

Alachua County Public Schools

Alachua Eschool (Virtual Franchise) School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	10
III. Planning for Improvement	16
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	23

Alachua Eschool (Virtual Franchise)

2802 NE 8TH AVE, Gainesville, FL 32641

<https://www.sbac.edu/aes>

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.

Alachua eSchool K-12 will provide a rigorous and engaging education to equip students with critical skills that promote the intellectual and social growth needed to be highly successful in college and careers and to be productive citizens.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Virtually teaching, supporting, and connecting students.

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
Alvarez, Jesely	Principal	To provide effective leadership in the administration and supervision of school operations to promote the successful education of students in a safe and orderly environment.
LaPlant, Brian	Assistant Principal	To provide effective leadership in the administration and supervision of school operations to promote the successful education of students in a safe and orderly environment.
Baez, Christthianny	Registrar	To prepare and maintain accurate student records in accordance with district policies and procedures.
Rhoden, Hillary	Teacher, K-12	Elementary/Secondary Team Leader role in facilitating team problem solving and the monitoring of the academic success of all students on the assigned team; and collaborating with the principal and other teachers on the building leadership team.
Lafler, Kate	Teacher, ESE	Under the direction of the Building Principal and Director of Special Education, the Licensed Special Education Teacher develops and provides specialized instruction to meet the unique needs of students with disabilities; Evaluates and assesses student progress against instructional objectives; follows State mandated due process procedures and functions as IEP Manager to assigned students.

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 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 is as follows:

The SIP is drafted based on prior year's achievement data with teachers and staff during pre-planning. Achievement is also shared as results are provided throughout the year. This same data is shared with our leadership team and SAC during monthly and quarterly meetings. Faculty also reviews data monthly

during team data chats. All of our SAC stakeholders are part of this process and review SIP prior to submission during our first meetings of the year.

SIP Monitoring

Describe how the SIP will be regularly monitored for effective implementation and impact on increasing the achievement of students in meeting the State’s academic standards, particularly for those students with the greatest achievement gap. Describe how the school will revise the plan, as necessary, to ensure continuous improvement. (ESSA 1114(b)(3))

The SIP will be regularly monitored 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 during monthly leadership team meetings, quarterly SAC meetings, and monthly team meetings with faculty.

The school will revise the plan, as necessary, to ensure continuous improvement by using achievement data such as FAST PM1, 2, and 3 results to adjust strategies embedded in our goals as needed. Additionally, we will review monthly attendance data to monitor progress on goals and pacing for students' credit completion towards high school graduation.

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	50%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	51%
Charter School	No
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)	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.	2021-22: I 2019-20: I 2018-19: I 2017-18: I
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	0
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	2
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4	9
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4	10
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

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	3	10	8	21

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	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Students retained two or more times	0	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	0
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	22	16	113
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	53	32	65	150
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

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	23	28	31	216

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	0
Students retained two or more times	0	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	0	0	0	0
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	22	16	53
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	53	32	65	150
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

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	23	28	31	82

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	0
Students retained two or more times	0	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*	39	53	50	26	57	51	64		
ELA Learning Gains				55			58		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				19			43		
Math Achievement*	25	48	38	17	30	38	59		
Math Learning Gains				46			44		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				33			33		
Science Achievement*	60	66	64	20	48	40	61		
Social Studies Achievement*	50	65	66	17	47	48	92		
Middle School Acceleration	58			56	40	44	10		
Graduation Rate	86	89	89	68	65	61	94		
College and Career Acceleration	40	66	65	46	71	67	48		
ELP Progress		57	45						

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

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

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	CSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	51
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	358
Total Components for the Federal Index	7

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
Percent Tested	57
Graduation Rate	86

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	CSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	37
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	Yes
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	403
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	44
Graduation Rate	68

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	18	Yes	2	2
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	40	Yes	2	
HSP				
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	61			
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	0	Yes	1	1
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	37	Yes	1	
HSP	56			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	64			
FRL	43			

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	39			25			60	50	58	86	40	
SWD	20			15							2	
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	35			29						17	4	
HSP												
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	73			42			72	53		45	6	
FRL	52			26			54	50		32	6	

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21	ELP Progress
All Students	26	55	19	17	46	33	20	17	56	68	46	
SWD	0											
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	31	29		19	35		18	45		80		
HSP	50	80		30						64		
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	73	58		75	62		63	67	65	67	50	
FRL	45	43		34	44	40	18	42	55	58	48	

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	64	58	43	59	44	33	61	92	10	94	48	
SWD	27	55		40	40							
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	36	39	23	22	6							
HSP	54	57		64	46							
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	75	64	50	68	54	50	72	91	14	92	52	
FRL	39	40	24	33	33	23	53		7			

