

Alachua County Public Schools

Kanapaha Middle School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	11
III. Planning for Improvement	16
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	25
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	0
VI. Title I Requirements	0
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

Kanapaha Middle School

5005 SW 75TH ST, Gainesville, FL 32608

<https://www.sbac.edu/kanapaha>

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.

Our mission is to maximize achievement for middle school students through a rigorous and engaging curriculum emphasizing foundational knowledge, problem-solving skills, multi-literacies, and civic dispositions. Students will achieve their annual learning gains in reading, writing, math, and science. With a high-performing faculty, robust community partnerships, and an effective Positive Behavior Support (PBS) program, we will produce responsible citizens prepared for success in high school and beyond.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Our vision is to be the premier middle school in Alachua County. We will, through an inclusive environment, with a very diverse student population, produce gains in student achievement, utilize community resources and support, and maintain a safe learning environment for all members of the school family.

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
Estes, Sherry	Principal	Serves as the head instructional leader, focusing on total school improvement, safety, and security. Oversees professional learning, teacher evaluation, data analysis, and acts as the face of the school for staff, students, families, and stakeholders.
Andino, Sara	Assistant Principal	Oversee curriculum, testing, and schedules of students.
McNichols, Austin	Assistant Principal	Assists in the duties of the school. Oversee the needs of students through Student Services - guidance and discipline.
Hart, Sara	Instructional Media	Serves as Media Specialist. She helps guides decision making from the school. Also serves on the Leadership Team.
Thomas, Ric	Dean	PBIS coordinator; serves on the Student Services team, developing safety protocols, analyzing data, and supporting Rtl for students.
Pena, Vianette	Teacher, K-12	Serves at the Team Leader for the seventh grade team and helps support teachers in the development of curriculum and discipline in the school .
Grater, Karen	Instructional Media	Serves as Media Specialist. She helps guides decision making for the school. Also serves on the Leadership team.
McDonald, Jeremy	Teacher, K-12	Serves at the Team Leader for the sixth grade team and helps support teachers in the development of curriculum and discipline in the school.
Renicks, Theresa	Teacher, K-12	Serves at the Team Leader for the seventh grade team and helps support teachers in the development of curriculum and discipline in the school.
Matrone, Kristina	Teacher, K-12	Serves at the Team Leader for the eighth grade team and helps support teachers in the development of curriculum and discipline in the school.
Brandel, Emily	Teacher, K-12	Serves at the Gifted Department Chair and CREATE contact for the school and helps support teachers in the development of curriculum and discipline in the school.
Pagliara-Suggs, Danielle	Teacher, K-12	Serves at the Team Leader for the sixth grade team and helps support teachers in the development of curriculum and discipline in the school.
Olsen, Maria	Teacher, K-12	Serves at the Math Department Chair and helps support teachers in the development of curriculum.

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Lamon, Megan	Teacher, ESE	Serves at the ESE Department Chair and helps support teachers in the development of curriculum and accommodations for students.

Gainey, Brittany	Teacher, ESE	Serves at the ESE Department Chair and helps support teachers in the development of curriculum and accommodations for students.
------------------	--------------	---

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.

Our School Advisory Council receives the plan in September and January and provides feedback. The council includes teachers, parents, school staff, business and community leaders, and a student.

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))

It is reviewed in September with our School Advisory Council and our entire school faculty. It is reviewed again in January when we review Progress Monitoring Data. At the school, we review District and State Assessment Data on a quarterly basis and will revise the plan accordingly.

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	64%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	54%
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)	Students With Disabilities (SWD)* English Language Learners (ELL) Asian Students (ASN)

(subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Black/African American Students (BLK)* Hispanic Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)*
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: B 2019-20: 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	80	117	110	307	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	47	63	45	155	
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	84	61	35	180	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	47	109	46	202	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	112	104	123	339	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	90	89	59	238	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	112	104	123	339	

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	122	133	112	367	

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	3	3
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1

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	89	83	90	262	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	30	45	37	112	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	60	82	71	213	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	50	59	67	176	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	97	90	85	272	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	102	105	95	302	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	97	90	85	272	

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	122	143	131	396

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	1	1
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	8	11

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	89	83	90	262	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	30	45	37	112	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	60	82	71	213	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	50	59	67	176	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	97	90	85	272	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	102	105	95	302	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	97	90	85	272	

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	122	143	131	396	

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	1	1
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	8	11

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	53	51	50	53		
ELA Learning Gains				48			52		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				31			35		
Math Achievement*	56	51	56	57	34	36	53		
Math Learning Gains				61			48		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				50			33		
Science Achievement*	46	46	49	46	51	53	49		
Social Studies Achievement*	65	58	68	62	54	58	64		
Middle School Acceleration	78	75	73	85	40	49	78		
Graduation Rate					45	49			
College and Career Acceleration					61	70			
ELP Progress	35	48	40	31	80	76	39		

