
Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	9
III. Planning for Improvement	14
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	21
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	21
VI. Title I Requirements	24
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	25

Chi Chi Rodriguez Academy

3030 N MCMULLEN BOOTH RD, Clearwater, FL 33761

[no web address on file]

SIP Authority

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

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

Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)

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

Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)

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

Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

I. School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

The Chi Chi Rodriguez Academy, along with the partnership of The Chi Chi Rodriguez Youth Foundation will provide quality educational opportunities for students and their families by educating and preparing each student for college, career, and life.

Provide the school's vision statement.

100% Student Success

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
Meurer, Joshua	Academy Director	Director of the Chi Chi Rodriguez performs day to day administrator duties, oversees Title 1, and acts as the testing administrator.
Messina, Lauren		Works with students and families on an individual basis to meet counseling needs. The counselor teaches weekly counseling lessons to all grade levels, as well as creates and holds meetings pertaining to student 504 plans. The counselor assists the Director as needed and fulfills the Director role when the Director is out.

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.

- Title 1 Survey Results
- Climate Survey Results
- Educational Alternative SAC
- School Website
- School Messenger

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))

School Administration and staff will participate in monthly PLC's to review for effective implementation of benchmark-aligned instruction. Administrator walkthroughs will be conducted and will provide feedback to teachers in regard to effectively increasing student achievement.

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)	Combination School 4-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Alternative Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	Yes
2022-23 Minority Rate	50%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	100%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	Yes
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	CSI
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	Yes
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD)* Black/African American Students (BLK)* White Students (WHT)* Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)*
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	
School Improvement Rating History	2021-22: MAINTAINING 2018-19: MAINTAINING 2017-18: MAINTAINING 2016-17: MAINTAINING
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	1	1	3	6	3	14
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	3
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	3	10	13	6	7	39
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	2	13	10	7	7	39
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	2	10	9	3	6	30

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	1	3	0	8	4	16
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	2
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	2	6	5	4	6	23

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	2	1	0	2	3	8

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	1	0	1
Students retained two or more times	0	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	1	3	0	8	4	16
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	2
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	2	6	5	4	6	23

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	2	1	0	2	3	8

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	1	0	1
Students retained two or more times	0	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*	18	55	53	17	55	55	15		
ELA Learning Gains				33			31		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				27			36		
Math Achievement*	27	61	55	22	34	42	15		
Math Learning Gains				46			19		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				79			7		
Science Achievement*	15	52	52	15	57	54	27		
Social Studies Achievement*	75	69	68		57	59	67		
Middle School Acceleration		69	70		44	51			
Graduation Rate		44	74		49	50			
College and Career Acceleration		17	53		65	70			
ELP Progress		56	55		69	70			

* 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)	CSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	34
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	Yes
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	4
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	135
Total Components for the Federal Index	4
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	CSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	34

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	Yes
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	4
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	239
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
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	9	Yes	2	2
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	12	Yes	4	4
HSP				
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	30	Yes	4	2
FRL	13	Yes	4	2

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	26	Yes	1	1
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	27	Yes	3	3
HSP				

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	29	Yes	3	1
FRL	28	Yes	3	1

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	18			27			15	75				
SWD	6			12							2	
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	6			17							2	
HSP												
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	31			34			25				3	
FRL	13			21			5				3	

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	17	33	27	22	46	79	15					
SWD	14	38		8	42							
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21	ELP Progress
BLK	19	32		20	35							
HSP												
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	22	35		20	50		20					
FRL	18	35		19	48		18					

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	15	31	36	15	19	7	27	67				
SWD	14	31		7	8							
ELL	10	50		20	30							
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	20	44		15	22							
HSP	10			0								
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	16	20		19	17		31					
FRL	16	26		14	15	9	32					

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	6%	57%	-51%	54%	-48%
07	2023 - Spring	35%	48%	-13%	47%	-12%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	29%	47%	-18%	47%	-18%
04	2023 - Spring	*	58%	*	58%	*
06	2023 - Spring	6%	47%	-41%	47%	-41%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	24%	58%	-34%	54%	-30%
07	2023 - Spring	35%	36%	-1%	48%	-13%
04	2023 - Spring	*	66%	*	61%	*
08	2023 - Spring	36%	61%	-25%	55%	-19%
05	2023 - Spring	6%	61%	-55%	55%	-49%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	29%	47%	-18%	44%	-15%
05	2023 - Spring	12%	60%	-48%	51%	-39%

CIVICS						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	71%	68%	3%	66%	5%

III. Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis/Reflection
 Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources.