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	52%	52%	0%	50%	2%
07	2023 - Spring	32%	46%	-14%	47%	-15%
08	2023 - Spring	62%	47%	15%	47%	15%
09	2023 - Spring	77%	52%	25%	48%	29%
06	2023 - Spring	67%	47%	20%	47%	20%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	58%	47%	11%	54%	4%
07	2023 - Spring	12%	24%	-12%	48%	-36%
08	2023 - Spring	47%	57%	-10%	55%	-8%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	48%	44%	4%	44%	4%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	36%	52%	-16%	50%	-14%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	43%	57%	-14%	48%	-5%

BIOLOGY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	72%	63%	9%	63%	9%

CIVICS						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	26%	58%	-32%	66%	-40%

HISTORY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	61%	63%	-2%	63%	-2%

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.

44% participation on All Statewide Assessments Participation. Contributing factors include low in-person participation due to testing virtual students off campus at their schools versus testing virtual students at our eschool campus as we initiated this year for the first time. Another contributing factor was that there was not a structure in place to take virtual school student attendance. Next school year we have worked with district colleagues in the FTE department to take attendance for all students.

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

The data component that showed the greatest decline from the prior year continues to be math achievement. As a virtual school we have limited access to students for additional services such as tutoring in the area of math. Our teachers and district provided opportunities for tutoring in math but had limited participation, especially for students needing math tutoring the most.

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 data component that had the greatest gap when compared to the state average is in math achievement. Our teachers and district provided opportunities for tutoring in math but had limited participation, especially for students needing math tutoring the most.

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

Graduation rate increased from 68.4% in 2020-21 to 85.5% in 2021-22. In the 2022-23 school year, we planned for implementation of a weekly attendance system for virtual students for the 2023-24 school year. we also started progress monitoring K-12 for course pacing and completion by students via the EPT process.

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

--Subgroups specifically related to Black/African American students and SWD re: credit completion and testing requirements for graduation
--Attendance

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

1. Positive Culture & Environment specifically related to Early Warning Systems i.e. attendance (implement weekly attendance system), progress monitoring (EPT process, in person on site testing).
2. ESSA Subgroups specifically related to Black/African American students
3. ESSA Subgroups specifically related to SWD

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 Early Warning System

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

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

DESCRIPTION: Provide a supportive and fulfilling environment with learning conditions that meet the needs of all students learning virtually to increase attendance and achievement.

RATIONALE:

Our students are expected to work independently in a rigorous online elearning platform.

Due to the pacing and completion rate data from 2022-23, with approximately 45% of students off pace/incomplete in courses, we need to provide better progress monitoring supports to students i.e. EPT process, attendance protocols, homerooms with an assigned teacher.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Our faculty will increase support to students learning virtually by monitoring progress monthly via the implementation of homerooms and weekly by taking attendance in core classes to ensure students stay on pace (6% per course per week/24% per course per month) and complete courses per district calendar timelines.

Fall implementation of PBIS strategies for recognition and school-wide expectations e.g. Quarterly Terrific Tigers recognition awards and PBIS posted expectations (Be kind, be responsible, be trustworthy).

Monitoring:

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

Our main strategy is implementing homerooms to build relationships with students to aid on-going progress monitoring of data sources e.g. FAST results, DBA's, unit tests, EPT process, homerooms, etc. to inform practice/systems and support the improvement of student outcomes monthly.

The leadership team will meet monthly to review data and assess needs.

Teacher teams meet monthly to review data and establish clear next steps and how they will monitor and celebrate progress with students and families.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jesely Alvarez (masencupja@gm.sbac.edu)

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.)

Intervention #1:

Tier 1/School wide: Fall implementation of PBIS strategies for school-wide expectations e.g. PBIS posted expectations (Be kind, be responsible, be trustworthy).

Intervention #2:

Tier 1/School wide: Fall implementation of PBIS strategies for recognition e.g. Quarterly/semester Terrific Tigers recognition awards.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Per PBIS.org, PBIS is a framework for creating safe, positive, equitable schools, where every student can feel valued, connected to the school community and supported by caring adults. By implementing evidence-based practices within a PBIS framework, schools support their students' academic, social, emotional, and behavioral success, engage with families to create locally-meaningful and culturally-relevant outcomes, and use data to make informed decisions that improve the way things work for everyone.

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 PBIS posters with faculty and post around campus and on teacher web pages.

Person Responsible: Jesely Alvarez (masencupja@gm.sbac.edu)

By When: Sept 2023

Teach students PBIS poster schoolwide expectations and Terrific Tigers recognition program rubric in homerooms.

Person Responsible: Hillary Rhoden (rhodenha@gm.sbac.edu)

By When: End of quarter 1, October 13, 2023

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Black/African-American

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

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

Description:

A "subgroup of students" in statewide accountability includes students from major racial and ethnic groups; economically disadvantaged students; students with disabilities and English language learners.

