Lake Asbury Junior High School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Lake Asbury Junior High School

2851 SANDRIDGE RD, Green Cove Springs, FL 32043

http://laj.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 children.We will increase student achievement by providing students with learning opportunities that are rigorous, relevant, and 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.

The School District of Clay County exists to prepare life-long learners for success in a global and competitive workplace and in acquiring 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
Creel, Lydia	Principal	Analyzes data and works with teams to develop goals for LAJH based on historical academic, behavioral, and social emotional learning progress to improve learning outcomes for all students.
Umbaugh, Jennifer	Assistant Principal	Analyzes data and works with teams to develop goals for LAJH based on historical academic, behavioral, and social emotional learning progress.
Davis, Daniel	Assistant Principal	Analyzes data and works with teams to develop goals for LAJH based on historical academic, behavioral, and social emotional learning progress.
Cascanet, Sara	SAC Member	Dual Certified teacher serving as a parent, liaison, club sponsor, and SAC Committee member assisting other committee members and stakeholders in understanding school initiatives and performance goals.
Patton, Nicole	Teacher, ESE	Dual Certified ESE teacher, Support Facilitator, ITF, and MTSS Coordinator working to ensure that students receive supports designed to help them meet learning and SEL goals as outlined in their IEP or 504.
Roache, Samantha	Teacher, K-12	Mathematics teacher and Department Chair working to assist in data analysis as we set goals for student growth and achievement.
Koporc, Lynn	School Counselor	As a school counselor, she designs and delivers academic and SEL counseling aimed at improving student outcomes. Leading, advocating and collaborating to promote equity and access for all students by connecting the school counseling program to the school's academic mission and school improvement plan.
Crawford, Erin	Instructional Media	Maintains a district approved diverse and current media collection (electronic and print) to facilitate student and staff use of the resources in the media center program.
Brashear, Arlie	Teacher, ESE	Provides Positive Behavior Supports and leadership for students served in our self-contained behavior units, working to help students transition out to the least restrictive environment for additional academic and social learning opportunities. He also serves as an active liaison between our school and the larger community we serve.

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.

After identifying key stakeholders, including members of the school leadership team, staff, parents, students, and community leaders, their insight and feedback was gathered. This information was analyzed to identify common themes and concerns and integrated into the draft of the SIP. An opportunity to review and vet the plan was provided to further validate and refine the plan, ensuring that it is reflective of the collective vision of our school community and the expectation that all students be taught to high academic standards.

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 via weekly classroom walkthroughs, student progress monitoring of academics, SEL participation, SAC meeting notes, survey results, and a systematic review of discipline data to ensure equitable outcomes. We also monitor faculty PLC participation and feedback and actively solicit staff and community input. A variety of analyzed data results will be shared an reviewed monthly with the school leadership team, SAC, amd community stakeholders, with adjustments made as needed and recommended by the team.

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)	Middle School 7-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	33%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	43%
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)* English Language Learners (ELL) Asian Students (ASN) Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: B 2019-20: A 2018-19: A

	2017-18: A
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**	**7**	**8**	
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	79	129	208
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	30	40	70
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	2	8
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	10	12
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	67	95	162
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	91	132	223
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	63	91	154

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	25	41	66

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students identified retained:

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

Prior Year (2022-23) As Initially Reported (pre-populated)

The number of students by grade level that exhibited each early warning indicator:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	110	137	247
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	65	84	149
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	9	15
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	35	42
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	52	112	164
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	37	0	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	83	127	210

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	96	150

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	110	137	247
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	65	84	149
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	9	15
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	35	42
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	52	112	164
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	37	0	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	83	127	210

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	96	150

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*	57	54	49	55	56	50	59		
ELA Learning Gains				47			56		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				31			40		
Math Achievement*	74	69	56	70	33	36	65		
Math Learning Gains				64			51		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				53			51		
Science Achievement*	61	62	49	60	64	53	65		
Social Studies Achievement*	82	81	68	83	59	58	80		
Middle School Acceleration	68	63	73	71	46	49	71		
Graduation Rate					63	49			
College and Career Acceleration					81	70			
ELP Progress		44	40		67	76	64		

* 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	68
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	342
Total Components for the Federal Index	5
Percent Tested	98
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	59
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	534
Total Components for the Federal Index	9
Percent Tested	98
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	41			
ELL	63			
AMI				
ASN	80			
BLK	57			
HSP	65			
MUL	70			
PAC				
WHT	70			

2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	**Federal Percent of Points Index**	**Subgroup Below 41%**	**Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%**	**Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%**
FRL	59			

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	40	Yes	1	
ELL	49			
AMI				
ASN	76			
BLK	56			
HSP	54			
MUL	60			
PAC				
WHT	61			
FRL	54			

