

Bay District Schools

# Surfside Middle School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

---

## Table of Contents

---

<b>SIP Authority and Purpose</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>I. School Information</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>II. Needs Assessment/Data Review</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>III. Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>VI. Title I Requirements</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus</b>	<b>30</b>

# Surfside Middle School

300 NAUTILUS ST, Panama City Beach, FL 32413

[ 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 Surfside Middle School family's mission is to achieve 100% proficiency for all students.

**Provide the school's vision statement.**

Together with community stakeholders we are committed to provide a positive, safe, and respectful learning environment where all students can be successful.

### 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
Pitts, David	Principal	Oversees all staff members.
Carmichael, Julie	Assistant Principal	8th grade discipline, evaluates math department, Title IX, bullying, harassment, threat assessment investigator, maintenance liaison Assists the principal in the overall administration of the school and assumes leadership of the school in the absence of the principal, serves as an Instructional Leader; facilitates the work of PLCs, leads data driven discussions and planning, relates to students with mutual respect while carrying out a positive and effective discipline policy
Trimble, Ashley	Administrative Support	7th grade discipline, evaluates science department, Title IX, bullying, harassment, threat assessment investigator Assists the principal in the overall administration of the school and assumes leadership of the school in the absence of the principal, serves as an Instructional Leader; facilitates the work of PLCs, leads data driven discussions and planning, relates to students with mutual respect while carrying out a positive and effective discipline policy
Maddox, Brittany	Administrative Support	6th grade discipline, evaluates social studies and electives departments, Title IX, bullying, harassment, threat assessment investigator Assists the principal in the overall administration of the school and assumes leadership of the school in the absence of the principal, serves as an Instructional Leader; facilitates the work of PLCs, leads data driven discussions and planning, relates to students with mutual respect while carrying out a positive and effective discipline policy
Wade, Sara	Teacher, ESE	ESE coordinator responsible for planning, developing, delivering and evaluating appropriate individualized educational services, identify the needs of assigned students through formal and informal assessments, review student performance data and assessment data to develop appropriate goals and objectives for each student, collaborate with general education teachers to ensure all students receive standards based instruction.
Brady, Marica	Teacher, K-12	Science department chair Plan, prepare and deliver instructional activities to address state standards, Create positive educational climate, monitor student progress through formative and summative assessments, adjust instruction based on student need, collaborate with colleagues to plan instruction and interventions based on student data
Wright, Martha	Teacher, K-12	7th grade leader Plan, prepare and deliver instructional activities to address state standards, Create positive educational climate, monitor student progress through formative and summative assessments, adjust instruction based

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		on student need, collaborate with colleagues to plan instruction and interventions based on student data
Land, Kelly	Teacher, K-12	8th grade leader Plan, prepare and deliver instructional activities to address state standards, Create positive educational climate, monitor student progress through formative and summative assessments, adjust instruction based on student need, collaborate with colleagues to plan instruction and interventions based on student data
Grice, Stephen	Teacher, K-12	Social Studies department chair Plan, prepare and deliver instructional activities to address state standards, Create positive educational climate, monitor student progress through formative and summative assessments, adjust instruction based on student need, collaborate with colleagues to plan instruction and interventions based on student data
Meadows, Kimberly	Teacher, K-12	Language arts team lead Plan, prepare and deliver instructional activities to address state standards, Create positive educational climate, monitor student progress through formative and summative assessments, adjust instruction based on student need, collaborate with colleagues to plan instruction and interventions based on student data
Robb, Kristy	School Counselor	scheduling, testing, counseling students Consults, facilitates, and maintains communication with parents, teachers, administrators, and pertinent agents on specific student and parent academic and educational matters including academic modifications and/or accommodations, provides counseling to address social and emotional concerns and appropriately refers students to behavioral health specialists, communicates, coordinates, and collaborates with school staff in developing and implementing student supports

**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.

School leadership met with the subject area teachers in their professional learning communities (PLCs) to review data. After analyzing their data, the teams created a list of strengths and areas in need of focus. Once the focus needs were identified, the team created goals and action steps to meet the goals. The data review and action steps will be discussed at the first school advisory council (SAC) meeting to be approved by all stakeholders.



**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))

Leadership and teachers will meet regularly in their PLCs to discuss data collected from common assessments and progress monitoring tests. They will analyze the data to identify the students above, at, or below proficiency. Discussions of strategies to be utilized for improvement will be ongoing. If the students are not progressing appropriately, the PLCs and leadership will revise the action steps and present them to SAC.

