

Clay County Schools

Keystone Heights Junior/ Senior High School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	9
III. Planning for Improvement	15
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	24
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	0
VI. Title I Requirements	0
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

Keystone Heights Junior/Senior High

900 ORCHID AVE, Keystone Heights, FL 32656

<http://khh.oneclay.net>

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Clay County School Board on 10/5/2023.

SIP Authority

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

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

Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)

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

Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)

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

Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)

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

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

ESEA sections 1111(d) requires that each school identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI develop a support and improvement plan created in partnership with stakeholders (including principals and other school leaders, teachers and parent), is informed by all indicators in the State's accountability system, includes evidence-based interventions, is based on a school-level needs assessment, and identifies resource inequities to be

addressed through implementation of the plan. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as TSI, ATSI and non-Title I CSI must be approved and monitored by the school district. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as Title I, CSI must be approved by the school district and Department. The Department must monitor and periodically review implementation of each CSI plan after approval.

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

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

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

I. School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

Our mission is to work collaboratively with all stakeholders to provide a public education experience that is motivating, challenging, and rewarding for all students. We will increase student achievement by providing students with learning opportunities that are rigorous and relevant; which transcend beyond the boundaries of the school walls. We will ensure a working and learning environment built upon honesty, integrity, and respect. Through these values, we will maximize student potential and promote individual responsibility.

Provide the school's vision statement.

KHHS exists to prepare lifelong learners for success in a global and competitive workplace and to help them acquire applicable life skills.

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
Burke, Laurie	Principal	
Underwood, Barry	Assistant Principal	
Rodriguez, Melanie	Assistant Principal	
Johnson, Spencer	Assistant 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.

The process of developing the 2023-2024 School Improvement Plan included the collaboration of the school leadership team, our Title 1 Coordinator, our District Title 1 Curriculum Specialist, and our School Advisory Council, which includes teachers, students, and business partners. Their input was used to help build our goals based on our student data.

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 progress monitoring of our SIP will be based on student PM1, PM2, and PM3 FAST data, student attendance, and student achievement based on subgroups. Our SAC team will meet quarterly to discuss our progress in meeting our goals and develop new strategies if needed.

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 7-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	12%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	56%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	ATSI
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)* Black/African American Students (BLK)* Hispanic Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: B 2019-20: B 2018-19: B 2017-18: B
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

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

Indicator	Grade Level										Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	54	48	102	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	75	72	147	
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5	12	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19	10	29	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	39	58	97	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19	18	37	
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	115	106	221	

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	34	18	52

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	4	3	7
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1

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	31	35	186	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	13	63	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	38	51	233	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25	39	98	
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	39	44	229	

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	54	57	316

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	0	0	31	35	66
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	13	26
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	0	0	38	51	89
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25	39	64
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	39	44	83

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	54	57	111

The number of students identified retained:

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

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review

ESSA School, District and State Comparison (pre-populated)

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school or combination schools). Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school.

On April 9, 2021, FDOE Emergency Order No. 2021-EO-02 made 2020-21 school grades optional. They have been removed from this publication.

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	46	57	50	46	56	51	47		
ELA Learning Gains				41			38		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				29			30		
Math Achievement*	54	50	38	55	35	38	47		
Math Learning Gains				47			36		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				37			24		
Science Achievement*	65	74	64	59	43	40	58		
Social Studies Achievement*	76	80	66	65	48	48	70		
Middle School Acceleration	66			62	39	44	49		
Graduation Rate	92	95	89	87	75	61	93		
College and Career Acceleration	67	63	65	61	78	67	70		
ELP Progress		52	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)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	67
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	466
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	95
Graduation Rate	92

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	54

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index

OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	589
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	97
Graduation Rate	87

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	42			
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	18	Yes	2	1
HSP	61			
MUL	55			
PAC				
WHT	67			
FRL	60			

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	33	Yes	1	
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	33	Yes	1	
HSP	43			

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%
MUL	52			
PAC				
WHT	54			
FRL	48			

Accountability Components by Subgroup

Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school. (pre-populated)

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS

Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2021-22	C & C Accel 2021-22	ELP Progress
All Students	46			54			65	76	66	92	67	
SWD	28			34			42	46	20	31	7	
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	17			19							2	
HSP	48			36			56	61		67	6	
MUL	39			57			69				3	
PAC												
WHT	47			56			67	78	65	68	7	
FRL	38			47			61	71	60	57	7	

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	46	41	29	55	47	37	59	65	62	87	61	
SWD	21	26	21	29	36	29	36	45	23	81	20	
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												