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	57			74			61	82	68			
SWD	29			46			31	59	42		5	
ELL	50			68			64	91	40		5	
AMI												
ASN	81			88					71		3	
BLK	44			58			45	69	71		5	
HSP	53			71			58	87	56		5	
MUL	55			81			76	86	53		5	

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2021-22	C & C Accel 2021-22	ELP Progress
PAC												
WHT	59			76			62	83	72		5	
FRL	49			63			48	76	57		5	

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	55	47	31	70	64	53	60	83	71			
SWD	26	32	27	42	49	37	34	62	50			
ELL	30	40	45	70	75		25	58				
AMI												
ASN	67	63		83	69				100			
BLK	45	44	27	58	64	56	48	88	70			
HSP	44	39	34	67	58	53	48	68	76			
MUL	63	52		66	62	47	52	76	64			
PAC												
WHT	58	48	32	73	65	52	65	86	69			
FRL	46	43	29	61	61	55	52	81	61			

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	59	56	40	65	51	51	65	80	71			64
SWD	35	40	35	43	47	39	39	59	45			
ELL	19	48	53	40	71	73	27					64
AMI												
ASN	85	85		92	77		90		94			
BLK	47	53	47	50	42	36	50	71	62			
HSP	51	55	46	61	52	59	53	78	68			
MUL	71	55		61	44		65	100	73			
PAC												
WHT	61	57	34	68	53	54	69	81	71			
FRL	47	50	41	54	48	49	54	72	54			

Grade Level Data Review– State Assessments (pre-populated)
The data are raw data and include ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.
<u>The percentages shown here represent ALL students who received a score of 3 or higher on the statewide assessments</u>.

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

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
07	2023 - Spring	58%	52%	6%	47%	11%
08	2023 - Spring	51%	51%	0%	47%	4%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
07	2023 - Spring	39%	50%	-11%	48%	-9%
08	2023 - Spring	79%	70%	9%	55%	24%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	98%	68%	30%	50%	48%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	98%	53%	45%	48%	50%

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

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.

ELA Achievement was our lowest performing tested content area at 54% proficiency.
There is a noticeable decline in ELA scores as students move from 7th to 8th grade.
Overall proficiency in 7th grade - 58% 8th grade - 51%
Students with Disabilities (SWD) 7th grade - 31% 8th grade - 19%
Learning Gains 7th grade - 32% 8th grade - 30%

Contributing factors: Curriculum Complexity and instructional supports, especially for students with disabilities
Changes in teaching staff?

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

There is a noticeable decline in ELA scores as students move from 7th to 8th grade.
Overall proficiency in 7th grade - 58% 8th grade - 51%
Students with Disabilities (SWD) 7th grade - 31% 8th grade - 19%
Learning Gains 7th grade - 32% 8th grade - 30%

Contributing factors: Curriculum Complexity and instructional supports, especially for students with disabilities
Changes in teaching staff?

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.

Mathematics in grade 7 proficiency (39%) was below the state average (48%) and represents the greatest gap of our tested subject areas.
Contributing factors:
The math progression allows for all students on grade level to be placed in accelerated courses, resulting in a cohort of students who need extra supports and work on foundational skills so they may master the tested standards.
Multiple changes in teaching staff created challenges for students and disrupted the continuity and coherence of instruction throughout the school year,

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

Overall mathematics achievement increased from 70% to 76%.
Contributing factors:
The math progression allowed for students taking accelerated courses to test at a higher grade level, boosting overall proficiency.
Careful consideration of student readiness to take accelerated options in mathematics combined with highly qualified teachers with expertise in the subject area.

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

Students with disabilities need to receive strong, scaffolded instruction and interventions tailored to their specific needs.
Our students in the lower quartile also will benefit from strong, scaffolded and differentiated instruction and the ability to adhere to class sizes that would provide opportunities for teachers to provide small group individualized attention and support.

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

1. Providing teacher supports via professional development and culture building to create a strong foundation of teaching and learning, building teacher capacity and retaining quality faculty.
2. Culture building for middle school students to foster a feeling of belonging and academic ownership. When students believe in their abilities and feel connected to their school, they are more likely to engage and perform at high levels.
3. Engaging, high quality instruction for SWD/ELA. ELA skills are foundational and translate to success across content areas.
4. Engaging, high quality instruction for LQ 7th and 8th grade students in mathematics. Targeted supports for struggling math students set them up for future success in higher-level math courses and STEM fields.

Area of Focus
(Identified key Area of Focus that addresses the school's highest priority based on any/all relevant data sources)

#1. 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.

Focus on Students With Disabilities/ELA proficiency and learning gains, an identified under-performing subgroup.

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

7th grade: Move from 31% to 36%.
8th grade: Move from 19% to 36%.

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

This area of focus will be monitored via classroom walk-throughs, PLC logs, PM assessment data, and teacher formative assessment results.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Lydia Creel (lydia.creel@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.)