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

<b>2023-24 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Combination School PK-12
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2022-23 Title I School Status</b>	No
<b>2022-23 Minority Rate</b>	36%
<b>2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b>	49%
<b>Charter School</b>	No
<b>RAISE School</b>	No
<b>ESSA Identification</b> *updated as of 3/11/2024	ATSI
<b>Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)</b>	No
<b>2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (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)
<b>School Grades History</b> *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: B 2019-20: A 2018-19: A 2017-18: A
<b>School Improvement Rating History</b>	
<b>DJJ Accountability Rating History</b>	

**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	95	76	75	246
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	24	68	72	164
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	4	10
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	4	12
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	40	46	31	117
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	59	74	46	179
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	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	0	0	14	32	13	59

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	2	1	3
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	3

**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	80	55	64	199
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	27	46	48	121
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	2	3	11
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	1	3	10
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	47	33	63	143
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	83	47	58	188
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	0

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	57	42	54	153

**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	3	6
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	3	5

**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	80	55	64	199
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	27	46	48	121
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	2	3	11
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	1	3	10
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	47	33	63	143
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	83	47	58	188
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	0

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	57	42	54	153

**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	3	6
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	3	5

**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*	55	49	53	58	52	55	60		
ELA Learning Gains				56			58		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				46			43		
Math Achievement*	62	58	55	59	35	42	59		
Math Learning Gains				60			48		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				47			45		
Science Achievement*	55	56	52	53	55	54	55		
Social Studies Achievement*	73	65	68	77	55	59	76		
Middle School Acceleration	80	70	70	73	41	51	77		
Graduation Rate		80	74		54	50			
College and Career Acceleration		49	53		69	70			
ELP Progress	41	45	55	55	69	70	38		

*\* In cases where a school does not test 95% of students in a subject, the achievement component will be different in the Federal Percent of Points Index (FPPI) than in school grades calculation.*

See [Florida School Grades, School Improvement Ratings and DJJ Accountability Ratings](#).

**ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)**

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	61
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	366
Total Components for the Federal Index	6

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
Percent Tested	97
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	58
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	584
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	99
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	37	Yes	2	
ELL	40	Yes	1	
AMI				
ASN	68			
BLK	48			
HSP	59			
MUL	65			
PAC				
WHT	66			
FRL	55			

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	40	Yes	1	
ELL	43			
AMI				
ASN	74			
BLK	41			
HSP	56			
MUL	57			
PAC				
WHT	61			
FRL	50			

**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	55			62			55	73	80			41
SWD	25			34			30	46	50		5	
ELL	36			45			30	47			5	41
AMI												
ASN	71			65							2	
BLK	44			56			20	70			4	
HSP	47			55			52	73	89		6	35
MUL	60			62			68	63	74		5	
PAC												
WHT	57			64			58	74	79		5	
FRL	44			52			47	67	67		6	54

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	58	56	46	59	60	47	53	77	73			55
SWD	31	44	34	28	49	46	26	56	43			
ELL	38	41	33	51	54	44	20	50				55
AMI												
ASN	69	50		85	92							
BLK	30	48	26	30	44	37	47	67				
HSP	53	51	39	57	56	52	44	64	85			63
MUL	48	48	33	57	65	58	53	77	76			
PAC												
WHT	62	58	54	61	61	45	56	79	71			
FRL	45	53	47	47	51	42	47	65	57			

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20	ELP Progress
All Students	60	58	43	59	48	45	55	76	77			38
SWD	29	42	34	31	43	38	32	51				
ELL	24	36	33	24	27	21		45				38
AMI												
ASN	67	70		92	60							
BLK	28	42	47	19	46	42	9	71				
HSP	46	44	24	45	51	40	50	68	93			38
MUL	55	66		67	50			81				
PAC												
WHT	64	60	45	62	48	46	58	77	77			
FRL	51	56	44	49	48	51	48	75	68			

**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	51%	48%	3%	47%	4%
08	2023 - Spring	50%	48%	2%	47%	3%
06	2023 - Spring	49%	46%	3%	47%	2%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	52%	55%	-3%	54%	-2%
07	2023 - Spring	54%	53%	1%	48%	6%
08	2023 - Spring	56%	61%	-5%	55%	1%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	52%	51%	1%	44%	8%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	95%	57%	38%	50%	45%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	100%	50%	50%	48%	52%

CIVICS						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	69%	71%	-2%	66%	3%

### 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.**

Across all grade levels ELA achievement scores were the lowest, with 6th grade ELA achievement being the lowest at 50%. We believe this is due to low attendance rates by both teachers and students. We also believe it is due to the reading gap due to lost instruction from Hurricane Michael and COVID.

**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 year was ELA achievement from 58% to 50% and Civics achievement with a decline from 77% to 69%, this is an 8% decrease in both components. We believe this is due to low attendance rates by both teachers and students. Another factor is that we had new ELA and CIVICS teachers this year.

**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.**

When comparing Surfside's achievement data to the State, the school was higher in all components. Our goal is 100% proficiency for all students, this data trend shows that we are heading in the right direction to meet our goal.

