Fort Clarke Middle School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Fort Clarke Middle School

9301 NW 23RD AVE, Gainesville, FL 32606

https://www.sbac.edu/fortclarke

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Alachua County School Board on 10/17/2023.

SIP Authority

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

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

Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)
A school not identified for CSI or TSI, but has one or more subgroups with a Federal Index below 41%.

Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)
A school not identified as CSI that has at least one consistently underperforming subgroup with a Federal Index below 32% for three consecutive years.

Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)
A school can be identified as CSI in any of the following four ways: 1. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%; 2. Have a graduation rate at or below 67%; 3. Have a school grade of D or F; or 4. Have a Federal Index below 41% in the same subgroup(s) for 6 consecutive years.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

I. School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

We believe that it is the responsibility of the faculty and staff of Fort Clarke Middle School to promote academic and behavioral student success by providing a positive, safe, respectful, engaging, and culturally responsive learning environment.

Provide the school's vision statement.

To increase student achievement through continuous progress monitoring and feedback supports of all school-wide data.

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
Lathem, Dan	Dean	Support assistant principal of student services and teachers with proactively supporting behavioral needs.
Fairchild, Jeff	Dean	Support assistant principal of student services and teachers with proactively supporting behavioral needs.
Welch, Mary	School Counselor	Support students and staff with emotional well being and prepare school-wide systems to proactively support students.
Pettit, Shannon	School Counselor	Support students and staff with emotional well being and prepare school-wide systems to proactively support students.
Taber, Jared	Principal	Oversee all aspects of school management and leadership.
Criscione, Bessie	Assistant Principal	oversee curriculum and instruction, student services: ESE.
Hutchinson, Kessler	Assistant Principal	Oversee student services and discipline.
Parker, Trish	Teacher, ESE	ESE Department chair. Support general education teachers and case managers to ensure fidelity of ese program.
Reed, Amy	Teacher, K-12	Support reading teachers with data analysis, curriculum, and instructional planning.
Wykoff, Laura	Teacher, K-12	Math department chair, support department with data analysis and interpretation.

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.

FCMS Leadership team collaborates with all stakeholders to discuss and review data and school improvement goals. School-wide data is shared during professional learning sessions and department/team level meetings throughout the school year. Department Chairs collaborate with school leadership to identify goals and action steps. Our data and goals are shared with our Student Advisory Council (SAC) and feedback is elicited. SAC provides feedback and refinements are made accordingly.

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))

Our School Improvement Plan will be monitored regularly. After each FAST PM/AIMS assessment data will be reviewed and SIP will be reviewed and refined as necessary.

Demographic Data
Only ESSA identification and school grade history updated 3/11/2024

2023-24 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Middle School 6-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	60%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	55%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	TSI
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD)* English Language Learners (ELL) Asian Students (ASN) Black/African American Students (BLK)* Hispanic Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)*
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: C 2019-20: B 2018-19: B 2017-18: B
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	107	102	87	296
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	69	83	71	223
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	40	71	65	176
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	33	52	57	142
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	85	96	103	284
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	90	99	88	277
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	85	96	103	284

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	113	131	118	362

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	1	5	6
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	2	5

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

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	78	87	73	238
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	29	64	74	167
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	47	35	41	123
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	60	45	43	148
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	83	86	90	259
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	103	106	83	292
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	83	86	90	259

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	110	125	118	353

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	1	2	2	5
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	14	18

Prior Year (2022-23) Updated (pre-populated)

Section 3 includes data tables that are pre-populated based off information submitted in prior year's SIP.

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	78	87	73	238
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	29	64	74	167
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	47	35	41	123
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	60	45	43	148
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	83	86	90	259
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	103	106	83	292
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	83	86	90	259

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	110	125	118	353

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	1	2	2	5
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	14	18

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*	51	49	49	54	51	50	54		
ELA Learning Gains				51			52		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				37			31		
Math Achievement*	52	51	56	52	34	36	51		
Math Learning Gains				53			37		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				37			29		
Science Achievement*	47	46	49	48	51	53	48		
Social Studies Achievement*	58	58	68	59	54	58	60		
Middle School Acceleration	73	75	73	77	40	49	59		
Graduation Rate					45	49			
College and Career Acceleration					61	70			
ELP Progress	47	48	40	9	80	76			

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)	TSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	55
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	328
Total Components for the Federal Index	6
Percent Tested	97
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	TSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	48

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	477
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	97
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	19	Yes	4	4
ELL	52			
AMI				
ASN	82			
BLK	25	Yes	4	2
HSP	55			
MUL	55			
PAC				
WHT	75			
FRL	38	Yes	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	21	Yes	3	3
ELL	46			
AMI				
ASN	79			
BLK	30	Yes	3	1
HSP	57			

