

Nassau County School District

# West Nassau County High School



## 2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

---

## **Table of Contents**

---

<b>School Demographics</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>Title I Requirements</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>20</b>

# West Nassau County High School

1 WARRIOR DR, Callahan, FL 32011

[ no web address on file ]

## Demographics

**Principal: Dan Snyder**

Start Date for this Principal: 7/17/2012

<b>2019-20 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	High School 9-12
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2018-19 Title I School</b>	No
<b>2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	44%
<b>2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups in orange are below the federal threshold)	Black/African American Students Economically Disadvantaged Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students <b>Students With Disabilities</b> White Students
<b>School Grades History</b>	2018-19: A (63%) 2017-18: A (65%) 2016-17: B (59%) 2015-16: B (58%)
<b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>	
<b>SI Region</b>	Northeast
<b>Regional Executive Director</b>	<a href="#">Dustin Sims</a>
<b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>	
<b>Year</b>	
<b>Support Tier</b>	NOT IN DA
<b>ESSA Status</b>	TS&I
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, <a href="#">click here</a> .	

## School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Nassau County School Board.

## SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F. This plan is also a requirement for Targeted Support and Improvement (TS&I) and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CS&I) schools pursuant to 1008.33 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

To be designated as TS&I, a school must have one or more ESSA subgroup(s) with a Federal Index below 41%. This plan shall be approved by the district. There are three ways a school can be designated as CS&I:

1. have a school grade of D or F
2. have a graduation rate of 67% or lower
3. have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

For these schools, the SIP shall be approved by the district as well as the Bureau of School Improvement.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F, or a graduation rate 67% or less. Districts may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing for schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at [www.floridacims.org](http://www.floridacims.org).

## 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 Florida Department of Education 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.

---

## **Table of Contents**

---

<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>Title I Requirements</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>20</b>

# West Nassau County High School

1 WARRIOR DR, Callahan, FL 32011

[ no web address on file ]

## School Demographics

<p><b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)</p> <p>High School 9-12</p>	<p><b>2018-19 Title I School</b></p> <p>No</p>	<p><b>2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p>44%</p>
<p><b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)</p> <p>K-12 General Education</p>	<p><b>Charter School</b></p> <p>No</p>	<p><b>2018-19 Minority Rate</b> (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p>12%</p>

## School Grades History

Year Grade	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17	2015-16
	A	A	B	B

## School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Nassau County School Board.

## SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a school improvement plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F (see page 4). For schools receiving a grade of A, B, or C, the district may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE’s school improvement planning web application located at <https://www.floridacims.org>.

## 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 Florida Department of Education 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.

## Part I: School Information

### School Mission and Vision

**Provide the school's mission statement**

Our mission is to develop each student as an inspired life-long learner and problem-solver with the strength of character to serve as a productive member of society.

**Provide the school's vision statement**

West Nassau High School exists to cultivate college and career-ready life-long learners.

### School Leadership Team

**Membership**

Identify the name, email address and position title for each member of the school leadership team:

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Gaus, Curtis	Principal	
Zobel, Karen	Teacher, K-12	
Knott, Richard	Teacher, K-12	
Grant, Sherrie	Teacher, K-12	
Finley, Joyce	Teacher, K-12	
Pearce, Jimmie	Assistant Principal	
Smith, Brooke	Guidance Counselor	
Pulliam, Laura	Teacher, K-12	
McNeil, Cynthia	Teacher, ESE	
Langford, Jackie	Teacher, K-12	
Eason, William	Teacher, K-12	
Snyder, Daniel	Assistant Principal	
Bryant, Randalyn	Teacher, K-12	
McNeill, Cynthia	Instructional Media	
Higginbotham, Carrie	Teacher, K-12	

### Early Warning Systems

**Current Year**

**The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:**



Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	282	253	250	248	1033
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	27	35	36	52	150
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	3	7	3	20
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	30	36	35	104
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	53	57	24	29	163

**The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:**

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	27	24	29	94

**The number of students identified as retainees:**

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	1	1	0	6

**FTE units allocated to school (total number of teacher units)**

55

**Date this data was collected or last updated**

Monday 9/30/2019

**Prior Year - As Reported**

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

**The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:**

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

**Prior Year - Updated**

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

**The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:**

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

**Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis**

**School Data**

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school, or combination schools).

