High Springs Community School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

High Springs Community School

1015 N MAIN ST, High Springs, FL 32643

https://www.sbac.edu/highsprings

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.

High Springs Community School contributes to the improvement of self, family, community, and nation.

We are committed to the success of every student!

Provide the school's vision statement.

All stakeholders will work collaboratively to ensure the social, emotional and academic success of each HSCS student.

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
McNeill, Lynn	Principal	
BISHOP, EMERY	Assistant Principal	
Spencer, Jennifer	Assistant Principal	
Wenzell, Tana	Teacher, K-12	
Davis, Christina	Teacher, K-12	
Register, Loretta	Teacher, K-12	
Cummings, Brandy	Teacher, K-12	
Allen, Michael	Teacher, K-12	
Butts, Jessica	Teacher, K-12	
Rendek, Sarah	Teacher, K-12	
Morrison, Michelle	Teacher, K-12	
Latham, Samantha	Behavior Specialist	
Bassett, Jennifer	Teacher, K-12	
Heo, Sunny	Teacher, K-12	
Quinlivan, Kristina	Teacher, ESE	

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.

Input for school improvement is gathered throughout the year from our leadership team as well as faculty and staff members. Strategies are discussed and vetted through our grade level data chat process. This is also our mechanism for monitoring our SIP goals and strategies throughout the year.

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

Classroom walkthroughs are used to monitor effective implementation. Our leadership team along with grade level teams meet to review assessment data in order to monitor the achievement of students in meeting state standards. Revisions will be made to the school improvement plan as needed based on student progress toward goals.

Demographic Data	
2023-24 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School PK-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	30%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	46%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
2021-22 ESSA Identification	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) Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History	2021-22: A 2019-20: A 2018-19: A 2017-18: A
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	25	16	24	17	17	12	24	34	169
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	1	1	0	3	5	10	20
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	1	7	14	9	5	25	8	27	13	109
Course failure in Math	0	5	7	7	7	22	7	15	16	86
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	1	18	42	22	14	24	20	19	23	183
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	1	34	28	27	13	19	17	6	9	154
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	1	18	42	22	14	24	20	15	21	177

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	1	4	17	11	9	24	16	25	31	138

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	1	5	0	1	0	0	0	1	2	10
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	2

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	1	10	19	14	7	5	17	26	9	108
One or more suspensions	0	0	2	2	2	1	5	13	7	32
Course failure in ELA	1	11	19	12	11	7	8	36	20	125
Course failure in Math	0	6	11	12	14	6	8	23	12	92
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	3	18	17	15	21	14	88
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	2	17	17	19	15	12	82
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	2	1	1	0	3	15	21	14	57
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	1	11	14	12	23	15	22	38	25	161

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	1	9	8	3	1	0	1	1	1	25
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	1	3

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	1	10	19	14	7	5	17	26	9	108
One or more suspensions	0	0	2	2	2	1	5	13	7	32
Course failure in ELA	1	11	19	12	11	7	8	36	20	125
Course failure in Math	0	6	11	12	14	6	8	23	12	92
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	3	18	17	15	21	14	88
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	2	17	17	19	15	12	82
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	2	1	1	0	3	15	21	14	57
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	1	11	14	12	23	15	22	38	25	161

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	1	9	8	3	1	0	1	1	1	25
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	1	3

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	2022			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	63	56	57	63	65	61
ELA Learning Gains	59	53	55	59	60	59
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	48	38	46	48	46	54
Math Achievement*	68	57	55	69	58	62
Math Learning Gains	66	59	60	74	59	59
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	52	48	56	63	56	52
Science Achievement*	54	47	51	65	60	56
Social Studies Achievement*	80	69	72	88	84	78
Middle School Acceleration	67			79		
Graduation Rate						
College and Career Acceleration						
ELP Progress	67					

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	62
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	624
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	97

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
Graduation Rate	

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

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	31	Yes	1	1
ELL	49			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	43			
HSP	60			
MUL	56			
PAC				
WHT	65			
FRL	49			

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)

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	63	59	48	68	66	52	54	80	67			67
SWD	25	37	25	26	45	46	23	18				
ELL	47	46		35	50							67
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	39	46	41	42	61	47	25					
HSP	57	54	44	63	68	65	62	58	67			64
MUL	42	63	60	50	64							
PAC												

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
WHT	69	61	50	73	66	50	59	88	68			
FRL	43	52	43	49	58	47	30	61	57			

