Gaines Alternative At Hamblen School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Gaines Alternative At Hamblen

1 CHRISTOPHER ST, St Augustine, FL 32084

www-gats.stjohns.k12.fl.us

SIP Authority

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

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

Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)
A school not identified for CSI or TSI, but has one or more subgroups with a Federal Index below 41%.

Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)
A school not identified as CSI that has at least one consistently underperforming subgroup with a Federal Index below 32% for three consecutive years.

Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)
A school can be identified as CSI in any of the following four ways: 1. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%; 2. Have a graduation rate at or below 67%; 3. Have a school grade of D or F; or 4. Have a Federal Index below 41% in the same subgroup(s) for 6 consecutive years.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

I. School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

The Gaines Alternative School provides an alternative to expulsion through temporary removal of students for Level Four infractions of the St. Johns County School District's Student Code of Conduct. Gaines also serves students awaiting adjudication of off-campus felonies. Gaines serves both categories of students by continuing academic instruction and providing therapeutic support.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The Gaines Alternative School will provide an academically sound, physically safe, and therapeutically supportive learning environment for students who have committed Level Four infractions of the St. Johns County School District's Student Code of Conduct and for students who are awaiting adjudication of off-campus
felonies.

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
Davis, Craig	Principal	Overall campus leadership
Allie, Bruce	Assistant Principal	Program leadership, instructional leadership
Rule, Kristopher	Dean	Management of student discipline
Ceaser, Amy	School Counselor	Academic and mental health counseling, MTSS team support

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 team and SAC collaborate to develop the SIP.

SIP Monitoring

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

The template for this plan requires the identification of personnel with specific monitoring roles. Refer to said sections of the plan.

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 5-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Alternative Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	46%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	69%
Charter School	No
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)	
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	
School Improvement Rating History	2021-22: UNSATISFACTORY 2018-19: COMMENDABLE 2017-18: MAINTAINING 2016-17: UNSATISFACTORY
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	5	14	21	40
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	16	22	43
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	9	12	26
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	9	12	26
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	7	9	19
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	7	9	19
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	7	9	19
	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	19	16	12	47

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	2	2	7	11
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	12	15	79
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	14	19	101
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	10	9	59
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	10	9	59
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	6	30
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	6	30
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	6	30

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	21	27	6	54

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	1	5	3	21
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	12	15	30
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	14	19	40
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	10	9	22
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	10	9	22
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	6	16
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	6	16
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	6	16

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	21	27	6	54

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	1	5	3	9
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*	0	71	50		74	51			
ELA Learning Gains									
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile									
Math Achievement*	0	61	38		50	38			
Math Learning Gains									
Math Lowest 25th Percentile									
Science Achievement*		86	64		70	40			
Social Studies Achievement*		82	66		59	48			
Middle School Acceleration					47	44			
Graduation Rate		94	89		84	61	0		
College and Career Acceleration		64	65		86	67			
ELP Progress		51	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)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	0
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	Yes
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	0
Total Components for the Federal Index	2

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
Percent Tested	75
Graduation Rate	

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

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				
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK				
HSP				
MUL				
PAC				
WHT				
FRL				

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				
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK				
HSP				
MUL				
PAC				
WHT				
FRL				

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	0			0								
SWD												
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK												
HSP												
MUL												
PAC												
WHT												
FRL												

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												
SWD												
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK												
HSP												
MUL												
PAC												
WHT												
FRL												

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										0		
SWD												
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK												
HSP												
MUL												
PAC												
WHT												
FRL												

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	10%	73%	-63%	50%	-40%
07	2023 - Spring	38%	69%	-31%	47%	-9%
08	2023 - Spring	20%	69%	-49%	47%	-27%
09	2023 - Spring	12%	70%	-58%	48%	-36%
06	2023 - Spring	*	70%	*	47%	*

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	*	81%	*	54%	*
07	2023 - Spring	8%	66%	-58%	48%	-40%
08	2023 - Spring	31%	81%	-50%	55%	-24%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	27%	71%	-44%	44%	-17%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	30%	78%	-48%	50%	-20%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	9%	67%	-58%	48%	-39%

BIOLOGY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	8%	86%	-78%	63%	-55%

HISTORY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	58%	82%	-24%	63%	-5%

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.