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
MUL	52			
PAC				
WHT	63			
FRL	35	Yes	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	51			52			47	58	73			47
SWD	17			22			11	27			4	
ELL	43			65			36	71			5	47
AMI												
ASN	74			91			63	93	90		5	
BLK	21			19			10	27	47		5	
HSP	51			56			45	71	63		6	45
MUL	53			43			57	50	71		5	
PAC												
WHT	73			73			68	83	77		5	
FRL	30			30			24	41	60		6	43

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	54	51	37	52	53	37	48	59	77			9
SWD	9	27	28	14	35	37	0	19				
ELL	53	47	45	58	61		46					9
AMI												
ASN	88	68		83	70		91	79	77			

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
2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
BLK	26	39	34	17	32	29	11	23	56			
HSP	53	51	43	56	62	57	51	56	85			
MUL	52	53	43	44	46	38	46	57	85			
PAC												
WHT	71	58	37	73	64	44	66	79	79			
FRL	32	40	32	28	40	33	24	33	51			

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
2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
All Students	54	52	31	51	37	29	48	60	59			
SWD	7	20	18	10	27	27	20	15				
ELL	35	52		48	48		27	50				
AMI												
ASN	80	68		72	52		83		64			
BLK	23	34	29	18	24	26	20	24	30			
HSP	57	57	41	54	39	25	47	64	57			
MUL	61	60	21	52	35	9	65	64	57			
PAC												
WHT	71	59	32	71	46	52	69	81	69			
FRL	28	38	27	28	27	25	27	28	33			

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
07	2023 - Spring	49%	46%	3%	47%	2%
08	2023 - Spring	47%	47%	0%	47%	0%

ELA

Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	50%	47%	3%	47%	3%

MATH

Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	43%	47%	-4%	54%	-11%
07	2023 - Spring	20%	24%	-4%	48%	-28%
08	2023 - Spring	56%	57%	-1%	55%	1%

SCIENCE

Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	45%	44%	1%	44%	1%

ALGEBRA

Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	93%	52%	41%	50%	43%

GEOMETRY

Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	97%	57%	40%	48%	49%

CIVICS

Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	57%	58%	-1%	66%	-9%

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.

The data component that showed the greatest decline from 21-22 to 22-23 was 6-8 Math achievement. Proficiency for 6-8 math in 21-22 was 52% and 40% for the 22-23 school year. A combination of new teachers, a new assessment that provided limited information to use to support teachers in informing instruction.
Student absentee percentages were higher than previous year.

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 from 21-22 to 22-23 was 6-8 Math achievement. Four math teachers in total were new to FCMS for the 22-23 school year- three of three for 6th grade. A new progress monitoring system was initiated and the data it produced did not provide teachers specific information to differentiate instruction to meet the needs of their students. IXL implementation was inconsistent.

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 data component that showed the greatest decline from 21-22 to 22-23 was 6-8 Math achievement. Four math teachers in total were new to FCMS for the 22-23 school year- three of three for 6th grade. A new progress monitoring system was initiated and the data it produced did not provide teachers specific information to differentiate instruction to meet the needs of their students. IXL implementation was inconsistent.

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

Our middle school acceleration component showed the most improvement. Middle school acceleration was at 77% for the 21-22 school year and 95% for the 22-23 school year. We focused on high expectations and accelerating learning for all students. Our math department met regularly to review quarterly assessment data to support/inform their instruction.

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

Students with 2 or more suspensions.
Absenteeism of students in all grade levels.

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

Increase 6-8 math proficiency overall and within following subgroups: African American, Economically Disadvantaged, and ESE.
Reduce the number of school suspensions.
Increase 6-8 ELA proficiency overall and within following subgroups: African American, Economically Disadvantaged, and ESE.
Increase Social Studies proficiency.
Increase attendance.

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 Black/African-American

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.

Increase proficiency of African American achievement in both ELA/Math to at least 41% proficiency.
Current Data- ELA: 20% proficient.
Current Data- Math: 23%

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

Increase proficiency of African American achievement in both ELA/Math to at least 41% proficiency.

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

Data will be reviewed regularly to support data informed decision making.
FAST Data as well as supplemental program data (iReady and IXL).

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Bessie Criscione (criscionebl@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.)

Data analysis by department as well as collaborative planning will be implemented.
Teachers will continue to utilize supplemental programs such as iReady and IXL to target specific instructional gaps.
Professional learning in the area of lesson planning- specifically, planning for learning.
Family liaison specialist will collaborate with APA to identify students who are chronically absent.

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

Regular data analysis will allow teachers to provide targeted supports and intervention as necessary.
Supplemental programs allow students to work on their instructional level but also provide teachers the ability to provide explicit instruction on grade-level standards.

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.

Analyze FAST/AIMS progress monitoring data. School leadership and department chairs will meet after each assessment to analyze data and discuss current status of reaching school improvement goals.

Person Responsible: Bessie Criscione (criscionebl@gm.sbac.edu)

By When: September/October 2023 December 2023/January 2024

Professional Learning in the area of lesson planning. Teachers will learn a planning framework that supports planning.

Person Responsible: Bessie Criscione (criscionebl@gm.sbac.edu)

By When: October 2023.