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	61	61	41	67	62	42	56	88	85			
SWD	19	34	26	30	42	31	14	44				
ELL	30			50								
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	41	51	27	41	51	38	21	73				
HSP	61	68	57	64	56	23	63	93	90			
MUL	45	50		54	42							
PAC												
WHT	65	62	44	72	67	49	61	89	89			
FRL	41	49	35	49	54	43	38	84	75			

2018-19 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 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18	ELP Progress
All Students	63	59	48	69	74	63	65	88	79			
SWD	30	43	41	30	60	54	41	53				
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	32	46	42	47	69	67	19	64				
HSP	65	63	50	65	67	57	68					
MUL	76	71		90	88							
PAC												
WHT	68	61	51	72	75	61	72	91	77			
FRL	45	54	46	54	66	61	47	76	73			

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
05	2023 - Spring	57%	53%	4%	54%	3%
07	2023 - Spring	55%	46%	9%	47%	8%
08	2023 - Spring	58%	47%	11%	47%	11%
04	2023 - Spring	57%	54%	3%	58%	-1%
06	2023 - Spring	53%	47%	6%	47%	6%
03	2023 - Spring	66%	49%	17%	50%	16%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	88%	47%	41%	54%	34%
07	2023 - Spring	*	24%	*	48%	*
03	2023 - Spring	72%	52%	20%	59%	13%
04	2023 - Spring	75%	58%	17%	61%	14%
08	2023 - Spring	80%	57%	23%	55%	25%
05	2023 - Spring	64%	54%	10%	55%	9%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	54%	44%	10%	44%	10%
05	2023 - Spring	62%	51%	11%	51%	11%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	84%	52%	32%	50%	34%

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

CIVICS						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
N/A	2023 - Spring	84%	58%	26%	66%	18%

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.

As we review our data from Spring PM 3, we see that overall proficiency in ELA is still lower than our overall proficiency in math school-wide. With the exception of 3rd grade, ELA proficiency dropped at each grade level. 60% of our students are proficient or above in ELA. For the 2021-2022 school year, 63% of our students were proficient in ELA. Although this is our lowest performance area and our area of concern, our percentage of students who were proficient at each grade level was above the state and district average.

The percentage of HSCS students with disabilities at proficiency or above in ELA is 24% based on 2021 - 2022 FSA data.

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

Grade 3 ELA 2022: 60 2023: 66
Grade 4 ELA 2022: 62 2023: 57
Grade 5 ELA 2022: 68 2023: 57
Grade 6 ELA 2022: 55 2023: 53
Grade 7 ELA 2022: 68 2023: 55
Grade 8 ELA 2022: 64 2023: 58

Grade 3 Math 2022: 58 2023: 72
Grade 4 Math 2022: 68 2023: 75
Grade 5 Math 2022: 66 2023: 64
Grade 6 Math 2022: 75 2023: 88
Grade 7 Math 2022: 73
Grade 7 and 8 Math(Pre-Algebra) 2022: 25 2023: 80
Grade 8 Algebra 1 2022: 70 2023: 84

Grade 5 Science 2022: 54 2023: 62

Grade 8 Science 2022: 55 2023: 54

Grade 7 Civics 2022: 80 2023: 84

Greatest decline - 7th grade ELA
However, the HSCS 7th grade ELA scores were the highest in the district and above the state average.

The percentage of HSCS students with disabilities who were proficient in the area of ELA is 24% based on 2021 - 2022 FSA data.

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.

Grade 3 ELA school: 66 state: 50
Grade 4 ELA school: 57 state: 58
Grade 5 ELA school: 57 state: 54
Grade 6 ELA school: 53 state: 47
Grade 7 ELA school: 55 state: 47
Grade 8 ELA school: 58 state: 47

Grade 3 Math school: 72 state: 59
Grade 4 Math school: 75 state: 61
Grade 5 Math school: 64 state: 55
Grade 6 Math school: 88 state: 54
Grade 7 Math school: N/A
Grade 7 and 8 Pre-Algebra school: 80 state: 55
Grade 8 Algebra 1 school: 84 state: 84

Grade 5 Science school: 62 state: 51
Grade 8 Science school: 54 state: 44

Grade 7 Civics school: 84 state: 67

The greatest gap is in the area of 6th grade math. 88% of the HSCS 6th graders were at or above proficiency. 54% of the 6th graders state-wide were proficient or above in math. This is a gap of 34%.

The percentage of HSCS students with disabilities who were proficient in the area of ELA is 24% based on 2021 - 2022 FSA data.