Due to the transient nature of the students and the annual 95% student turnover rate, specific comparison data are difficult to obtain.

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

Due to the transient nature of the students and the annual 95% student turnover rate, specific comparison data are difficult to obtain.

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.

Due to the transient nature of the students and the annual 95% student turnover rate, specific comparison data are difficult to obtain.

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

Due to the transient nature of the students and the annual 95% student turnover rate, specific comparison data are difficult to obtain.

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

Academic progress, as indicated by exit grades, remains the greatest concern. Students tend to demonstrate apathy while enrolled at Gaines, and this is reflected in a tendency toward low academic performance.

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

The team is currently addressing student engagement through the use of brain breaks (students periodically leaving the lab to go outside to walk and get some fresh air) and the use of a recreational period at the end of the day, which will also give the students a break from the lab while fostering physical activity. One-on-one support from our school counselor and mental health counselor should also foster improved academic performance.

Professional development is driven by the Gaines professional learning community. Through the weekly collaboration of this team, student and teacher needs are continually addressed.

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.

Gaines commonly serves students who are at risk of low attendance, recidivism, academic failure, and dropping
out. Cultivating a supportive culture, including attention to social-emotional learning, can mitigate this trend.

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

We expect to see a decline in absenteeism (as measured by weekly attendance records), recidivism (as measured by the number of returning students per semester), improvement in academic success (as measured by exit grades), and a reduction in the number of students dropping out while enrolled.

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

The Gaines PLC will monitor student attendance records, the number of returning students (per weekly Discipline Committee placements), exit grades for students returning to their home-zone school, and the number of drop-out requests per semester.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Bruce Allie (bruce.allie@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

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

The Gaines team will function as a professional learning community, meeting weekly to troubleshoot student
performance concerns, and partner with the MTSS team as needed to foster student success.

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

Ongoing team collaboration in supporting student progress is a research-based strategy for improving student success. The PLC model is a district-wide initiative for strengthening student 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.

The Gaines team will function as a PLC to foster student success and partner with the MTSS team for this purpose as needed.

Person Responsible: Craig Davis (craig.davis@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

By When: This is an ongoing process.

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

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

Gaines students with disabilities tend to be at risk for academic failure. Providing individualized support to these students can mitigate this trend. The students most at risk of academic failure are assigned to smaller lab environments, staffed with ESE teachers.

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

We expect to see an improvement in academic success (as measured by exit grades and progress monitoring assessment scores).

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

The Gaines PLC will monitor weekly grades, exit grades, and progress monitoring assessment scores, providing remediation and counseling as needed.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Bruce Allie (bruce.allie@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

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

The Gaines team will function as a professional learning community, meeting weekly to troubleshoot student
performance concerns, and partner with the MTSS team as needed to foster student success.

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

Ongoing team collaboration in supporting student progress is a research-based strategy for improving student success. The PLC model is a district-wide initiative for strengthening student 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.

The Gaines team will function as a PLC to foster student success and partner with the MTSS team for this purpose as needed.

Person Responsible: Craig Davis (craig.davis@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

By When: This is an ongoing process.

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Professional Learning Communities

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.

Collaborative problem solving is a critical component of how the Gaines team identifies and addresses student needs for support, academic and otherwise.

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

We expect to see an improvement in academic success (as measured by exit grades and progress monitoring assessment scores).

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

The Gaines PLC will monitor weekly grades, exit grades, and progress monitoring assessment scores, providing remediation and counseling as needed.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Bruce Allie (bruce.allie@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

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

The Gaines team will function as a professional learning community, meeting weekly to troubleshoot student
performance concerns, and partner with the MTSS team as needed to foster student success.

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

Ongoing team collaboration in supporting student progress is a research-based strategy for improving student success. The PLC model is a district-wide initiative for strengthening student 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.

The Gaines team will function as a PLC to foster student success and partner with the MTSS team for this purpose as needed.

Person Responsible: Craig Davis (craig.davis@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

By When: This is an ongoing process.

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).

Not applicable.