

Miami-Dade County Public Schools

C. G. Bethel 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	23
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	0
VI. Title I Requirements	0
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

C. G. Bethel High School

16150 NE 17TH AVE, North Miami Beach, FL 33162

www.cgbethelhs.com

SIP Authority

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

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

Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)

A school not identified for CSI or TSI, but has one or more subgroups with a Federal Index below 41%.

Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)

A school not identified as CSI that has at least one consistently underperforming subgroup with a Federal Index below 32% for three consecutive years.

Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)

A school can be identified as CSI in any of the following four ways:

1. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%;
2. Have a graduation rate at or below 67%;
3. Have a school grade of D or F; or
4. Have a Federal Index below 41% in the same subgroup(s) for 6 consecutive years.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

I. School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

To inspire students to reach their academic potential, strengthen their resiliency, and resolve to succeed. To develop the strong work ethic and strength of character that will enable them to graduate from high school with the preparation, and confidence required to succeed in today's global economy. Ultimately, we aim to build self-sufficiency in our students.

Provide the school's vision statement.

To provide students with a relevant education in a safe learning environment where every student has an opportunity to achieve their individual educational goals. Our focus is on the 4 E's: Enrollment, Education, Enlistment, and Employment.

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
Madrigal, Alejandro	Principal	Bethel's Principal, Alejandro Madrigal, is an instructional leader who sustains a shared vision for the students' academic achievement. He ensures rigorous, standards-based instruction. He supports continuous professional development opportunities for all teachers. As the school leader, he oversees school wide safety and efficient operations. He is in constant communication and collaboration with the surrounding community and its stakeholders.
Lasa, Gloriya	Dean	The dean of Academics assist with the daily academic operations of the school. The DOA oversees that direct instruction program, with a focus on MTSS. The DOA maintains school site data and addresses all curricular needs of both faculty and staff.
Mcduffie, Dewana	School Counselor	The Guidance Counselor oversees the PBS, mentoring, student mental health programs. She is the lead team leader on all behavior support, documentation, and referrals. She ensures the Code of Conduct is communicated to students and parents during the orientation process and throughout the year. She assists the school administration with the Parent Involvement and Safe School Plan initiatives. In addition, she provides guidance services to address the social and emotional needs of students.
Thompson, Heather	Instructional Coach	The Instructional Coach collaborates with teachers on differentiated, research based instructional practices. Ms. Thompson and teachers meet bi-weekly during Professional Learning Communities (PLC) to support the design of differentiated instruction for level 1 and 2 reading groups, text based writing interventions, and the extended reading hour. She also provides professional development on best instructional practices and classroom coaching in Read 180. She supports the teachers in locating and using instructional materials that support best practices.

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.

The school leadership designates staff members and identifies students that are actively involved in school activities and are willing to take part in school improvement process. The school also sends out

questionnaires to determine the parents that have a willingness to serve on council. The community and business partners are selected based on their involvement in school events.

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 SAC will convene quarterly and will review and analyze the data available based on the goals determined at the start of the school year. DOA will share out data and instructional adjustments that are made.

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)	Alternative Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	93%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	23%
Charter School	Yes
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	CSI
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD) English Language Learners (ELL)* Black/African American Students (BLK)* Hispanic Students (HSP)* White Students (WHT)* Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)*
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	
School Improvement Rating History	2021-22: COMMENDABLE 2018-19: COMMENDABLE 2017-18: MAINTAINING 2016-17: MAINTAINING
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*	3	55	50	5	54	51	17		
ELA Learning Gains							25		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile									
Math Achievement*	6	43	38	4	42	38	0		
Math Learning Gains							20		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile									
Science Achievement*	0	62	64	4	41	40	20		
Social Studies Achievement*	23	69	66	8	56	48			
Middle School Acceleration					56	44			
Graduation Rate	24	89	89	32	56	61	29		
College and Career Acceleration	8	70	65	15	67	67	8		
ELP Progress	22	49	45	18					

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

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

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	CSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	12
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	Yes
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	5
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	86
Total Components for the Federal Index	7

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
Percent Tested	98
Graduation Rate	24

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	CSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	12
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	Yes
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	5
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	86
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	88
Graduation Rate	32

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	32	Yes	1	
ELL	7	Yes	4	4
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	14	Yes	4	4
HSP	16	Yes	4	4
MUL				
PAC				
WHT				
FRL	14	Yes	4	4

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	43			
ELL	15	Yes	3	3
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	8	Yes	3	3
HSP	20	Yes	3	3
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	30	Yes	3	3
FRL	12	Yes	3	3

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	3			6			0	23		24	8	22
SWD										0	2	
ELL	0			0				8			5	22
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	6			9				16		11	6	23
HSP	0							31		7	5	20
MUL												
PAC												
WHT												
FRL										9	2	

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	5			4			4	8		32	15	18
SWD										43		
ELL				0						26		18
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	0			0			0	3		32	15	
HSP				7				25		32	14	
MUL												
PAC												
WHT										30		
FRL	8			3			8	3		34	17	

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	17	25		0	20		20			29	8	
SWD										38		
ELL				0						26	17	
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	19	30		0						35	14	
HSP										25	0	
MUL												
PAC												
WHT										18		
FRL	17			0	20					31	8	

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	12%	54%	-42%	50%	-38%
09	2023 - Spring	4%	51%	-47%	48%	-44%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	12%	56%	-44%	50%	-38%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	4%	52%	-48%	48%	-44%

BIOLOGY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	5%	65%	-60%	63%	-58%

HISTORY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	16%	66%	-50%	63%	-47%

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.