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
BLK	21	43		7	36			60				
HSP	37	30	17	45	48	46	69	54				
MUL	40	44		67	47			62				
PAC												
WHT	47	41	28	56	48	38	58	66	62	88	64	
FRL	38	38	23	44	43	41	51	60	55	82	56	

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	47	38	30	47	36	24	58	70	49	93	70	
SWD	21	31	26	22	29	28	28	42	16	87	33	
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	38	32	20	22	10		36					
HSP	42	43		29	37	0	47	67	30	90		
MUL	36	32		67	50		33					
PAC												
WHT	47	38	29	49	37	27	60	72	50	93	70	
FRL	38	32	25	39	36	23	52	70	34	87	57	

Grade Level Data Review– State Assessments (pre-populated)

The data are raw data and include ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data. The percentages shown here represent ALL students who received a score of 3 or higher on the statewide assessments.

An asterisk (*) in any cell indicates the data has been suppressed due to fewer than 10 students tested, or all tested students scoring the same.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
10	2023 - Spring	44%	57%	-13%	50%	-6%
07	2023 - Spring	39%	52%	-13%	47%	-8%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	48%	51%	-3%	47%	1%
09	2023 - Spring	52%	55%	-3%	48%	4%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
07	2023 - Spring	36%	50%	-14%	48%	-12%
08	2023 - Spring	68%	70%	-2%	55%	13%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	59%	59%	0%	44%	15%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	59%	68%	-9%	50%	9%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	50%	53%	-3%	48%	2%

BIOLOGY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	70%	73%	-3%	63%	7%

CIVICS						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	83%	79%	4%	66%	17%

HISTORY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	66%	77%	-11%	63%	3%

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.

Students in 7th grade Math had the lowest proficiency rating, 37%, compared to the other grade levels and schools in the district. Trends show that this same 7th-grade cohort also had the lowest ELA proficiency rating (39%) compared to our other grade levels and schools in the district. Looking at attendance and behavior data for this same 7th-grade cohort, it shows that 54 students have been absent 10 or more days to school; and 75 students have one or more suspensions.

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 of 3 points from the prior year is the 7th grade ELA dropping from 43% proficiency to 39% proficiency. Factors that contribute to this decline are the high level of discipline and attendance concerns in this 7th-grade cohort, as well as, the lack of instructional support provided to our students in our 7th-grade inclusion classrooms.

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 state average for 7th grade Math is 48%, and KHHS 7th grade proficiency is 37% an 11-point discrepancy. Trends show this same cohort is low in all areas compared to other grade levels. They also have a higher discipline rate and higher attendance issues.

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

The data component that showed the most improvement is our 8th grade ELA increase of 9 points in one year from 39% proficiency to 48% proficiency. New actions that took place in the school year to contribute to this increase, were the teachers' willingness to focus their instruction on the BEST standards and incorporate a collaborative style of instruction utilizing the practice of standard-based questions.

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

Reflecting on the EWS data, two areas of concern are attendance and ELA proficiency.

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

ELA Proficiency
Math Proficiency
Attendance

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 ELA**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.

Based on FAST/ACT/SAT data, our area of focus will be ELA. By using the strategies and action plan described below, we will increase Reading Proficiency from 45.75% to over 50%.

Measurable Outcome:

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

By using the strategies and action plan described below, we will increase Reading Proficiency from 45.75 to over 50% by the end of the 2023-2024 school year.

Monitoring:

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

We will use Fast PM1, 2, and 3 data to progress monitor student baseline, mid-year, and end-of-the-year growth. Lexia will also be used to help us follow student achievement levels, and see what levels they need specific instruction in to help close gaps. We will be able to utilize both of these measures to monitor where our students need support.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Melanie Rodriguez (melanie.rodriguez@myoneclay.net)

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.)

Teachers will use direct-explicit instruction in the ELA/Reading classes and provide small group instruction as needed for students and give immediate feedback. Teachers will use explicit vocabulary instruction and provide frequent student practice in class. Teachers will use visual representations as needed for all students. KHH will provide tutoring outside of the normal school day and Saturday school as needed. Teachers will be provided professional development on how to build teacher efficacy using the co-teach model.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Using all of the above strategies will allow teachers to work with all of the students to meet their needs. The research in Improving Adolescent Literacy: Effective Classroom and Intervention Practices, says "teachers should provide adolescents with direct and explicit instruction in comprehension strategies to improve students' reading comprehension. Comprehension strategies are routines and procedures that readers use to help them make sense of texts." Providing students with small groups for guided practice and immediate feedback will help with their confidence in Reading. Allowing them extra time and support outside of school hours will also allow for this confidence to show.

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.