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

ELA and Math both had the same number of students achieving a score of level one. One of the contributing factors that continues to be a trend is the correlation between the students who scored a level one in one or more subject areas and missed more than 10% of the school days.

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

The data component that showed the greatest decline was students with two or more indicators. We feel our school lacked a strong attendance incentive program which could have been a reason that contributed to this decline.

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.

Our largest gap when compared to the state average is in ELA . To qualify for our school students must be a level one in ELA, Math, or both.

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

The data component that showed the most improvement was course failure in ELA. An action we took was hiring a part time hourly reading intervention teacher along with a strong focus on small group instruction.

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

Students being absent more than 10% of the school year and the number of students achieving a level one on ELA and Math assessments.

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

1. Student Achievement in ELA and Math
2. Student Attendance
3. Learning Gains for students in the lowest 25%

Area of Focus

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

#1. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to 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.

We are in the process of receiving recognition as a PBIS school. We will continue to complete the necessary steps to achieve our goal. We will continue to implement PBIS incentives throughout the year which will have a positive impact on our school culture and environment. As a result of our data a strong focus will be placed on attendance through PBIS.

Measurable Outcome:

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

With the implementation of PBIS our school culture will improve by showing a 20% decrease in student referrals and out of school suspensions. The amount of students missing more than 10% of the school year will decrease from 14 students to 8 students.

Monitoring:

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

Academy Director and School Counselor will collaborate with instructional staff to monitor and record the number of referrals and out of school suspensions.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Joshua Meurer (pcs.meurerj@pcsb.org)

Evidence-based Intervention:

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

The evidence-based intervention being implemented for this area of focus is Roger's Diffusion of Innovation Theory. This theory can influence adoption, implementation, and sustainability. The attributes of this theory include relative advantage, observability, compatibility, complexity, and trialability.

Chitiyo, J., & May, M. E. (2018). Factors predicting sustainability of the schoolwide positive behavior intervention support model. *Preventing School Failure*, 62(2), 94–104. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1045988X.2017.1385446>

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Adapting this theory and framework would increase our success as a PBIS school and build a stronger foundation in the years to come.

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 2 - Moderate Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

Yes

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.

Develop PBIS Guidelines For Successful and incentive activities.

Person Responsible: Joshua Meurer (pcs.meurerj@pcsb.org)

By When: Guidelines for success and PBIS activities will be in place before the end of the first quarter of the 2023-2024 school year.

Monthly average daily attendance reports in CST Meetings will be conducted and reviewed by the administrative and school based leadership team

Person Responsible: Joshua Meurer (pcs.meurerj@pcsb.org)

By When: Monthly throughout the 2023-2024 school year

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Professional Learning Communities**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

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

Holding PLC's on a bi-weekly basis to create purposeful guidelines that will support teachers in the implementation of classroom instruction. Allowing UniSIG funds to provide the opportunity for teachers to hold after hours collaborative planning sessions. Teachers would also have the opportunity to attend the BSI conference.

Measurable Outcome:

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

The outcomes from the PLC's will be measured by the teacher's instructional implementation and will be monitored by the student's increase in their test scores from PM1 to PM2.

Monitoring:

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

Instructional staff will turn in their PLC checklist and collaborative planning notes at the biweekly meeting and will be reviewed by administration. Feedback will be provided based on classroom walk through.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Joshua Meurer (pcs.meurerj@pcsb.org)

Evidence-based Intervention:

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

The evidence-based intervention being implemented for this area of focus is the implementation of Response to Intervention. This process integrates instruction, intervention, and assessment. This proactive approach will utilize differentiated instruction. This can result in a more cohesive program of instruction and will be talked about during our biweekly PLC's.

Johnson, E. S., & Smith, L. (2008). Implementation of response to intervention at middle school: Challenges and potential benefits. *Teaching Exceptional Children*, 40(3), 46–52.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Adapting this intervention and framework would provide collaborative integration, differentiated instruction for students, and provide feedback to engage learners and increase test scores.