** 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	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	331
Total Components for the Federal Index	6
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	TSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	52
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	524
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
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	23	Yes	4	4
ELL	53			
AMI				
ASN	84			
BLK	34	Yes	2	
HSP	55			
MUL	53			
PAC				

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%
WHT	74			
FRL	42			

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	27	Yes	3	3
ELL	42			
AMI				
ASN	78			
BLK	33	Yes	1	
HSP	51			
MUL	57			
PAC				
WHT	71			
FRL	40	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			56			46	65	78			35
SWD	18			21			23	31			4	
ELL	42			45			38	79	79		6	35
AMI												
ASN	79			83			80	76	100		5	
BLK	27			28			21	35	60		5	
HSP	48			53			47	67	79		6	33

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
MUL	43			53			36	73	60		5	
PAC												
WHT	70			77			59	85	80		5	
FRL	33			37			29	48	57		6	47

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	53	48	31	57	61	50	46	62	85			31
SWD	18	33	28	18	41	39	9	26				
ELL	36	47	36	49	62	56	17	47				31
AMI												
ASN	73	67		86	80		53	88	100			
BLK	22	30	26	26	41	37	14	30	71			
HSP	50	51	41	49	64	63	30	58	71			33
MUL	57	52	33	57	62	63	46	56	83			
PAC												
WHT	75	58	31	81	72	70	76	86	89			
FRL	30	36	29	33	50	49	25	37	74			

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	53	52	35	53	48	33	49	64	78			39
SWD	19	32	26	23	32	26	12	28				
ELL	28	54	56	41	45	41	14	44	50			39
AMI												
ASN	80	69		86	50		82	94	94			
BLK	26	35	28	25	30	22	28	35	61			
HSP	40	47	38	43	46	35	33	62	67			38
MUL	59	51	35	56	46	35	53	62	93			
PAC												
WHT	76	66	56	74	63	64	64	89	79			

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
FRL	33	41	30	29	34	26	26	41	60			36

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	52%	46%	6%	47%	5%
08	2023 - Spring	46%	47%	-1%	47%	-1%
06	2023 - Spring	52%	47%	5%	47%	5%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	50%	47%	3%	54%	-4%
07	2023 - Spring	26%	24%	2%	48%	-22%
08	2023 - Spring	64%	57%	7%	55%	9%

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	86%	52%	34%	50%	36%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	100%	57%	43%	48%	52%

CIVICS						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	66%	58%	8%	66%	0%

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 lowest performance is our Math Achievement, which decreased by 6%. Factors that had an affect on this is student attendance, mental health challenges, teachers entering the classroom without an educational background, and in 7th grade math our Accelerate students now test for 8th grade math.

For ELA Achievement we decreased by 3%. Factors that had an affect on this is student attendance, mental health challenges, teachers entering the classroom without an educational background, and we had three long term substitute teachers in ELA and/or reading in seventh grade.

In our ESSA subgroup for the third year in a row our SWD students scored 27% achievement. The contributing factors for this are student attendance, mental health challenges, teachers entering the classroom without an educational background, and students entering our school below grade level. For African America/Black students they are achieving 33%, which is 9 percentage points below the benchmark. The contributing factors for this are student attendance, mental health challenges, teachers entering the classroom without an educational background, and students entering our school below grade. For the FRL subgroup, 40% of students are achieving, this is 1 percentage points below the benchmark. The contributing factors for this are student attendance, mental health challenges, teachers entering the classroom without an educational background, and students entering our school below grade.

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 the previous school year is seventh grade math achievement. The overall all Achievement for Math decreased by 6% from 2021-2022. In 6th grade math we had 47% of students score a Level 3 or above, 7th grade we had 24% of students score a Level 3 or above, and in 8th grade 47% of students scored a level 3 or above. The factors that contributed to the drop in seventh grade math is student attendance, mental health challenges, and in 7th grade math our Accelerated students now test for 8th grade math.

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 had the greatest gap compared to the state average is in sixth and seventh grade Math Achievement. Factors that contributed to this gap is our SWD and African American/Black ESSA subgroups, attendance issues, mental health challenges, school readiness, and teachers coming in without an educational background.

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 our Civics Achievement. We increased the number of students achieving a Level 3 or above by 4% from 2021 - 2022. The teachers incorporate Civics360 to support standards based teaching.