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

We dropped in all components compared to the previous school year. We plan to utilize progress monitoring of district common assessments and F.A.S.T. to gauge student knowledge and differentiate instruction based on the data from the assessments.

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

Our first area of concern is absences 10% or more. This increased by 47 from the previous school year. Our second area of concern is one or more suspensions. This increased by 43 from the previous school year.

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

Attendance of students and staff, ELA achievement, Civics EOC achievement, teacher retention and ESE proficiency

**Area of Focus**

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

**#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Social Studies**

**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.

Student achievement in social studies students will increase to 100% proficiency on the Civics EOC.

**Measurable Outcome:**

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

We will evaluate Social Studies progress monitoring data.  
We will use the district scores for the Civics EOC and the FAST scores in reading at the end of the year for our students.

**Monitoring:**

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

- 1.) We will use district mandated common summative assessments to gauge student proficiency/mastery of the social studies students standards.
- 2.) We will monitor specific ELA assessment results to determine if students are successfully building content specific background knowledge.
- 3.) We will use progress monitoring to track student proficiency.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

David Pitts (pittsdm@bay.k12.fl.us)

**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.)

We will use CRISS strategies to improve student content based literacy.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:**

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The CRISS strategies help students understand how to set their own goals for learning and through teacher modeling and guidance, students learn a variety of comprehension strategies for narrative and content texts.

**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.

- 1.) We will use ESE teacher input alongside the content specific teachers to increase student support in the classroom.
- 2.) We will emphasize reading comprehension of text through various strategies that could include, but are not limited to, summarizing a passage of text, DBQs, and answering all levels of DOK questions about the text.
- 3.) Civics teachers will share their vocabulary lists with ELA teachers so they can support learning as much as possible.

4.) Civics and US History teachers will collaborate and focus on the Bill of Rights, 13-15 Amendments, vocabulary, and the structure of the 3 branches of government.

**Person Responsible:** David Pitts (pittsdm@bay.k12.fl.us)

**By When:** May 2024

## #2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

### Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

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

ELA Achievement Levels for baseline data shows an average of 12% growth in proficiency across grade levels from PM 1 to PM 3 for an overall average of 50% by PM 3.

ELA Learning gains of students below proficiency rose an average of 14% across grade levels during the 2022-2023 SY from PM 1 to PM 3.  
(Students with Disabilities )

Upon evaluation of individual teacher data, all grade levels found a common area of focus in the category of Reading Across Genres & Vocabulary. Upon implementing the new standards, we aim to see 100% proficiency in this area for all students as we move forward using the new B.E.S.T. standards with reporting categories of Reading Prose and Poetry, Reading Informational Text, Reading Across Genres & Vocabulary, and B.E.S.T Writing.

### Measurable Outcome:

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

ELA proficiency in Reading Across Genres & Vocabulary will increase to 100% proficiency. We will use PM1, PM2, and PM3, as well as, I-Ready progress monitoring and common summative assessments to gauge student proficiency/mastery of ELA B.E.S.T standards.

### Monitoring:

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

We will use progress monitoring and common summative assessments to gauge student proficiency/ mastery of ELA B.E.S.T standards. PLC's will track data accordingly from the PM 1 and 2 and common assessments.

### Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

David Pitts (pittsdm@bay.k12.fl.us)

### 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.)

Progress monitoring data PM1, PM2, and PM3 will be used to determine student proficiency in ELA. Teachers will use the StudySync evidence-based strategies of differentiated scaffolding and extending the learning, small group instruction, CRISS strategies, the gradual release of responsibility model, and Kagan cooperative learning strategies to meet the needs of struggling students.

### Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

We defined evidence-based strategies as any school improvement strategy producing evidence to monitor or gauge progress toward our objectives. The rationale for using any strategy would be for the purpose of progress monitoring toward our stated goals.

### 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.

- 1.) Utilize triad for home visits for truancy.
- 2.) Identify lower quartile using the early warning system to provide intervention using MTSS
- 3.) Hold students accountable for their learning: parent contact, student contracts, team meetings, etc.
- 4.) Provide increase in depth and complexity for students who demonstrate mastery of the standard.
- 5.) Reteach and remediate individually and in small groups for students who do not demonstrate proficiency.
- 6.) Progress monitoring using PM1 and PM2 in grade level and ELA PLC.
- 7.) Fully understand the category of Reading Across Genres & Vocabulary
- 8.) Fully understand new testing format
- 9.) Student documentation in Focus
- 10) To build teacher capacity, ELA and Intensive Reading teachers will participate in professional development through district and school-based inservices as we implement BEST standards and StudySync curriculum. Intensive Reading teachers will meet with the IReady consultant to learn more about implementation of the curriculum.