1. District ELA Specialists/Coaches to hold Professional Development on "Direct-Explicit Instruction".
2. Reading coach supporting ELA teachers in instruction.
3. Use Vocabulary.com as a resource to monitor student progress.
4. Utilize supplemental reading materials to increase Reading interest in small groups.
5. Utilize a teacher assistant to support small group instruction.
6. Hold quarterly data meetings.
7. Use data to monitor progress in creating targeted small groups.
8. Use the Small Group Reading Instructional Professional Development book as a book study for PD.
9. Use Wireless Quiz Busser System and Nearpods as an engagement tool.
10. Students use Lexia PowerUp and other district-approved online programs.
11. Providing materials to help with classroom walk-throughs and observations.
12. Use of visual models - posters, etc.
13. Whiteboards for teacher walls in classrooms.
14. Use SMORES as a way of communication between school and home.
15. Interactive T.V.s and Chromebooks to support engagement.

Person Responsible: Melanie Rodriguez (melanie.rodriguez@myoneclay.net)

By When: Each quarter Mrs. Rodriguez will review the action steps that are being used at KHH.

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math**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.

Based on FAST data, our area of focus will be Math. By using the strategies and action plan described below, we will increase overall math achievement from 51.25% to 59% by the end of the 2023--2024 school year.

Measurable Outcome:

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

By using the strategies and action plan described below, we will increase overall math achievement from 51.25% to 59% by the end of the 2023-2024 school year.

Monitoring:

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

We will use PM 1, 2, and 3 data to progress monitor student baseline, mid-year, and end-of-the-year growth.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Laurie Burke (laurie.burke@myoneclay.net)

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.)

Teachers will use small group instruction as needed and give immediate feedback. Teachers will use visual representations as needed and provide frequent student practice with math problems. Teachers will model for students the expected academic achievement. KHH will provide tutoring outside of the normal school day and Saturday school as needed. Teachers will be provided professional development on how to build teacher efficacy using the co-teach model.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Using the above strategies will allow teachers to work with all students to meet their needs. Research in the article, Enhancing Core Mathematics Instruction for Students At Risk for Mathematics Disabilities, reads "that the experimental intervention research supports the notion of making core mathematics instruction more systematic and explicit for students that are at risk of mathematics disability." This evidence-based intervention can be used in small groups providing that explicit instruction to a small group of students who are struggling or may not understand a concept. Students will receive immediate feedback from their teachers. The research in, Improving Mathematical Problem Solving in Grades 4-8, reads to "model how to monitor and reflect on the problem-solving process." Teachers will model as they solve problems so that students can use the same strategy as they are solving independently. Allowing them extra time and support outside of school hours will also allow for this confidence to grow.

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.

1. District Support in small group instruction, PD, and model lessons.
2. Collaborative lesson planning through common planning opportunities.
3. Utilize data to monitor progress for small groups.
4. Conduct data meetings quarterly to address areas of concern.
5. Small Group instruction
6. PD book study Making Sense of Mathematics for Teaching the Small Group.
7. Formative and Summative Assessments.
8. Incorporate IXL to use for model instruction and for additional practice.
9. Use visuals aids for teaching and supplemental materials
10. Use SMORES for communication between school and home. And opportunities for parent/teacher conferences.
11. Whiteboards for classrooms with chalkboards for problem-solving.
12. Interactive T.V.s and Chromebooks for student engagement.
13. Provide scientific calculators
14. Offer tutoring for extra support. Provide Transportation as needed.
15. Provide summer school for students who are not proficient in 3rd progress monitoring.

Person Responsible: Laurie Burke (laurie.burke@myoneclay.net)

By When: Each quarter Mrs. Burke will review the action steps that are being used at KHH.

#3. 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.

Based on Synergy data, our area of focus will be Student Life Skills. By using the strategies and action plan described below we will increase Student attendance from 89.89% to 92% by the end of the 2023-2024 school year.

Measurable Outcome:

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

By using the strategies and action plan described below we will increase Student attendance from 89.89% to 92% by the end of the 2023-2024 school year.

Monitoring:

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

It begins with the teachers. Teachers take daily attendance in all of their classes. From there when students are absent three days in one month, the teacher calls the parent. Student misses 5 days, the teacher completes a form to notify the administration. Student misses 10 days (within 90 day period), the attendance Student Success Team will meet to work with families and determine the cause of absences.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Laurie Burke (laurie.burke@myoneclay.net)

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.)

