored an overall 35% proficiency compared to the state which had an overall 54% proficiency. Contributing factors were a new curriculum and standards and ability to remediate within the instructional framework. Between a new framework and a lack of math course choices, students were placed in algebra 1 who still needed pre-algebra skills. We chose not to block math classes for students last year who needed more remediation time.

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

Algebra 1 EOC proficiency increased by 13% from last year though overall proficiency is still low. Increased Proficiency in US History EOC by 7%. Targeted tutoring, Intention planning for teams and district support in math helped to move students towards improvement in these areas.

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

EWS report shows a large percentage of students across all grade levels with reading deficiencies. Approximately 420 of our students are identified as having a reading deficiency. The number of students

with 2 or more indicators correlate closely to the number of students with reading deficiencies. Further investigation shows the largest gaps with our ELL and SWD populations.

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

-Increase Proficiency in math and reading for our SWD.
-Increase Proficiency in math and reading for our ELL students.
-Increase supports for math students to ensure success in all math courses.
-Decrease number of skipping, tardies, and overall absences.
-Increase CCA earning opportunities for all students.

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

#1. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Teacher Retention and Recruitment

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.

Focusing on creating a positive culture and environment will help to retain highly qualified staff that has a growth mindset and a belief that all students can learn at high levels. Retaining staff by building a collaborative environment of support will be crucial to success.

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

Staff retention rate will increase from 86% to 92% from previous year.

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

Monitoring that all programs built for staff culture is followed through with fidelity. Quarterly surveys to illicit staff feedback for improvement. Leadership team review of survey data.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Tim Aitken (aitkent@martinschools.org)

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.)

1. Ensuring staff is trained in and understands SFHS long term goals for students.
2. Creating a leadership team that values trust and transparency to build a foundation for retention.
3. Creating social norms for how we interact as a staff with all members providing input.
4. Build the capacity of other team members through distributive leadership.

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

Creating workplace social norms has been proven to build trust among staff and decrease the chances for a toxic environment to build. Transparency as a leadership team with a focus on building the capacity of team members allows for trust to exist and creates common goals for our team to work towards. Encouraging staff members to feel free to bring issues to the table for the sake of collaborative problem solving makes people feel validated, heard, and like they are an important member of the school community.

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.

Create a new teacher program complete with mentors and timely training for success in the classroom.

Person Responsible: Kathleen Wonnell (wonnelk@martinschools.org)

By When: August 2023

Bulldog Proud Committee for staff relations. Events will be planned to build morale and comradery amongst staff. Teambuilding events will be planned along with celebrations.

Person Responsible: Kathleen Wonnell (wonnelk@martinschools.org)

By When: August 2023

Building norms as a school to achieve a collective vision and belief system.

Person Responsible: Tim Aitken (aitkent@martinschools.org)

By When: Ongoing training and leadership building.

#2. 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.

Students with disabilities will increase proficiency in ELA and Math.

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

Students with disabilities will increase proficiency by 10% in ELA and Math as determined by FAST and EOC scores.

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

CLT Meetings to review data
Quarterly planning meetings.
Training on Kagan and AVID strategies to increase engagement
Discipline data reviews and interventions as needed.
Inquiry Skills class for all freshmen
Training on how different disabilities impact the classroom and the student.
Co-Teaching training for supported classrooms and monitoring follow up with logs.
Student Services collaborative team to meet weekly as a problem solving team.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Tim Aitken (aitkent@martinschools.org)

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.)

Specialized after school tutoring for students to receive remediation and extended time with transportation provided. FBAs when appropriate, multisensory approaches to reading, modeling and school wide training on differentiated instruction. Utilizing a true co-teaching approach to the support facilitation model. Teaching executive functioning skills embedded.

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

Multiple approaches need to be employed for evidence based interventions for students with disabilities because there is no one size fits all approach. Teachers need their capacity built in multiple interventions in order to find success for students unique abilities.

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.

Training on co-teaching for facilitated classrooms for both the general ed and the ESE teacher.

Person Responsible: Edmund Geiger (geigere@martinschools.org)

By When: September 2023

SWD training on different disabilities and how they manifest in the classroom. Strategies on how to accommodate lessons and assignments.

Person Responsible: Jaime Thompson (thompsj@martinschools.org)

By When: Start September 2023 and ongoing.

Training on student engagement strategies that particularly appeal to SWD and follow up.

Person Responsible: Tim Aitken (aitkent@martinschools.org)

By When: August 2023 and ongoing.

Inquiry skills class for all freshmen to embed executive functioning skills in their learning.