Also 8th grade math achievement increased from 33% in 2021-2022 to 64% in 2022-2023. We contribute much of this increase to the seventh grade Accelerated students now taking eighth grade Pre-Algebra assessment for F.A.S.T., other factors would be the use of IXL and ALEXS by students targeting specific standards for students to make improvements in, which increases their retention of math skills.

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

Areas of concern are our ESSA subgroups of Students with Disabilities that is in their third year of being below 41% achievement and our African American/Black students who are also below the 41% achievement.

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

Priority #1 is to increase student achievement is our ESSA subgroup Students With Disabilities.

Priority #2 is to increase student achievement in our ESSA subgroup of African American/Black students.

Priority #3 is to increase our overall ELA achievement.

Priority #4 is to increase our overall math achievement.

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.

During the 22-23 school year, we had 372 suspension events leading to 753 suspension days for students in 6th through 8th grade. This equates to 225,900 lost instructional minutes. While the number of suspension events decreased by 22% from the 21-22 school year, we still feel this is a significant challenge to academic achievement due to lost instructional time.

This instructional loss most affects our students with disabilities (SWD) and black (AA) students with decreased attendance and lack of full engagement with classroom instruction. A focus on discipline and positive culture and environment will support all students but helps to target students in greatest need to making gains, moving out of the lowest quartile, and being able to reach proficiency.

Measurable Outcome:

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

For the 23-24 school year, will decrease overall suspension events by 10%, moving from 372 to 335.

Monitoring:

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

Weekly implementation will be monitored by the administration. Monthly data analysis will be created by the student services team and shared out to faculty on discipline and intervention implementation. Regular analysis will assist the school in determining areas of need for targeted interventions as well as schoolwide trends.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Austin McNichols (mcnicholsa@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.)

Working with teachers, deans, and counselors to adjust as the weeks go by to create a positive environment that bolsters caring relationships. We are implementing Habitudes behavior, social, and life-skills (BSL) instruction in weekly homeroom lessons to increase the positive culture and open communication. Administrators will be making regular circuits to visit homeroom classrooms to ensure accountability. We will also be using Insights to Behavior online professional development for teachers to help reduce referrals and foster a productive classroom environment. Insights to Behavior also assists with creation of consistent BIPs. It allows us to quickly determine the function of a student's behavior in order to implement ABA-based strategies. After the strategies are implemented, data capture and reporting tools allow teams to generate individual student progress reports. Additional systems to be used include PBIS (schoolwide) and additional trainings for teachers on MTSS framework and how to implement RtI with fidelity.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

All of the strategies selected for addressing discipline (positive culture and environment) were chosen for one or more of several reasons. These strategies are either evidence-based, a district-wide initiative, or provide instruction or interventions for teachers and students on positive school climate. These strategies also have the additional purpose of increasing instructional minutes and academic achievement.

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.

Continue implement PBIS and restorative practices so students miss less instructional time due to disciplinary issues. By increasing time in class students will have greater opportunity to be on task and have a stronger more supportive relationship with administrators, teachers and peers which will lead to increased success. Helping students to focus on positive behaviors and celebrate their accomplishments rather than mistakes will continue to improve relationships and attitude about being in school.

Person Responsible: Austin McNichols (mcnicholsa@gm.sbac.edu)

By When: regularly throughout the school year.

Restorative practices through BSL instruction will be addressed through multiple occasions. First in pre-planning and faculty meetings teacher will be introduced to ways to effectively establish social circles in their homeroom classes with topics for discussions. Ms. Andino with Mr. McNichols will lead discussions and open opportunities to be culturally sensitive and aware during these classroom lessons from Habitudes that will allow students to safely share emotional discussions that will improve classroom relationships with teachers, peers and continue to improve a culture that supports every student having a voice. Mrs. Brandel will also lead a professional development group both in the fall and spring focusing on restorative practices.

Person Responsible: Austin McNichols (mcnicholsa@gm.sbac.edu)

By When: During pre-planning week and regularly throughout the year.

Book Study for teachers. Closing the Attitude Gap: How to fire up your students to strive for success by Baruti Kafele. Teachers will be provided the opportunity to complete a book study using this title to improve relationships with students and critically analyze practices to increase positive climate within the school.

Person Responsible: Sherry Estes (estessl@gm.sbac.edu)

By When: By start of school, make the book available to teachers and implement schedule for book study PLC.

#2. 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.

The area of focus will be to increase the use of student engagement strategies in the classroom through professional learning, increase teacher knowledge of standards and aligning their teaching more closely to the standards, and we will have a book study on the book Teacher 50 by: Baruti Kafele focusing on how to inspire students of all racial and socio-economic backgrounds to strive for academic excellence.

Measurable Outcome:

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

We plan to increase Black student achievement from 33% to 42% in 2023 - 2024 school year on the F.A.S.T assessment.