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	62%	65%	56%	66%	66%	56%
ELA Learning Gains	53%	55%	51%	59%	58%	53%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	40%	38%	42%	41%	49%	44%
Math Achievement	54%	64%	51%	57%	64%	51%
Math Learning Gains	52%	54%	48%	51%	55%	48%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	38%	52%	45%	48%	52%	45%
Science Achievement	76%	84%	68%	86%	78%	67%
Social Studies Achievement	81%	80%	73%	82%	80%	71%

<b>EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey</b>					
Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)				Total
	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	282 (0)	253 (0)	250 (0)	248 (0)	1033 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	27 (0)	35 (0)	36 (0)	52 (0)	150 (0)
One or more suspensions	7 (0)	3 (0)	7 (0)	3 (0)	20 (0)
Course failure in ELA or Math	3 (0)	30 (0)	36 (0)	35 (0)	104 (0)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	53 (0)	57 (0)	24 (0)	29 (0)	163 (0)

**Grade Level Data**

NOTE: This data is raw data and includes ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.

NOTE: 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
09	2019	60%	65%	-5%	55%	5%
	2018	65%	66%	-1%	53%	12%
Same Grade Comparison		-5%				
Cohort Comparison						
10	2019	64%	64%	0%	53%	11%
	2018	68%	64%	4%	53%	15%
Same Grade Comparison		-4%				
Cohort Comparison		-1%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	92%	84%	8%	67%	25%
2018	94%	80%	14%	65%	29%
Compare		-2%			

CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					

HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	82%	82%	0%	70%	12%
2018	81%	81%	0%	68%	13%
Compare		1%			

<b>ALGEBRA EOC</b>					
<b>Year</b>	<b>School</b>	<b>District</b>	<b>School Minus District</b>	<b>State</b>	<b>School Minus State</b>
2019	41%	74%	-33%	61%	-20%
2018	57%	77%	-20%	62%	-5%
Compare		-16%			

  

<b>GEOMETRY EOC</b>					
<b>Year</b>	<b>School</b>	<b>District</b>	<b>School Minus District</b>	<b>State</b>	<b>School Minus State</b>
2019	65%	68%	-3%	57%	8%
2018	57%	59%	-2%	56%	1%
Compare		8%			

**Subgroup Data**

<b>2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS</b>											
<b>Subgroups</b>	<b>ELA Ach.</b>	<b>ELA LG</b>	<b>ELA LG L25%</b>	<b>Math Ach.</b>	<b>Math LG</b>	<b>Math LG L25%</b>	<b>Sci Ach.</b>	<b>SS Ach.</b>	<b>MS Accel.</b>	<b>Grad Rate 2016-17</b>	<b>C &amp; C Accel 2016-17</b>
SWD	22	34	30	24	41	23	35	54		97	36
BLK	50	60		33	43			60			
HSP	78	74		47	43						
MUL	59	59		40	54						
WHT	62	51	38	57	53	36	79	82		98	72
FRL	57	47	40	49	46	30	73	79		96	66

<b>2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS</b>											
<b>Subgroups</b>	<b>ELA Ach.</b>	<b>ELA LG</b>	<b>ELA LG L25%</b>	<b>Math Ach.</b>	<b>Math LG</b>	<b>Math LG L25%</b>	<b>Sci Ach.</b>	<b>SS Ach.</b>	<b>MS Accel.</b>	<b>Grad Rate 2015-16</b>	<b>C &amp; C Accel 2015-16</b>
SWD	20	39	32	28	35	40		53		89	19
BLK	33	30									
HSP	68	69		58	50			85		100	73
MUL	67	70		59	62		70				
WHT	67	59	43	57	51	49	87	82		95	68
FRL	58	58	41	52	52	48	83	72		97	61

**ESSA Data**

This data has been updated for the 2018-19 school year as of 7/16/2019.

<b>ESSA Federal Index</b>	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	TS&I
OVERALL Federal Index - All Students	63
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	

<b>ESSA Federal Index</b>	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	627
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	100%
<b>Subgroup Data</b>	
<b>Students With Disabilities</b>	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	40
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
<b>English Language Learners</b>	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
<b>Asian Students</b>	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
<b>Black/African American Students</b>	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	49
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
<b>Hispanic Students</b>	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	61
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
<b>Multiracial Students</b>	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	53
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
<b>Native American Students</b>	
Federal Index - Native American Students	

Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	63
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	58
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

## Analysis

### Data Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources (see guide for examples for relevant data sources).

#### Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year’s low performance and discuss any trends

The 2018-2019 Algebra 1 EOC showed the lowest performance at 41%. Students entering 9th grade are not prepared for Algebra concepts due to gaps in the math skills. In addition, there was a high teacher turn-over rate in the Algebra 1A and Algebra 1B classes.

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

The 2018-2019 Algebra 1 EOC showed a 16% decline from the 2017-2018 results. High teacher turn-over rate in the Algebra 1A and Algebra 1B classes.