Person Responsible: Jaime Thompson (thompsj@martinschools.org)

By When: ongoing.

#3. 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.

ELL students will increase proficiency in ELA and Math.

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

ELL students will increase proficiency in ELA and Math by 10% as determined by FAST or EOC scores.

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

CLT Meetings to review data
Quarterly planning meetings.
Training on Kagan and AVID strategies to increase engagement
Inquiry Skills class for all freshmen
Team with district ELL supports for targeted training for our staff.
Student Services collaborative team to meet weekly as a problem solving team.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

[no one identified]

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.)

-Staff training on world learning strategies reading, writing, listening and speaking for language acquisition.
-Support for staff on how to scaffold learning to embed fluency and language development practice.
-Specific after school tutoring for students needing language support with transportation provided.
-Focused intensive reading support in flexible small groups.

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

Students who are English language learners need time to develop fluency through guided practice and the ability to work in small groups in which the teacher can support flexible needs.

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.

Staff training on world learning strategies that provide ELL students opportunities to read, write, listen and speak in all classrooms.

Person Responsible: Jaime Thompson (thompsj@martinschools.org)

By When: September 2023 and ongoing.

Teacher support on how to specifically accommodate lessons and assignments for ELL students including how to effectively scaffold lessons.

Person Responsible: Jaime Thompson (thompsj@martinschools.org)

By When: October 2023 and ongoing.

Schedule to allow for intensive reading support in flexible small groups.

Person Responsible: Jaime Thompson (thompsj@martinschools.org)

By When: August 2023

#4. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Student Engagement

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.

We have a goal of increasing student engagement in the classrooms through professional development of Kagan and AVID strategies. Student survey data shows a desire for real work application and strategies that students find more engaging.

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

We will increase student engagment in all classrooms by 80% as measured by classroom walkthrough data.

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

Using walkthrough tools that have specfic look-fors related to student engagment, we will montior our level of student engagement on a montly basis. Monthly showcases to share teacher practice will also be implemented to encourage others to use strategies.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

[no one identified]

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.)

Teaching students how to work collaboratively leads to a learning environment of trust and community. It provides students with a sense of belonging and to safely learn in a high interest way.

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

Focusing on behavioral, cognitive, and social engagements leads to less absences, less discipline issues and a growth mindset for students.

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.

Staff Day one Kagan Training

Person Responsible: Jaime Thompson (thompsj@martinschools.org)

By When: August 2023

Staff Day 2 Kagan Training

Person Responsible: Jaime Thompson (thompsj@martinschools.org)

By When: February 2024

Monthly engagement showcases to share teacher and student successes to build capacity

Person Responsible: Jaime Thompson (thompsj@martinschools.org)

By When: Ongoing monthly

#5. Graduation specifically relating to Graduation

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.

Graduation rates and acceleration points should always seek to be increased from previous years to ensure that our student are college or career ready.

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

Graduation rate will increase by 2 percentage points from 96% to 98% and CAA points will increase by 10 points from 58 points to 68 points.

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

Utilizing weekly student service meetings with the guidance team and graduation specialists, we will monitor and support at-risk students to ensure they get the support they need to graduate on time with their cohort, Additionally, students are monitored to determine their college and career acceleration plan and they are reviewed quarterly for progress.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jaime Thompson (thompsj@martinschools.org)

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.)

Drop out prevention program implemented with both a behavioral and academic teacher to support students in these areas of need. 18 credit diploma option and flexible schedule to assist where needed. Mentoring with grad specialists for identified students and streamlined MTSS process.

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

Having a team support the academic and behavioral needs of students helps us to identify struggling students with multiple warning signs and provide interventions in a timely manner.

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.

Develop Student Services Team that consists of admin, ESE staffing specialist, school counselors, dean and graduation specialists.

Person Responsible: Jaime Thompson (thompsj@martinschools.org)

By When: August

Create CCA tracking sheet for all grade levels so that counselors can support appropriate conversations for students.

Person Responsible: Jaime Thompson (thompsj@martinschools.org)

By When: September and ongoing

Creation of drop out prevention program from district training

Person Responsible: Tim Aitken (aitkent@martinschools.org)

By When: August and ongoing,.

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).

All resources will be vetted to relate to a school improvement goal. There will be a rationale, budget, and direct tie to a specific school improvement goal to ensure we are focused on our areas of concern. All stakeholders will be communicated with so that there is an awareness for what we offer to support students. SAC meetings will incorporate progress made towards SIP goals and for open discussion on SIP alignment.