Manatee County Public Schools

State College Of Florida Collegiate School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

State College Of Florida Collegiate School

5840 26TH ST W, Bradenton, FL 34207

https://scfcs.scf.edu/bradenton/

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.

State College of Florida Collegiate School's mission is to guide and mentor student achievement by equipping them to attain a high school diploma and an Associate in Arts Degree concurrently upon graduation. Beginning in 6th grade, SCFCS students' progress in a rigorous academic environment, supported with 1:1 technology. The program utilizes demanding and innovative initiatives to establish a system that encourages independent learning, preparing students for success in a full-time college schedule beginning their junior year.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The following tenets guide the operation of the SCF Collegiate School:

-Pursue innovation in teaching and learning.
-Engage in continuous assessment to measure success for positive change.
-Partner with other schools and institutions locally, nationally and internationally.
-Infuse curriculum with characteristics necessary to build student awareness of the international community, and their role as global citizens.
-Instill a 'going to college' culture at an early age, specifically for students who are first generation college students.
-Educate families and the community about the benefits of a college education, and the importance of early preparation.
-Eliminate transitions in education with a continuum from sixth grade to college, while providing academic advising for college at SCF and beyond.
-Using technology to increase interest, and to teach and learn with relevant tools needed for today's "digital natives".
-Increase rigor and curricular relevance, with enrichment utilizing college resources.
-Create a home base for accelerated college students enrolled in SCFCS.

Innovative teaching and creative leadership will accomplish this mission. Each student is encouraged to learn to work independently, with other students, and with instructors to meet their goals.

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
Lewellen, Karen	Principal	

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

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

School goals are created upon reflection of the previous year, and includes data from students testing and academics, behavior reports, school culture surveys and other objective data gathering. The leadership team includes student feedback from organizations such as the Student Voice Club. It includes internal stakeholder collaboration with teachers and staff through surveys and team meetings. It includes the external stakeholder collaboration with the State College of Florida leadership teams, School District of Manatee County and charter school parents at the School Advisory Council.

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 and overall school goals are monitored by the Charter leadership team as part of a regular meeting schedule. Data is monitored as well with the state testing and academic progress. SCFCS Leadership Team utilizes "Response to Intervention" processes as part of our Multi Tiered System of Supports as a component of progress monitoring.

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 6-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	49%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	45%
Charter School	Yes
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	N/A
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD) English Language Learners (ELL) Asian Students (ASN) Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)

School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: A
	2019-20: A
	2018-19: A
	2017-18: A
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

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	7	5	7	19
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5	0	8
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	3
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	11	20
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	13	15	42
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	10	22	43
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	
	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	5	6	5	16

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	3	1	3	11
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	3
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	10
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	19
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	8	3	21
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5	2	20
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	3	3	1	9

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) 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	3	1	3	7
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	2
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	3
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	3
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	8	3	14
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5	2	12
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	3	3	1	7

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Total
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*	63	44	50	75	48	51	81		
ELA Learning Gains				51			62		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				43			55		
Math Achievement*	85	42	38	83	35	38	85		
Math Learning Gains				67			59		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				61			64		
Science Achievement*	86	64	64	83	45	40	81		
Social Studies Achievement*	90	59	66	98	43	48	92		
Middle School Acceleration	15			29	37	44	24		
Graduation Rate	100	84	89	100	63	61	100		
College and Career Acceleration	100	61	65	100	66	67	100		
ELP Progress	67	41	45	42			89		

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)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	76
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	606
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	100

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	69
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	832
Total Components for the Federal Index	12
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	100

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	33	Yes	1	
ELL	62			
AMI				
ASN	75			
BLK	67			
HSP	75			
MUL	84			
PAC				
WHT	79			

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%
FRL	72			

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	57			
ELL	45			
AMI				
ASN	74			
BLK	66			
HSP	66			
MUL	77			
PAC				
WHT	73			
FRL	68			

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	63			85			86	90	15	100	100	67
SWD	15			50							2	
ELL	26			61			80	77			5	67
AMI												
ASN	56			93							2	
BLK	62			71							2	
HSP	59			79			83	86	20	100	8	69
MUL	75			93							2	

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
PAC												
WHT	65			89			88	97	13	100	7	
FRL	52			79			84	88	12	100	8	62

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21	ELP Progress
All Students	75	51	43	83	67	61	83	98	29	100	100	42
SWD	57	57		77	38							
ELL	29	30	34	67	54	60	44					42
AMI												
ASN	83	61		81	69							
BLK	67	52		80	57		73					
HSP	64	48	41	81	67	70	67	96	6	100	100	53
MUL	85	50		91	80							
PAC												
WHT	81	52	40	86	67	55	93	100	34	100	100	
FRL	68	46	44	81	62	51	74	97	24	100	100	

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	81	62	55	85	59	64	81	92	24	100	100	89
SWD	73	82		82	91							
ELL	52	47	41	70	53	56	46					89
AMI												
ASN	86	77		100	82							
BLK	71	57		88	54		69					
HSP	73	58	45	76	53	59	71	86	0	100	100	88
MUL	91	64		90	50							
PAC												
WHT	88	65	73	88	63	68	90	97	28	100	100	
FRL	76	57	46	81	54	57	73	93	12	100	100	90

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.
<u>The percentages shown here represent ALL students who received a score of 3 or higher on the statewide assessments</u>.