There are two areas in which our students performed poorly.

1. Achievement level distribution in Geometry EOC is the first data component that shows a troublingly low performance for the 22-23 school year. 92% of students scored a Level 1 and only 4.7% scored at or above Level 3.

The fact that students were only offered intensive instructional opportunities for Algebra 1 EOC may

have greatly contributed to these results. In addition, although testing preparation was improved throughout last year, it did not include Geometry as the subjects.

2. ELL students' proficiency levels across all assessments was very low. More prominently, though, less than 1% of ELL students achieved proficiency in Science (Biology EOC) and BEST and FSA ELA.

Some of the contributing factors were insufficient training on how staff can support ELL students, Ellevation resources, and instructional strategies to best prepare ELL students for performance on the state assessments.

Finally, looking at a variety of data representations of student performance, there has been no major, obvious trend. However, improving in one direction while performance declines in another may speak to the need for an overarching, systematic change that can help us provide supports for all students, according to their specific needs.

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

The greatest decline in performance, overall, was seen in student proficiency levels in Biology EOC. Proficiency dropped from 22% to 6% from last year.

The main contributing factor for this is the fact that the overwhelming majority of instruction in Biology is in the form of our online curriculum. Having prioritized direct instruction and test preparation for Reading and Algebra 1, students were not properly prepared for the assessment; their Biology grades and GPA as a result.

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.

Comparing state data to our school standing, the greatest gap is evident in the graduation data. State graduation rate has been getting close to 90%, while our graduation rate is projected to be at 40% for 22-23 SY.

A great reason for this gap is the nature of our institution and the population that we serve. A significant portion of our student body enrolls with us to recover from several credits to several school years of credits. Other students (and many of the first identified group) have a history of low performance on state assessments and in courses. These and many other at-risk factors present obstacles and make graduation challenging.

We have increased the graduation rate from 10% to 40% since SY 17-18, about 9% per year until a noticeable plateau during the 19-20 and 20-21 SYs. With reaching 40%, we will be increasing our rate by 17% since 21-22 SY.

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

1. There was an improvement in meeting math requirement with both the Algebra 1 EOC and with concordant scores. The increase from 42% to 63% may be contributed to the the implementation and improvement in test preparation as well as the same in our Direct Instruction, data-driven progress monitoring, and targeted intervention.

2. The improved cohort graduation rate from 21% to 43% has been positively affected by a increased efforts in student engagement, progress monitoring, and improved supports and interventions.

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

1. Truancy
2. Failure in Math and English course

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

1. Implementation of MTSS with fidelity;
2. Shifting the Learning Language and Instructional Rounds;
3. Establishing a Culture of Accountability;
4. Improving the Learning Experience.

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 Intervention**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.

The area of focus is to implement MTSS with fidelity. The rationale is to increase the level of the overall success of ALL students by identifying student challenges and tracking progress to provide and adjust intervention that targets each student's needs and matches each student's learning style. The idea is to boost student morale and involvement in their learning experience.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Implementing MTSS with fidelity, we will provide research-based intervention to 100% of the students who require in, based on placement data, a cycle of progress monitoring, and data-driven MTSS meetings and decisions.

90% of students within Tier 1 instruction will achieve 70% or higher in their the core curriculum courses (e-schoolware).

67% of students with low and high Tier 2 and/or Tier 3 interventions in Reading and/or in Math will demonstrate learning gains between the progress monitoring periods.

Monitoring:

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

The effectiveness of Tier 1 instruction will be measured by student performance on core curriculum assessments, productivity measures, and overall course grades.

Learning gains related to Tier 2 and Tier 3 interventions will be measured through student performance on in-house benchmarks as well as FAST ELA and BEST EOC assessments.

In addition, performance data on supplemental program (READ 180/SYS 44) assessments will be analyzed in the context of program usage data to evaluate the effectiveness of the student-specific interventions.

The school has incorporated a student database that allows teachers to monitor daily student progress. In addition to outcomes in course work and state required assessments. The use of this tool will facilitate the teachers ability to have tangible learning conversations with students.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Gloriya Lasa (glasa@cgbethelhs.com)

Evidence-based Intervention:

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

The school's core curriculum, Eschoolware, is research-based and state certified.

In addition, the school will use Read 180/SYS44, Study Island, and Write Score, as well as teacher-created materials and facilitated PBL experiences as supplemental programs for intervention as part of the MTSS process.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Upon reviewing the data it was determined that 78% of students grades 9-10 and off-grade retake testers have scored a level 2 or below in both 22-23 SY PM3 FAST ELA or FSA ELA Retake. In mathematics, above 80% of first-time takers and retakes scored below the passing Level 3. This data demonstrated a great need for implementing MTSS with fidelity.