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

Grade 3 ELA 2022: 60 2023: 66
Grade 4 ELA 2022: 62 2023: 57
Grade 5 ELA 2022: 68 2023: 57
Grade 6 ELA 2022: 55 - 2023: 53
Grade 7 ELA 2022: 68 2023: 55
Grade 8 ELA 2022: 64 2023: 58

Grade 3 Math 2022: 58 2023: 72
Grade 4 Math 2022: 68 2023: 75
Grade 5 Math 2022: 66 2023: 64
Grade 6 Math 2022: 75 2023: 88
Grade 7 Math 2022: 73

Grade 7 and 8 Math(Pre-Algebra) 2022: 25 202 3: 80
Grade 8 Algebra 1 2022: 70 2023: 84

Grade 5 Science 2022: 54 2023: 62
Grade 8 Science 2022: 55 2023: 54

Grade 7 Civics 2022: 80 2023: 84

We showed overall performance above the state average and we contribute this to being purposeful in using the district adopted curriculum to teach the BEST standards.

All subgroups with the exception of students with disabilities met or exceeded the state goal of 41% proficiency in the area of ELA.

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

Attendance is an early warning system area of concern. 169 HSCS students were absent 10% or more school days during the 22-23 school year.

The highest priority for the upcoming school year is to find ways to meet the needs of SWD and lowest quartile students in the area of ELA, while continuing to press forward with the growth seen in the other areas.

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

1. Increasing overall proficiency in ELA.
2. Increasing overall proficiency in the areas of ELA and Math for students with disabilities.

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.

Less than 40% of our students with disabilities achieved proficiency in the area of ELA. For the 21-22 school year, 24% of the HSCS students with disabilities were at proficiency or above on the ELA portion of the FSA.

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

HSCS students with disabilities' proficiency level (All tested areas) will improve to the equivalent of 41% or greater on the 2024 FAST.

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

FAST testing three times per year.
DIBELS assessments (K-5)
CAPM progress monitoring assessments (adopted curriculum informal and formative assessments)
iStation assessments
Lowest-quartile SIPPS

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

[no one identified]

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

Support facilitation in grades 3-8 for both reading and math.
UFLI
SIPPS
iStation
iReady
Incorporate UDL strategies in daily instruction

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

In order to have students with disabilities be provided the least restrictive
learning environment. we will have our exceptional student education
teachers support them in the regular education classroom. This year we
have two ESE teachers supporting 3rd- 5th graders and two ESE teachers
supporting 6th - 8th graders.

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.

Quarterly review of ESE student assessment data.

Adjust level of support to include Title 1 services when needed.

90% or more of classroom walkthroughs will provide evidence of students with disabilities being instructed using research-based interventions.

Person Responsible: Lynn McNeill (mcneillm@gm.sbac.edu)

By When: August, 2023

#2. 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.

Overall ELA proficiency dropped by 3 percentage points from the 21-22 school year to the 22-23 school year. In addition, school-wide math performance is significantly higher than school-wide ELA performance. For the 21-22 school year, 24% of the HSCS students with disabilities were at proficiency or above on the ELA portion of the FSA.

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

HSCS ELA overall proficiency as measured by the 2024 state FAST assessment will increase by at least 5 percentage points in comparison to the 2023 state FAST assessment.

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

DIBELS data
Benchmark Assessments (CAPM- adopted curriculum formal and informative assessments)
iStation data
FAST data
iReady data

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

EMERY BISHOP (bishopbe@gm.sbac.edu)

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

SIPPS
UFLI
iReady
iStation

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

Each of these strategies are research-based and there is strong evidence these intervention strategies increase proficiency in the area of reading.

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.

Formulate intervention groups based on the above assessment data.
Provide evidence-based interventions daily.

90% or more of classroom walkthroughs will provide evidence of students with disabilities being instructed using research-based interventions.

Person Responsible: EMERY BISHOP (bishopbe@gm.sbac.edu)

By When: Intervention groups will begin by September 1, 2023.

#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.

HSCS is focusing on creating caring relationships for all students along with academic support and a school-wide positive behavior support system.

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

HSCS will reduce in and out of school suspensions by 10%.

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

Both the Behavior Resource Teacher and the Dean will run Skyward discipline reports monthly. These monthly discipline reports will be reviewed during Leadership Team meetings to determine course of action.
Classroom Walkthroughs

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Samantha Latham (lathamsk@gm.sbac.edu)

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

PBIS school-wide (High Flying Hawk awards, reward days)
Restorative Conferences
Insights to Behavior

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

PBIS provides positive reinforcement for appropriate behavior. Within our PBIS plan, there are tiered behavior interventions to be used in the classroom along with support from the Behavior Resource Teacher and the Dean. School-wide expectations will be shared each morning on the morning news. Faculty and staff will refer to the posted school-wide expectations while consistently using our expectation language to redirect unwanted behaviors. Expectations are posted in all classrooms and throughout campus. PBIS is research-based. PBIS focuses on the positive expectations. The consistent K-8 expectations, the positive reinforcement, and the tiered behavior interventions formulate the most powerful strategy for improving behavior and reducing suspensions.