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?

Yes

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.

Establish and incorporate collaborative planning time for middle school staff.

Person Responsible: Joshua Meurer (pcs.meurerj@pcsb.org)

By When: This planning time will be established in August of 2023 and these planning session will take place on a monthly basis throughout the 2023-2024 school year.

Using the data and strategies discussed during PLC's and collaborative planning to create effective lessons and drive instruction

Person Responsible: Joshua Meurer (pcs.meurerj@pcsb.org)

By When: These PLC's and collaborative planning sessions will begin in August of 2023 and continue on a monthly basis throughout the 2023-2024 school year.

No description entered

Person Responsible: [no one identified]

By When:

No description entered

Person Responsible: [no one identified]

By When:

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Small Group Instruction**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.

We will have our part time hourly intervention teacher provide small group instruction for all grade levels to increase academic performance within our L25 students.

Measurable Outcome:

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

The outcomes will be measured by the growth of the lower 25 students monitored by the iReady diagnostic and learning gains measured by the FAST assessments. 50% of these students will achieve learning gains on the fast assessment.

Monitoring:

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

This area of focus will be monitored by the part time hourly intervention teachers reporting monthly progress to the classroom teacher and school administration.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Joshua Meurer (pcs.meurerj@pcsb.org)

Evidence-based Intervention:

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

The evidence-based intervention being implemented is developmental models for reading interventions and introducing matching instruction. Developmental models are guides for understanding how children develop and learn. Matching instruction provides the knowledge of each child, their understanding of the material, and their learning style. Applying active responses will also increase student engagement and active participation.

Wilson, T., Nabors, D., Berg, H., Simpson, C., & Timme, K. (2012). Small-group reading instruction: Lessons from the field. *Dimensions of Early Childhood*, 40(3), 30–39.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Using these specific strategies will increase interaction and engagement in small groups, as well as tailor the lesson to the students' individual needs.

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?

Yes

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 based administration will provide guidance and feedback to ensure small group instruction and academic acceleration for students are in place.

Person Responsible: Joshua Meurer (pcs.meurerj@pcsb.org)

By When: Small group instruction with guidance and feedback sessions with administration begin in September of 2023 and continue throughout the school year on a monthly basis throughout the 2023-2024 school year.

Teachers will provide an interactive introduction to lessons and utilize collaborative study groups.

Person Responsible: Joshua Meurer (pcs.meurerj@pcsb.org)

By When: Ongoing throughout the 2023-2024 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).

we made the decision to spend money based on data. How and why did we do this. Vague answer is fine. UniSEG funds

We made the decision to spend our UniSEG funds on will review the school improvement plan

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

N/A

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

Our area of focus based on the data from the 2022-2023 FAST assessment indicates our most critical need to be in reading comprehension.

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

We will have our part time hourly intervention teacher provide small group instruction for all grade levels to increase academic performance within our L25 students.

The outcomes will be measured by the growth of the lower 25 students monitored by the iReady diagnostic and learning gains measured by the FAST assessments. 50% of these students will achieve learning gains on the fast assessment.

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.

This area of focus will be monitored by the part time hourly intervention teachers reporting monthly progress to the classroom teacher and school administration.

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Meurer, Joshua, pcs.meurerj@pcsb.org

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?

The evidence-based intervention being implemented is developmental models for reading interventions and introducing matching instruction. Developmental models are guides for understanding how children develop and learn. Matching instruction provides the knowledge of each child, their understanding of the material, and their learning style. Applying active responses will also increase student engagement and active participation.

Wilson, T., Nabors, D., Berg, H., Simpson, C., & Timme, K. (2012). Small-group reading instruction: Lessons from the field. *Dimensions of Early Childhood*, 40(3), 30–39.

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?

Using these specific strategies will increase interaction and engagement in small groups, as well as tailor the lesson to the students' individual needs.

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
School based administration will provide guidance and feedback to ensure small group instruction and academic acceleration for students are in place.	
Teachers will provide an interactive introduction to lessons and utilize collaborative study groups.	Meurer, Joshua, pcs.meurerj@pcsb.org

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 plan and protocol will be shared through the school webpage that all parents have access to. Parents also have access to a parent resource center that provides flyers and information in the office. Parents and families receive Title I and UniSEG information upon attending the annual Title I meeting. Throughout the year, flyers are sent home and pertinent information is sent through the school messenger.