#### 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 2018-2019 Algebra 1 EOC showed a 20% gap as compared to the state average. Students struggle with basic math skills which makes the transition to Algebra concepts more difficult. The school experienced a high teacher turn-over in the Algebra 1A and Algebra 1B classes.

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

The 2018-2019 Geometry EOC showed an 8% improvement over the 2017-2018 scores. Increasing the time struggling students have to master difficult concepts. Teachers implemented a flipped class strategy which provided more class time for teachers to work with students in small groups and implement targeted instructional strategies.

**Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern? (see Guidance tab for additional information)**

The EWS area of most concern is the percent of students with lower than 90% attendance rate.

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

1. Performance on the Algebra 1 End of Course Assessment.
2. Performance of the lowest quartile students on the English Language Arts Assessment.
3. Performance of students with disabilities on the ESSA Federal Index.
4. Percent of students with lower than 90% attendance rate.
- 5.

**Part III: Planning for Improvement**

**Areas of Focus:**

<b>#1</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Performance on the Algebra 1 End of Course Assessment.
<b>Rationale</b>	The 2018-2019 Algebra 1 EOC dropped to 41%. Students entering 9th grade are not prepared for Algebra concepts due to gaps in the math skills. The 2018-2019 Algebra 1 EOC showed a 16% decline from the 2017-2018 results.
<b>State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve</b>	Increase student achievement on the Algebra 1 EOC to 50% by the end of the 2019-2020 school year.
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome</b>	Daniel Snyder (snyderda@nassau.k12.fl.us)
<b>Evidence-based Strategy</b>	Differentiated instruction, addressing areas of need for individual students, utilizing standards-based progress monitoring.
<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy</b>	Multi-tiered support provides the most efficient means for meeting individual student learning needs. Daily, weekly, and monthly assessments will be utilized to measure student growth. Resources include the following: classroom formative assessments of standards mastery, individual study plans on Khan Academy, teacher generated assessments (comprehension checks, project-based measures, exit tickets, etc.), remediation, enrichment, and summative assessments through iXL, Math XL, and Algebra Nation.
<b>Action Step</b>	
<b>Description</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Mathematics instructors have been provided weekly collaborative planning time, with ESE Support Facilitators to develop instructional interventions, differentiated lessons, and other tools to meet the needs of bottom quartile learners as well as students with disabilities.</li> <li>2. Through scheduling, two, three teacher teams were created, with shared planning time to create common teaching assignments, centered on addressing the needs of the lowest performing quartile of learners as well as students with disabilities.</li> <li>3. Mathematics instructors work collaboratively to develop, standards-based lessons, centered on the students' areas of need, utilizing the gradual release model, and targeted small group instruction.</li> <li>4. Provide additional instruction for level I students by adding one semester of Intensive Math prior to taking the Algebra I EOC to address the students' skill gaps.</li> <li>5. Teachers will work collaboratively to develop progress monitoring instruments, analyze data, and address continued areas of need.</li> </ol>
<b>Person Responsible</b>	Daniel Snyder (snyderda@nassau.k12.fl.us)



<b>#2</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Performance of the lowest quartile students on the English Language Arts Assessment.
<b>Rationale</b>	40% of students in the lowest quartile demonstrated learning gains on the 2019 FSA ELA. This was a 1% decrease, compared to previous year's scores, and 2% below the state average; however, bottom quartile learners were 2% above the district average.
<b>State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve</b>	Increase the percentage of lowest quartile learning gains on the FSA ELA to meet or exceed the state average of 42%.
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome</b>	Curtis Gaus (curtis.gaus@nassau.k12.fl.us)
<b>Evidence-based Strategy</b>	Differentiated instruction, addressing areas of need for individual students, utilizing standards-based progress monitoring.
<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy</b>	Multi-tiered support provides the most efficient means for meeting individual student learning needs. Daily, weekly, and monthly assessments will be utilized to measure student growth. Resources include the following: classroom formative assessments of standards mastery, individual study plans on Khan Academy, teacher generated assessments (comprehension checks, project-based measures, exit tickets, etc.), remediation, enrichment, and summative assessments through USATestPrep, Achieve3000.
<b>Action Step</b>	
<b>Description</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The English/Intensive Reading instructors will work collaboratively to develop standards-based lessons to support the learners in their identified areas areas of need, based on state and school-based assessment data.</li> <li>2. English/Intensive Reading instructors will work together, along with ESE support professionals, to develop common strategies and lessons for whole group and small group instruction.</li> <li>3. Through the PLC, instructors will work collaboratively to develop progress monitoring instruments.</li> <li>4. Instructors will work together to develop lessons that incorporate AVID WICOR strategies, as well as text-based reading activities aligned to LAFS Item Specifications.</li> <li>5. Provide professional development opportunities that support teachers in providing meaningful and differentiated lessons and activities.</li> </ol>
<b>Person Responsible</b>	Curtis Gaus (curtis.gaus@nassau.k12.fl.us)