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.

School-wide Behavior plan has been created and shared.
A PBIS team (K-5) has been formed to direct the HSCS PBIS plan.

Person Responsible: Jennifer Spencer (spencejl@gm.sbac.edu)

By When: August 10, 2023

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 principal and district (support Principal or executive director) will review the data to ensure the identified areas of focus and action steps align to school needs as the data indicates. Subgroup data will be identified in addition to overall goals. Ongoing progress will be monitored on regular intervals to ensure alignment of action steps and student needs, including identified subgroups. Subgroups will be monitored in addition to school-wide, overall group data. The Federal Grants and programs department will aid in the budget alignment processes to ensure the student needs are met.

Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE)

Area of Focus Description and Rationale
Include a description of your Area of Focus (Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA) for each grade below, how it affects student learning in literacy, and a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed. Data that should be used to determine the critical need should include, at a minimum:

- The percentage of students below Level 3 on the 2022 statewide, standardized ELA assessment. Identification criteria must include each grade that has 50 percent or more students scoring below level 3 in grades 3-5 on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.

- The percentage of students in kindergarten through grade 3, based on 2021-2022 end of year screening and progress monitoring data, who are not on track to score Level 3 or above on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.

- Other forms of data that should be considered: formative, progress monitoring and diagnostic assessment data.

Grades K-2: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

Grades 3-5: Instructional Practice specifically related to Reading/ELA

Measurable Outcomes
State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each grade below. This should be a data-based, objective outcome. Include prior year data and a measurable outcome for each of the following:

- Each grade K -3, using the coordinated screening and progress monitoring system, where 50 percent or more of the students are not on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment;

- Each grade 3-5 where 50 percent or more of its students scored below a Level 3 on the most recent statewide, standardized ELA assessment; and

- Grade 6 measurable outcomes may be included, as applicable.

Grades K-2 Measurable Outcomes

N/A

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

N/A

Monitoring

Monitoring
Describe how the school's Area(s) of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcomes. Include a description of how ongoing monitoring will impact student achievement outcomes.

N/A

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome
Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Evidence-based Practices/Programs

Description:
Describe the evidence-based practices/programs being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each grade and describe how the identified practices/programs will be monitored. The term "evidence-based" means demonstrating a statistically significant effect on improving student outcomes or other relevant outcomes as provided in 20 U.S.C. §7801(21)(A)(i). Florida's definition limits evidence-based practices/programs to only those with strong, moderate or promising levels of evidence.

- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs meet Florida's definition of evidence-based (strong, moderate or promising)?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align with the district's K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align to the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards?

N/A

Rationale:
Explain the rationale for selecting practices/programs. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting the practices/programs.

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs address the identified need?

- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

N/A

Action Steps to Implement
List the action steps that will be taken to address the school's Area(s) of Focus. To address the area of focus, identify 2 to 3 action steps and explain in detail for each of the categories below:

- Literacy Leadership

- Literacy Coaching

- Assessment

- Professional Learning

Action Step	Person Responsible for Monitoring

N/A

Title I Requirements

Schoolwide Program Plan (SWP) Requirements
This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A SWP and opts to use the SIP to satisfy the requirements of the SWP plan, as outlined in the ESSA, Public Law No. 114-95, § 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

Provide the methods for dissemination of this SIP, UniSIG budget and SWP to stakeholders (e.g., students, families, school staff and leadership and local businesses and organizations). Please articulate a plan or protocol for how this SIP and progress will be shared and disseminated and to the extent practicable, provided in a language a parent can understand. (ESSA 1114(b)(4))
List the school's webpage* where the SIP is made publicly available.

The school utilizes various methods of communication to disseminate the information within the SIP and SWP to all stakeholders. The school holds a Title 1 Annual Meeting in September before Open House where the PFEP and SWP are shared with parents. This same information is shared with faculty and staff at the September faculty meeting. The full SIP is posted on the school's website in downloadable format. It is available at the following web address: https://www.floridacims.org/districts/alachua/schools/0461. Upon completion and approval, the SIP is presented to community members and stakeholders at a School Advisory Committee (SAC) meeting and Parent Teacher Student Association meeting. Stakeholders are given the chance to provide feedback, suggestions, and questions about the SIP and PFEP. Progress is reported throughout the school year during faculty meetings and SAC meetings.

Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission, support the needs of students and keep parents informed of their child's progress.
List the school's webpage* where the school's Family Engagement Plan is made publicly available. (ESSA 1116(b-g))

The school establishes clear and open lines of communication through various channels such as newsletters, emails, social media, and a dedicated school website. Regular updates and announcements about school events, curriculum, and student activities are shared to keep parents informed and engaged.
Regular parent-teacher conferences are scheduled to provide an opportunity for parents to meet with teachers one-on-one. These conferences allow parents to discuss their child's progress, strengths, areas for improvement, and receive personalized recommendations for supporting their child's learning journey.
The school encourages parents to get involved by volunteering in school activities, joining parent-teacher associations, or participating in committees focused on specific projects or initiatives. This involvement allows parents to contribute their insights, skills, and time to enhance the school environment.
The school utilizes digital platforms and online portals to provide parents with easy access to student grades, assignments, attendance records, and other important information. This real-time transparency helps parents stay informed about their child's academic performance and progress. The Title 1 Parent and Family Engagement Plan is available on the High Springs Community School website under the Title 1 tab or at the following web address: https://www.sbac.edu/cms/lib/FL02219191/Centricity/Domain/10021/HSCP%20PFEP%202023-2024.docx.pdf.

Describe how the school plans to strengthen the academic program in the school, increase the amount and quality of learning time and help provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum. Include the Area of Focus if addressed in Part III of the SIP. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)ii))

The school's plan to strengthen the academic program, increase learning time, and provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum in reading involves a targeted approach to literacy development. Throughout the year, the school will conduct reading assessments for all students to identify their individual reading levels, strengths, and areas of improvement. This data will be utilized by teachers when implementing differentiated instructional strategies that cater to diverse reading abilities within each classroom. Teachers and support personnel provide tailored support, small-group instructions and remediation, and enrichment activities based on students' needs. Teachers will utilize the Benchmark curriculum to provide an enriched reading experience that incorporates a range of genres, authors, and reading materials. The school will create and provide a literacy-rich environment throughout the school that displays a variety of reading materials, posters, and student work to promote a culture of reading. The school will provide ongoing professional development for teachers focused on best practices in reading instruction, literacy strategies, and integrating technology to enhance reading skills. Through the Title 1 program, the school will involve parents and families in supporting reading at home by offering family events that highlight ways parents can assist their child's literacy development.

If appropriate and applicable, describe how this plan is developed in coordination and integration with other Federal, State, and local services, resources and programs, such as programs supported under ESSA, violence prevention programs, nutrition programs, housing programs, Head Start programs, adult education programs, career and technical education programs, and schools implementing CSI or TSI activities under section 1111(d). (ESSA 1114(b)(5))

N/A

Optional Component(s) of the Schoolwide Program Plan
Include descriptions for any additional strategies that will be incorporated into the plan.

Describe how the school ensures counseling, school-based mental health services, specialized support services, mentoring services, and other strategies to improve students' skills outside the academic subject areas. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(I))

N/A

Describe the preparation for and awareness of postsecondary opportunities and the workforce, which may include career and technical education programs and broadening secondary school students' access to coursework to earn postsecondary credit while still in high school. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(II))

N/A

Describe the implementation of a schoolwide tiered model to prevent and address problem behavior, and early intervening services, coordinated with similar activities and services carried out under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. 20 U.S.C. 1400 et seq. and ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(III).

N/A

Describe the professional learning and other activities for teachers, paraprofessionals, and other school personnel to improve instruction and use of data from academic assessments, and to recruit and retain effective teachers, particularly in high need subjects. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(IV))

N/A

Describe the strategies the school employs to assist preschool children in the transition from early childhood education programs to local elementary school programs. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(V))

N/A

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: Instructional Practice: ELA				$255,163.67
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2023-24
	5100		0461 - High Springs Community School	Title, I Part A		$250,167.87
			Notes: (1) IIC (1) Intervention Teacher (3) Title 1 Para-Professionals			
	5900	130	0461 - High Springs Community School	Title, I Part A		$4,995.80
			Notes: ESY IIC to review data, create groupings, design schedule for next school year. 18 days @ 6 hrs./day for $38/hour			
			0461 - High Springs Community School			$0.00

3	III.B.	Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Other				$1,000.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2023-24
	6300	5100-DIS00	0461 - High Springs Community School	General Fund		$1,000.00
			Notes: PBIS student incentives			
					Total:	$256,163.67

Budget Approval

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

Yes