1. Systematic, direct-explicit instruction
Focus on SWD/ELA - Improving Adolescent Literacy: Effective Classroom and Intervention Practices
2. Implementation of the RACE strategy as a school-wide initiative https://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/Docs/PracticeGuide/adlit_pg_082608.pdf#page=22

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

(Referenced in the above researched based, linked article)Teachers should provide adolescents with direct and explicit instruction in comprehension strategies to improve students' reading comprehension; routines and procedures that readers use to help them make sense of texts. These strategies include, but are not limited to, summarizing, asking and answering questions, paraphrasing, and finding the main idea. Comprehension strategy instruction (RACE) can also include specific teacher activities that have been demonstrated to improve students' comprehension of texts. Direct and explicit teaching involves a teacher modeling and providing explanations of the specific strategies students are learning, giving guided practice and feedback, and promoting independent practice to apply the strategies. An important part of comprehension strategy instruction is the active participation of students in the comprehension process. In addition, explicit instruction involves providing a sufficient amount of support, or scaffolding, to students as they learn the strategies to ensure 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.

RACE strategy PD provided during pre-planning, across all content areas.

RACE posters are in every classroom to reinforce a common language around reading and writing and to provide students with a visual reminder and to reinforce the strategy.

Monitoring of the implementation and effectiveness of the strategy to include PM results, teacher feedback, and walk-through evidence.

Follow-up PD at the mid-year to share best practices and data- based evidence of effectiveness.

Person Responsible: Lydia Creel (lydia.creel@myoneclay.net)

By When: After PM test at Mid-year and in Spring (prior to testing).

#2. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Teacher Retention and Recruitment

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.

Positive culture and environment relates to both Teacher Retention and Recruitment and Student's self-efficacy.

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

18% of the teaching staff at LAJH are new to the campus and 12% are new to the teaching profession. The goal is to retain 80% of our new staff for reasons within our control and as a direct result of the school culture and supports provided during the school year.
Climate and culture survey results (from both students and staff) will show an increase of 10% satisfaction in the areas of sense of belonging and the importance of school.

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

Survey results and analysis of satisfaction comparisons from year to year and via feedback collected from our faculty and staff.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Lydia Creel (lydia.creel@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.)

Cultivating Collaboration through Strong Professional Learning Communities and New Teacher Talks where we meet informally, in a round table fashion, to chat about their concerns, celebrations, and challenges as first year teachers.
WEB Crew Orientation for 7th graders: Where everyone Belongs is one of our campus themes this year.
PBIS - Rewards and Recognitions that support student SEL growth, sense of belonging, and belief in themselves.

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

Cultivating Collaboration - According to several studies, isolation can push teachers to leave the profession altogether. One study mentioned in "Support, Collaborate, Retain" found that when teachers did not have access to collaborative relationships, 1 out of every 5 left the profession (https://www.recruiting.com/blog/the-best-strategies-for-increasing-teacher-retention-rates/#:NEA) The level of support that teachers receive can make a huge difference in the way they feel about their jobs. Allowing teachers to have monthly 1-on-1 meetings with administrators and/or the principal is a great way to provide these opportunities for teachers to express their opinions and concerns and hear that they are not alone.
WEB Crew and PBIS Reward and Recognition - Research proves that when PBIS is implemented properly at the secondary level, the PBIS multitiered framework results in improved student outcomes including lower school dropout rates, higher student engagement, decreased behavior problems, improved academic progression, and a sense of belonging.

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.

Weekly PLC
Monthly Teacher Talks for first year teachers
PBIS rewards and recognitions for both staff and students
Tiger Store where students may redeem their Tiger Tokens earned for demonstrating our school character values as outline by ROAR.

Person Responsible: Lydia Creel (lydia.creel@myoneclay.net)

By When: Weekly and monthly throughout the school year.

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).

LAJH has allocated an additional support facilitator to assist with implementing a push-in schedule that complements the dual certified teacher model in support of both students and teachers. All support facilitators are scheduled into classrooms based on the needs of our Students with Disabilities and we have developed new protocols designed to promote higher levels of partnership and information sharing with parents.

The push-in delivery into the general education classroom, in combination with our inclusion settings, allows for the incorporation of services into routine class activities and is delivered in real time. Assistance, additional support, and differentiated instruction is given within the context of ongoing classroom instruction with high expectations for student learning gains and performance outcomes.

Professional development is provided for all teachers and includes a focus on best practices for meeting the needs as outlined in students' IEP, 504, and ELL plans.

Additionally, our PBIS model for rewards and recognitions encourages a growth mindset and is designed to support the academic, social, emotional, and behavioral competence of our students, establishing high expectations for all.

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: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities	$0.00
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Teacher Retention and Recruitment	$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