Faculty and staff will establish positive connections with students through engaging/active classrooms. KHH will foster student expectations of success at the beginning of the school year in grade-level assemblies. KHH will provide meaningful two-way communication between school and family.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Using the Center of PBS guide, research shows teachers need to establish a positive connection with students, families, and other educators. When we establish these connections, students in return will feel connected to their teachers or peers. Families will feel connected by receiving information via email, in person, social media, or positive phone calls from home. Research says teachers need to engage students in relevant learning. Most students do not like to sit in a boring classroom. Students are more up to come to school if their classes are more engaging. Teaching students positive expectations at the beginning of the school year sets them up for success!

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.

1. First-period teachers will contact the parents of their students and hold one conference with them.
2. Positive notes home.
3. High Expectations of students.
4. Attendance posters around school campus
5. Pancake Breakfast - rewards for no absences and no tardies.
6. Utilize WEB program (Where Everyone Belongs) Anti-Bullying
7. Utilize Hall Pass - digital program allowing teachers to see if too many students are out using the restroom already.
8. Use 7 Mindsets
9. Administration sharing important phone calls home through robo calls or individual phone calls home. Sharing school newsletters on social media.
10. Transportation as needed for parents to attend parent events.
11. PD on engaging lessons
12. Utilize the Indian Buck when students show one of our characteristics traits: STRONG- S = Shows Up, T = Working Together, R = Giving Respect, O = Taking Ownership, N = Never Give UP, G = Using Grit

Person Responsible: Laurie Burke (laurie.burke@myoneclay.net)

By When: Each quarter Mrs. Burke will review the action steps that are being used at KHH.

#4. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups**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.

Our ESSA Subgroup data indicated both SWD and BLK students current overall Federal Index was below 41%. These two subgroups missed the target, which identifies these subgroups as an area of focus. Data indicated both our SWD students and BLK students received a Federal Index score of 33%.

Measurable Outcome:

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

With the current year testing platform of the FAST PM ELA and Math Assessment, as well as, content area EOCs as our measurable outcomes our goal is to increase the Federal Index above 41% for both subgroups.

Monitoring:

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

Progress will be monitored through the Florida FAST PM1 and PM2 assessment, common assessments, content area assessments, EOCs, as well as SLD ESE Goal Achievement, Savvas, and ALEKS.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Melanie Rodriguez (melanie.rodriguez@myoneclay.net)

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.)

Utilizing district support in PD.
Increase collaborative planning.
PD on small group instruction.
Lexia Power Up
Savvas
PLC Modeling and Reflection
School-wide - ACE strategy initiative
PBIS - acknowledgments and supports

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Utilizing district support in professional development. Increase instruction to foster cultural awareness in hopes to reshape the curriculum to reflect students' diversity to lead to better educational outcomes. Intentional planning to target students who would benefit from small group instruction. Utilize FIN to support and train teachers on how to collaboratively plan to incorporate the support facilitators more effectively, as well as, guidance on how to implement a Universal Design approach in the classroom. Increased walkthroughs will monitor progress.

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.

Strategies will include: collaborative planning, professional development, master schedule to maximize team planning, analyze student data to target individual learning needs. After hours tutoring after school on Saturdays will be utilized. Teacher will use visual representations, Professional development on explicit instruction in Reading. Reading coach will be utilized to support ELA instruction.. Use vocabulary.com to improve vocabulary. Utilize small group instruction to target specific skill deficiencies. Use data to monitor student progress when creating targeted small groups. Students will use Lexia Power Up and other district-approved programs. Professional development using Small Group Reading Instruction book study to improve collaborative methods for instruction.

Person Responsible: Melanie Rodriguez (melanie.rodriguez@myoneclay.net)

By When: The goal is for our progress monitoring data to show improvement throughout the school year, we are able to master standards and be proficient in their end-of-year assessments.

CSI, TSI and ATSI Resource Review

Describe the process to review school improvement funding allocations and ensure resources are allocated based on needs. This section must be completed if the school is identified as ATSI, TSI or CSI in addition to completing an Area(s) of Focus identifying interventions and activities within the SIP (ESSA 1111(d)(1)(B)(4) and (d)(2)(C).

The process by which our school will review school improvement funding allocations and ensure resources are allocated based on need is by incorporating the collaboration of our School Advisory Council, Community Partnership School, Guidance, Teachers, Parents, and Students in the decision-making process. Some resources we will utilize this year for school improvement will be funded through Title 1, as well as, our Community Partnership Schools. During our first SAC meeting, we will approve our SIP and collaborate to review resources and address allocations based on student needs. Some resources that will be discussed but not limited to are; per-pupil expenditures, instructional time, early intervention, teacher quality, school leadership quality, facilities and rigorous content/courses, and specialized instructional support personnel. Each of these factors contributes to student success and will be discussed to determine which identifying intervention or activity will have the greatest impact on improving our area of focus.