Monitoring:

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

The will be monitored through the use of iReady, CommonLit, ALEXS, District Common Assessments, and state progress monitoring data.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Sara Andino (andinosm@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.)

Strategies used to meet this goal will include the use of researchbased interventions of iReady for ELA instruction, Common Lit for Advanced Readers, ALEKS for Math instruction, and Universal Design for Learning in all subject areas.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The rationale begins with the need to improve equitable practices allowing for practices that allow for practices that allow for every student to have the opportunity to make academic growth in ELA and math. There is a achievement gap found when analyzing the data for ELA and math between white students and African American students To best support all students and increase their ability to achieve students must be in school and teachers can learn motivation strategies that increase students desire to be in a school they feel welcome and comfortable in. By lessening microaggressions between peers or support restorative practices by teachers we can open discussions to allow all voices to be heard. Using a school wide approach to modeling, revisiting, revising, connecting, summarizing and applying learning students will find increased academic success and have less distractions from their academic accomplishments.

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

#3. 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.

The area of focus will be to increase the use of student engagement strategies in the classroom through professional learning, increase teacher knowledge of standards and aligning their teaching more closely to the standards, and we will have a book study on the book Teacher 50 by: Baruti Kafele focusing on how to inspire students of all racial and socio-economic backgrounds to strive for academic excellence.

Measurable Outcome:

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

We plan to increase Students With Disabilities achievement from 29% to 42% in 2023 - 2024 school year on the F.A.S.T assessment.

Monitoring:

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

The will be monitored through the use of iReady, CommonLit, ALEXS, District Common Assessments, and state progress monitoring data.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Sara Andino (andinosm@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.)

Strategies used to meet this goal will include the use of researchbased interventions of iReady for ELA instruction, Common Lit for Advanced Readers, ALEKS for Math instruction, and Universal Design for Learning in all subject areas.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The rationale begins with the need to improve equitable practices allowing for practices that allow for practices that allow for every student to have the opportunity to make academic growth in ELA and math. There is a achievement gap found when analyzing the data for ELA and math between white students and African American students To best support all students and increase their ability to achieve students must be in school and teachers can learn motivation strategies that increase students desire to be in a school they feel welcome and comfortable in. By lessening microaggressions between peers or support restorative practices by teachers we can open discussions to allow all voices to be heard. Using a school wide approach to modeling, revisiting, revising, connecting, summarizing and applying learning students will find increased academic success and have less distractions from their academic accomplishments.

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

#4. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Economically Disadvantaged**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.

The area of focus will be to increase the use of student engagement strategies in the classroom through professional learning, increase teacher knowledge of standards and aligning their teaching more closely to the standards, and we will have a book study on the book Teacher 50 by: Baruti Kafele focusing on how to inspire students of all racial and socio-economic backgrounds to strive for academic excellence.

Measurable Outcome:

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

For the ESSA subgroup of Economically Disadvantaged Students we will student achievement from 40% in the 2021-2022 school year to 42% for the 2023-2024 school year.

Monitoring:

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

The will be monitored through the use of iReady, CommonLit, ALEXS, District Common Assessments, and state progress monitoring data.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Sara Andino (andinosm@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.)

Strategies used to meet this goal will include the use of researchbased interventions of iReady for ELA instruction, Common Lit for Advanced Readers, ALEKS for Math instruction, and Universal Design for Learning in all subject areas.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The rationale begins with the need to improve equitable practices allowing for practices that allow for practices that allow for every student to have the opportunity to make academic growth in ELA and math. There is a achievement gap found when analyzing the data for ELA and math between white students and African American students To best support all students and increase their ability to achieve students must be in school and teachers can learn motivation strategies that increase students desire to be in a school they feel welcome and comfortable in. By lessening microaggressions between peers or support restorative practices by teachers we can open discussions to allow all voices to be heard. Using a school wide approach to modeling, revisiting, revising, connecting, summarizing and applying learning students will find increased academic success and have less distractions from their academic accomplishments.

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)).

For Students with Disabilities we are using our teacher allocations to provide Tier 1, 2, and 3 support in math through Varying Exceptionality classes in sixth grade along with support facilitation and Seventh and eighth grade we are providing Support Facilitation. For ELA we are using our teacher allocations to provide tier 1,2, and 3 support through the use of varying exceptionally classes for Reading in grades six and seven. Along with a Varying Exceptionally class in sixth grade Language Arts. We offer Tier 3 through High Dose tutoring to students in sixth grade using Great Leaps. Our Family Liaison works to increase family engagement to increase student attendance at school. District funding is used to implement iReady in our Intensive Reading classes.