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 description entered

Person Responsible: [no one identified]

By When:

#2. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Other

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

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

Establishing a school-wide culture of accountability would be a crucial area of focus for us as such a culture will ensure that all other improvement efforts are implemented with fidelity and to a level of quality that reflects us a community.

The data that pronged us to collectively identify this area as one we should focus on was the low performance of our ELL students. As a subgroup that is in constant contact with all staff and staff having easy access to a multitude of resources, lack of accountability on each member of our community, ELL students were not properly supported.

The idea is to develop, establish, and maintain

- transparency across classrooms and departments;
- clarity of roles, responsibilities, expectations, and supports;
- the gradual release of ownership (to staff and students); and
- constructive and supportive relationships that promote and facilitate growth and development.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Using the iObservation program, 95% of the staff will reach their stated individual growth objectives.

95% of staff will complete all required professional development as it pertains to the needs of our school and the areas of focus four our school improvement,.

Staff responsible for holding meetings/trainings and feedback sessions will complete 90% of pre-determined scheduled meetings and trainings and 95% of the feedback sessions.

95% of accountability checklist will be completed by staff and 95% of those will be verified by person responsible.

Monitoring:

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

We have created a tracking tool, in accordance with established Standard Operating Procedures that will make the completion of tasks visible. We will use the accountability tools developed on a regular basis. Using the iObservation schedule and our internal evaluation and observation cycles, we will discuss, communicate and evaluate others and ourselves to keep ourselves and other accountable and on track with our action plan.

Communication between staff members will be made more visible so as for other staff to be able to monitor, follow up, and follow through with tasks and conversations.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Gloriya Lasa (glasa@cgbethelhs.com)

Evidence-based Intervention:

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

Accountability and transparency, using tracking and communication tools.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

To establish a culture of accountability, the tools have implemented will provide a clear visual tracking of expectations, communicate those expectations and provide a medium for monitoring the process, responsibilities, and effectiveness of the intervention.

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. 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.

Improving the learning experience of students is an essential focus area for us as it extends the service we provide to students by seeing and supporting them not only academically, but also socio-emotionally.

Observations from our staff regarding the low level of learning and engagement of students encourages us to choose this area of focus. The low learning gains and performance, as well as attendance were identified as resulting from a learning experience that did not possess the quality we can and should provide.

Measurable Outcome:

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

90% of students will achieve 70% of proficiency in core curriculum courses.

90% participation from students enrolled in the CTE program.

5% increase in learning gains and 5% increase in proficiency on state assessments.

Monitoring:

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

Our progress monitoring tool will be used to track students performance in courses, learning gains, and state assessment achievement levels.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Gloriya Lasa (glasa@cgbethelhs.com)

Evidence-based Intervention:

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

Progress motoring, Learning conversations, CTE, MTSS interventions and supports.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The tools, cycle of progress monitoring and problem-solving by staff, learning conversations that release ownership of the learning process to students, as well as implementing specific interventions and supports will allow us to identify the needs of students, engage them in their own academic path, and improve the level and relevance of learning.

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 Coaching

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.

Shifting the learning language and instructional rounds is another identified focus area in our plan to improve the student experience and success in their academic, personal, and future professional life. The idea is to shift our view of students to encompass them holistically as well as to observe teacher and student behaviors in order to set SMART goals that can be followed up and followed through for the targeted improvement. Student performance, learning gains, and indicators that subgroups did not receive proper support to success were some of the data points identified as the rationale behind selecting this area of focus.

Measurable Outcome:

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

- Increase in Student productivity by 5%
- Increase in communication by 10% between staff, student and parents, evident through an increase in documentation (eschoolware reports) with pre-identified categories.

Monitoring:

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

The progress monitoring tool will measure all of the above outcomes and will be used in data-driven discussions and problem-solving meeting between staff.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Gloriya Lasa (glasa@cgbethelhs.com)

Evidence-based Intervention:

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

1. Learning Conversations - using performance data, academic standing data, as well as a discussion of each student's strengths, areas of improvement, and external factors that may prevent or positively affect students.
2. Instructional Rounds where observation happens on a regular basis, targeting SMART Goal attainment, measurable through observation and data.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The learning conversations will provide a visible shift of ownership to students as students are required to set goals, while staff asks questions to the student's academic as well as socio-emotional and personal state. This will allow us to not only see students holistically but devise ways to respond to their holistic needs.

The instructional rounds model the kind of goal setting we would like to see from students and their goal-driven nature allows for incremental improvement through observation that is focused on a clear topic and uses evidence in the form of behaviors rather than judgement that stunts 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

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).

The school uses its general funds to provide supplemental programs to prompt student progress in the areas of ELA/Reading and Math. We incorporate the Read 180 program for all students that encounter challenges and have scored at or below a level 2 in previous assessment. In addition, students that have not had success in earning a passing score on the Algebra I or Geometry EOC will be given access to the Edmentum Study Island Math to provide reinforcement in mathematical skills that have presented a challenge.