#2. 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.

Increase ELA/Math proficiency for our ESE students to 41%.
Current Data- ELA: 20%
Current Data- Math: 23%

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

Increase ELA/Math proficiency for our ESE students to 41%.

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

FAST data will be utilized as well as supplemental program data such as iReady (reading) and IXL (math).
ESE Teachers will collaborate with General Education teachers to identify accommodations and appropriate strategies to increase proficiency.
General Education teachers will consult regularly with ESE teachers/case managers to identify specific needs of students.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Bessie Criscione (criscionebl@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.)

Increased monitoring of our ESE students- to include additional collaboration amongst ESE and General Education teachers.
Increased collaboration meetings between Case Managers and General Education teachers.
Additional training provided by APC and ESE Department Chair to support ALL teachers in understanding best practices within planning- specifically UDL.

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

Additional collaboration amongst teachers will provide additional supports for students. A higher focus on planning with support teachers in intentionally planning for student needs and accommodations.

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.

FAST/AIMS assessment review after each progress monitoring assessment. APC and ESE Department Chair will collaborate to analyze and share data/next steps with staff.

Person Responsible: Trish Parker (parkerpl@gm.sbac.edu)

By When: October/November 2023. December 2023/January 2024.

Additional training provided by APC and ESE Department Chair to support ALL teachers in understanding best practices within planning- specifically UDL.

Person Responsible: Bessie Criscione (criscionebl@gm.sbac.edu)

By When: November 2023.

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

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

Increase math proficiency in grades 6-8. The data component that showed the greatest decline from 21-22 to 22-23 was 6-8 Math achievement.
Four math teachers in total were new to FCMS for the 22-23 school year- three of three for 6th grade. A new progress monitoring system was initiated and the data it produced did not provide teachers specific information to differentiate instruction to meet the needs of their students. IXL implementation was inconsistent.

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

Increase 6-8 math proficiency to 61%.

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

FAST PM 1/2 data will be closely monitored and reflected upon. Teachers will work with principal, assistant principal of curriculum, and department chair to discuss data, instruction, curriculum, gaps, next steps to inform instruction.
Assistant principal of curriculum will review FAST and supplemental program data (IXL) regularly and act on results accordingly (data chats, professional learning, coaching, etc.)

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Laura Wykoff (wykofflls@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.)

Regular progress monitoring, data chats, lesson planning support.

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

This year's FAST assessment data should yield actionable data for teachers. Teachers will review data to identify achievement deficiencies and plan accordingly. Teachers will learn a lesson planning framework that will support planning for learning and not only planning for teaching. This will increase student engagement and accountability.

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.

Review FAST progress monitoring assessment data and plan collaboratively for differentiation. Math department chair will facilitate collaborative planning amongst 6-8 grade math teachers. Teachers will be provided release time to work together to analyze data, review standards, and plan for instructional units.

Person Responsible: Bessie Criscione (criscionebl@gm.sbac.edu)

By When: At the close of FAST PM 1 (end of September/ early October 2023). At the close of FAST PM 2 (end of December/early January 2024).

Implement professional learning around the Learning-Focused lessons planning template.

Person Responsible: Bessie Criscione (criscionebl@gm.sbac.edu)

By When: October 2023.

Math teachers will participate in Learning Walks focused on high-quality math instruction. Teachers will identify look fors around a central focus area (engagement/formative assessment within the math classroom) and observe other teachers in action. Teachers will then discuss and plan collaboratively.

Person Responsible: Laura Wykoff (wykoffls@gm.sbac.edu)

By When: September/October. December/January.

#4. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Early Warning System

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.

Decrease the number of out of school suspensions of African American students.

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

Reduce the number of Out of school suspensions by 15%.

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

Early warning system data will be reviewed on a regular basis. Assistant principal of student services will work closely with deans and ESE case managers to review discipline data of our ESE students and general education students. We have a few alternatives to out of school suspension and will work with deans to implement an equitable system in which students receive restorative support.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Kessler Hutchinson (hutchikl@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.)

Regular data analysis and collaboration among school staff, implementation of River Phoenix's Restorative Practice professional learning throughout the school year.

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

Many of our students who are being suspended have experienced trauma and will need additional support. Teachers will need to understand how to identify when restorative practices are necessary and learn strategies to implement regularly.

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.

Thorough review of data from 22-23 school year and identification of high-risk students.

Person Responsible: Kessler Hutchinson (hutchikl@gm.sbac.edu)

By When: August 2023.

Implementation of initial River Phoenix training will all staff.
Continuation of professional learning throughout the school year.

Person Responsible: Jared Taber (taberjc@gm.sbac.edu)

By When: August 8th, 2023. October January March

Collaborate with school social worker and student services team to identify proactive supports for high-risk students.

Person Responsible: Kessler Hutchinson (hutchikl@gm.sbac.edu)

By When: September 2023.

#5. -- Select below -- specifically relating to

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.

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

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

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.)

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

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.

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

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.