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 will continue to build positive relationships through parent and family engagement nights, daily communication through student planners, and holding conferences at flexible times to meet the needs of parents. The school will continue to foster a strong relationship with the Chi Chi Youth Foundation to engage our community stakeholders.

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)

We plan on adding an additional part time hourly teacher to support our L25 students in fifth grade with ELA and Math. Our middle school staff will continue to attend district offered professional development and hold highly effective PLC’s that occur more often and have a high focus on academic progress.

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

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: Positive Culture and Environment: Other				\$1,000.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2023-24
	5100	510	2441 - Chi Chi Rodriguez Academy	UniSIG		\$1,000.00
<i>Notes: Instruction, basic/supplies: Materials and supplies supporting instructional delivery such as copies, pens, notebooks, etc.</i>						
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Professional Learning Communities				\$4,910.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2023-24
	6400	330	2441 - Chi Chi Rodriguez Academy	UniSIG		\$2,000.00
<i>Notes: Instructional staff training services/travel: Attendance by two staff members at the 2024 BSI summer conference. Estimated costs include lodging \$600 (\$200/night x 3 nights), food \$192 (\$62 x 3 days), and mileage/parking \$208. Total cost per attendee = \$1,000 x 2 attendees = \$2,000.</i>						
	6300	120	2441 - Chi Chi Rodriguez Academy	UniSIG		\$2,400.00
<i>Notes: Instruction and curriculum development services/classroom teachers: To help support professional learning communities our middle school staff will participate in collaborative planning sessions after contractual hours. This collaborative planning will allow teachers the opportunity to share student data, curriculum, and classroom strategies to create an effective learning environment. Total salary = \$2,320 (\$09/hour x 4 teachers x 2.5 hours x 11 sessions).</i>						
	6300	210	2441 - Chi Chi Rodriguez Academy	UniSIG		\$326.00
<i>Notes: Instruction and curriculum development services/retirement: Collaboration hours retirement contribution (13.57%).</i>						
	6300	220	2441 - Chi Chi Rodriguez Academy	UniSIG		\$184.00
<i>Notes: Instruction and curriculum development services/ Federal Insurance Contributions Act (FICA): Collaboration hours FICA taxes (7.65%).</i>						
3	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Small Group Instruction				\$39,547.50
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2023-24
	5100	120	2441 - Chi Chi Rodriguez Academy	UniSIG	0.72	\$21,600.00

			<i>Notes: Instruction, basic/classroom teacher. Base salary for a part time hourly (PTH) teacher providing academic support in reading and math with for elementary students. The PTH teacher will provide small group instruction and focus on supporting our L25 students. They will use curriculum from the LLI program and other evidence-based interventions. Base salary = \$21,600 (\$24 per hour x 25 hours per week x 36 weeks).</i>			
	5100	210	2441 - Chi Chi Rodriguez Academy	UniSIG	0.72	\$2,932.00
			<i>Notes: Instruction, basic/retirement: PTH teacher retirement contribution (13.57%).</i>			
	5100	220	2441 - Chi Chi Rodriguez Academy	UniSIG	0.72	\$1,653.00
			<i>Notes: Instruction, basic/Federal Insurance Contributions Act (FICA): Math ISD FICA taxes (7.65%).</i>			
	5100	640	2441 - Chi Chi Rodriguez Academy	UniSIG		\$4,545.75
			<i>Notes: Instruction, basic/Furniture, fixture and equipment. Purchase of extra student digital devices/laptops to continue to support students in classrooms.</i>			
	5100	510	2441 - Chi Chi Rodriguez Academy	UniSIG		\$5,816.75
			<i>Notes: Instruction, basic/supplies: Materials and supplies to enhance small group learning. Examples include composition books, pencils, markers, desktop printers, document cameras, toner, paper, etc.</i>			
	5100	610	2441 - Chi Chi Rodriguez Academy	UniSIG		\$3,000.00
			<i>Notes: Instruction, basic/library books: Purchase of media center books supporting students in their academic research, reading comprehension, and reading opportunities.</i>			
					Total:	\$45,457.50

Budget Approval

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

No