Increase the federal index from 36% to 50% for Black/African-American students to meet or exceed the overall federal index of more than 40%.

Rationale:

Our school is currently a TSI (Targeted Support & Improvement) designated school.

A school is identified for support if it earns a D or F school grade, has an overall Federal Index of 40 percent or less, or has a graduation rate of 67 percent or lower.

2020-21, overall federal index was 57%. 2021-22, overall federal index was 43% (14% decrease from prior year).

Measurable Outcome:

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

Through monthly progress monitoring of students via continued EPT (Educational Planning Team) process and the implementation of homerooms, we will increase the federal index for students to meet or exceed the overall federal index for our school and increase the graduation rate, specifically relating to Black/African-American students.

Remove our school designation of TSI (Targeted Support & Improvement) by May 2024 by scoring above 40% in our overall Federal Index.

Monitoring:

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

Grow our progress monitoring systems (EPT process and homerooms) with the leadership team and meet weekly administratively to discuss progress monitoring of students to ensure students are on schedule for graduation, specifically relating to Black/African-American students.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jesely Alvarez (masencupja@gm.sbac.edu)

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.)

Intervention #1:

Progress monitoring student pacing and course completion rates on a weekly and monthly basis via teacher homerooms, leadership team, and administration, specifically relating to Black/African-American students.

Intervention #2:

Referring students for early intervention via the EPT referral process or for enrichment courses pending pacing and course completion rate per student, specifically relating to Black/African-American students.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

By monitoring student progress weekly and monthly and in multiple platforms (FLVS/homerooms/ leadership team), we can provide student supports early in the semester/quarter. Supports such as the EPT process, enrichment opportunities, intervention as applicable to promote credit completion and prevent credit deficiencies towards on-time high school graduation, specifically relating to Black/African-American 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 2 - Moderate Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

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

Identify student roster, specifically relating to Black/African-American students, to review in leadership team weekly and monthly for progress monitoring in core courses.

Person Responsible: Brian LaPlant (laplantbm@gm.sbac.edu)

By When: September 2023

#3. 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.

Description:

A “subgroup of students” in statewide accountability includes students from major racial and ethnic groups; economically disadvantaged students; students with disabilities (SWD) and English language learners.

Per 2021-22 ELA assessment results (not enough students tested in math to record data) the achievement level for our students with disabilities was 90% level 1 and 10% level 2. No SWD achieved a level three or higher.

Rationale: We need to better serve SWD by focusing on ensuring SWD are participating in testing sessions and moving at least 20% of students toward achieving level 3 or higher in tested subjects to match or exceed district and statewide achievement levels of SWD.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Our School Assessment Coordinator (SAC) will pull a roster to identify our SWD and ensure we individually invite them to all testing sessions to ensure 80% or higher of SWD are attending State testing during each progress monitoring window.

Monitoring:

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

Our School Assessment Coordinator (SAC) will log the number of students participating in each testing session to look for growth in attendance for testing by SWD and monitor achievement data, specifically related to students with disabilities (SWD).

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Brian LaPlant (laplantbm@gm.sbac.edu)

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.)

Intervention #1:

Communication with students and parents/guardians about testing via Skylert using contact information on Skyward, FLVS, and homerooms, specifically relating to SWD.

Intervention #2:

Progress monitoring attendance for testing windows in fall, winter, and spring, specifically relating to SWD.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

We need to better serve SWD by focusing on ensuring SWD are participating in testing sessions through individual communication to students and parent/guardians and the use of homerooms. Once students are present for testing and we have enough test data to pull score reports, we need to focus on moving at least 20% of students toward achieving level 3 or higher in tested subjects to match or exceed district and statewide achievement levels of SWD.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

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

Tier 2 - Moderate Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

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

Pull a roster from our SIS Skyward to identify our SWD and ensure we individually invite them to all testing sessions.

Person Responsible: Brian LaPlant (laplantbm@gm.sbac.edu)

By When: August 2023

Log the number of students participating in each testing session to look for growth in attendance for testing by SWD.

Person Responsible: Brian LaPlant (laplantbm@gm.sbac.edu)

By When: September 2023, January 2024, and May 2024

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).

Schools identified as CSI (Alachua eSchool) must collaborate with the district and stakeholders in using data to review resources and determine the needs of the school in comparison with other schools in the district.

District collaboration: Data Analytics, Accountability, and Evaluation Team,

Stakeholder collaboration: SAC

Budget to Support Areas of Focus

Part VII: Budget to Support Areas of Focus

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

1	III.B.	Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Early Warning System	\$0.00
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Black/African-American	\$0.00
3	III.B.	Area of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00

Budget Approval

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

No