<b>#3</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Performance of students with disabilities on ESSA Federal Index
<b>Rationale</b>	Current ESSA criteria is indicative of student performance that falls below federal guidelines
<b>State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve</b>	Outcome of 41% or greater on ESSA criteria
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome</b>	Cynthia McNeil (cynthia.mcneil@nassau.k12.fl.us)
<b>Evidence-based Strategy</b>	Differentiated instruction, including small group instruction, implementation of instructional accommodations, and ESE support facilitation within the content area classrooms.
<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy</b>	To best support individual learning needs, identified through students Individual Education Plans as well as their, standards based, local and state based assessment data.
<b>Action Step</b>	
<b>Description</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Content instructors have been provided weekly collaborative planning time, with ESE Support Facilitators to develop instructional interventions, differentiated lessons, and other tools to meet the needs students with disabilities.</li> <li>2. Professional development opportunities, through Florida Inclusion Network, centered on collaborative planning and instructional best practices for inclusive instruction, as well as subsequent observations and feedback to ensure implementation with fidelity.</li> <li>3. District level training for instructional support professionals, to aid in improving practices for supporting students with disabilities in the content area classrooms.</li> <li>4. Teachers of record work to develop IEP goals to enroll students with disabilities in courses that yield industry certification.</li> <li>5. Teachers of record will work with students to develop goals and strategies, centered on self-advocacy, goal-setting, self-determination, prioritizing, as well as time management to improve student success on federally measure outcomes.</li> </ol>
<b>Person Responsible</b>	Cynthia McNeil (cynthia.mcneil@nassau.k12.fl.us)

<b>#4</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Percent of students with lower than 90% attendance rate.
<b>Rationale</b>	There is a correlation between student attendance and academic performance; students who have significant absences are prone struggling academically. Improved student attendance will translate to improved academic performance.
<b>State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve</b>	Decrease the number of students with an absentee rate of greater than 10% by 25%.
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome</b>	Jimmie Pearce (jimmie.pearce@nassau.k12.fl.us)
<b>Evidence-based Strategy</b>	Implementation of a check-in and check-out system, to increase adult contact, for students with a high absentee rate, for data tracking and progress monitoring purposes.
<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy</b>	There is a correlation between student attendance and academic performance; students who have significant absences are prone struggling academically. Improved student attendance will translate to improved academic performance.
<b>Action Step</b>	
<b>Description</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Identify students who have a rate of absence greater than 10% of the possible days of attendance.</li> <li>2. Assign scholars with an absentee rate greater than 10% to an on-campus, adult contact/mentor for the implementation of the check-in/check-out process.</li> <li>3. Students with an absentee rate above 20% will be escalated to the second tier of the MTSS process.</li> <li>4. Identify, develop, and implement engagement strategies for students with chronic attendance issues, including enrolling them in high interest elective programs.</li> <li>5. Provide positive reinforcements for students who make measurable improvement on their attendance.</li> </ol>
<b>Person Responsible</b>	Jimmie Pearce (jimmie.pearce@nassau.k12.fl.us)

**Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities (optional)**

**After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities (see the Guidance tab for more information)**

Students will be provided with positive, on campus, adult role models/mentors. Engagement strategies will be implemented, through the MTSS process, to motivate students to improve their attendance by increasing their involvement in the program. Learners will benefit from the structure and support provided by the intervention, and will enjoy the incentives as well.

## Part V: Budget

<b>1</b>	<b>III.A.</b>	<b>Areas of Focus: Performance on the Algebra 1 End of Course Assessment.</b>	<b>\$0.00</b>
<b>2</b>	<b>III.A.</b>	<b>Areas of Focus: Performance of the lowest quartile students on the English Language Arts Assessment.</b>	<b>\$0.00</b>
<b>3</b>	<b>III.A.</b>	<b>Areas of Focus: Performance of students with disabilities on ESSA Federal Index</b>	<b>\$0.00</b>
<b>4</b>	<b>III.A.</b>	<b>Areas of Focus: Percent of students with lower than 90% attendance rate.</b>	<b>\$0.00</b>
<b>Total:</b>			<b>\$0.00</b>