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	66%	44%	22%	50%	16%
07	2023 - Spring	54%	43%	11%	47%	7%
08	2023 - Spring	67%	45%	22%	47%	20%
09	2023 - Spring	70%	46%	24%	48%	22%
06	2023 - Spring	56%	45%	11%	47%	9%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	83%	59%	24%	54%	29%
07	2023 - Spring	80%	58%	22%	48%	32%
08	2023 - Spring	97%	41%	56%	55%	42%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	83%	45%	38%	44%	39%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	90%	58%	32%	50%	40%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	86%	56%	30%	48%	38%

BIOLOGY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	90%	64%	26%	63%	27%

CIVICS						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	90%	69%	21%	66%	24%

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.

The English Language Arts scores showed the lowest performance last year. While still higher than the district and the state scores, overall, the ELA scores were lower when compared against the previous years. A contributing factor includes a comparison of scores from two different state exams as the Florida Standards Assessments have been replaced with Progress Monitoring. Looking as student growth, there is a trend downward of annual individual student progress each year.

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

Per the 2023 Spring progress monitoring scores, there is a significant increase of students not passing minimum ELA and middle school math comprehension requirements.

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.

There are only positive gaps when comparing scores to the state averages. However, the 6th and 7th grade ELA are the weakest areas of comparison.

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

The science and high school math scores continue to remain in the 80-90 percentile of students who illustrate comprehension in these subjects.

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

The Early Warning Systems data reveal a significant increase in overall number of level 1 students in middles school ELA and math. This is paired with an increase of students not passing their math courses. There is also an increase of student absences. Areas where the same student falls into two or more categories that illustrates the most concern is a level 1 scores and failure in the course.

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

Academic priorities for 2023-24 include a focus on reading for students in all curriculum areas, as well as increase support in the classroom. Additional monitoring and scheduling of students in push in/pull out small groups for individual planning for the lowest scoring students.

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 Small Group Instruction

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.

Increase in scheduling and support for small group instruction in reading and math. Paraprofessionals are resources in the middle and high school classrooms, grades 6-10, for push in/pull out literacy groups. Focus on literacy in all content areas, as well as professional development for the paras.

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

Outcome will be an increase in progress monitoring scores from PM1 to PM3 by at least 5%, with a long term goal to have at least 70% of students in middle and high school illustrating grade level comprehension.

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

Monitoring is through the Multi Tiered System of Support (MTSS) team, including the certified counselors, Special Education (ESE) and English as a Second Language (ESOL) coordinator, Director of Curriculum and Instruction as well as grade level teaching/academic coaching teams.

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.)

Reading interventions in small groups with targeted outcomes in literacy, fluency, vocabulary and comprehension. Focus on reading in all curriculum groups as well as working on focus, capacity and endurance.

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

Review of data from current reading scores in all grades as well as historical decline in reading gains.

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

#2. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Other

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

SCFCS is working on a positive culture and environment for students. The objective is to reinforce a community that works together to create and produce initiatives and events, reflects school pride and spirit and encourages a safe space to ask for assistance.

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

The focus on a positive culture and environment is designed for measurable outcomes, including a decrease in student absenteeism, an increase in participation in school initiatives and events, an increase in utilization of resources such as tutoring, and a decrease in behavior infractions.

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

Monitoring will be from the leadership group as they assess the impact and participation in school events, review the data from attendance and behavior infractions. Monitoring procedures include identifying key personnel to regularly review throughout the school year.

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.)

There has been much research on the increase of student performance when students feel positive about their environment, when they feel emotionally and physically safe and secure, and their basic needs are met. Engagement and achievement will increase when students know the adults at school are supportive advocates.

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

Positive school culture is always a priority.

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. 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.

A third area of focus for SCFCS in 2023-24 is the increased recruitment for dual enrolled students, and support for those who need to meet requirements from the 10th to 11th grade transition to full time dual enrollment.

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

SCFCS will increase the number of 10th grade students meeting requirements for junior year, and create more opportunities for recruitment of juniors from the district.

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

The area of focus will be monitored from the counselors, with support form the college advisor and leadership 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.)

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

SCFCS has had a decline in qualified students enrolling in the junior year.

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