**Person Responsible:** David Pitts (pittsdm@bay.k12.fl.us)

**By When:** May 2024

**#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science**

**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.

Science achievement levels increased by one point from 51% to 52% in the school year 2022 - 2023.

Science learning gains for Nature of Science increased by one data point, Earth and Space remained at the same level, physical science decreased by one data point, and life science decreased by one data point from spring 2022 to spring 2023.

Upon evaluation of individual teacher data, all grade levels found a common area of focus in the domain of Nature of Science. The goal is to see 100% proficiency for all students in this area.

The area of focus will be to increase integration of the Nature of Science benchmarks across grades 6-8 including interpretation of data, data tables and graphs.

Students will engage in activities that increase reading comprehension and application of content specific knowledge in the grade level content area.

**Measurable Outcome:**

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

100% of grade 8 science students at Surfside will score level 3 or above on the SSA.

**Monitoring:**

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

We will use common summative assessments to gauge student proficiency.

**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.)

Teachers will focus on Nature of Science utilizing Think pair share, Higher Order Thinking Skills, Gallery Walks, and Graphic Organizers. These are CRISS and KAGAN based strategies.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:**

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The PLC for science plans to increase achievement to reinforce the competencies within the Nature of Science to address the various learning styles of students through bell work, labs, discussion, and demonstrations. The CRISS strategies help students understand how to set their own goals for learning and through teacher modeling and guidance, students learn a variety of comprehension strategies for narrative and content texts.

**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.

- 1.) Progress monitoring at each grade level using district common assessments
- 2.) Build teacher capacity through having the district science coach mentoring individual teachers as needed and presenting strategies and critical content at PLCs
- 3.) Grade-level PLC meetings once per month to discuss data.
- 4.) Develop common bell work, labs, and demonstrations.
- 5.) Share best practices at regular PLC meetings.
6. Teachers will increase integration of the Nature of Science benchmarks across grade levels through the interpretation of data, data tables, and graphs through the use of bell work, labs, and demonstrations.

**Person Responsible:** David Pitts (pittsdm@bay.k12.fl.us)

**By When:** May 2024

**#4. 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.

The Surfside school wide math proficiency results were 54% for 6-8 math in the 2022-2023 school year. The math department’s area of focus for the 2023-2024 school year will be for all students to perform at proficiency by focusing on Algebraic and Geometric Reasoning in 6-8 Math and Algebraic Reasoning and Equations, Inequalities, and Systems in Algebra. The reason for concern is prior FSA data shows that 46% of students did not demonstrate Proficiency.

**Measurable Outcome:**

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

Surfside plans to increase the math proficiency to 100% which would exceed the District mean and state mean.

**Monitoring:**

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

Students will take common formative and summative assessments to monitor student progress and proficiency in the areas of focus. PLC’s will track data accordingly. We will also utilize FAST PM, iReady PM, and ALEKS data for monitoring.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

David Pitts (pittsdm@bay.k12.fl.us)

**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.)

We will use iReady data for the lower quartile students, compare fall and winter results for all students on the state progress monitoring to study and anticipate the 2023-2024 F.A.S.T. Assessment. Evidence-based interventions will be included in math discourse during class by using explicit instruction, multiple representations, and motivational strategies. Intensive math classes will provide positive and constructive feedback to students and our foundation classes will collaborate with the core math teachers weekly.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:**

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

We defined evidence- based strategies as any school improvement strategy producing evidence to monitor or gauge progress toward our objectives. The rationale for using any strategy would be for the purpose of progress monitoring toward our stated goal.

**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.

- 1.) Utilize triad for home visits for truancy.
- 2.) Identify lower quartile students using the early warning system to provide intervention using MTSS.
- 3.) Hold students accountable for their work; parent contact, student contracts, team meetings, ect.
- 4.) Progress monitoring for lowest quartile students using I-ready data in grade level and math PLC's.
- 5.) Reteaching/remediation/differentiation and reassess students not proficient.
- 6.) Fully implement the B.E.S.T math standards and utilize APP policies for mastery of the standards.
- 7.) Student documentation in Focus.
- 8.) All core math classes will use Aleks pie reports to monitor progress and see mastery in each course standard throughout the year.
- 9.) Evidence-based interventions will be included in math discourse during class by using explicit instruction, multiple representations, and motivational strategies. Intensive math classes will provide positive and constructive feedback to students and our foundation classes will collaborate with the core math teachers weekly.

**Person Responsible:** David Pitts (pittsdm@bay.k12.fl.us)

**By When:** May 2024

**#5. 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.

The vision of PLC's at Surfside is to build practitioner skills through the use of researched based strategies to increase learning for all students.

**Measurable Outcome:**

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

100% of our teachers will actively participate in student focused PLC. This is what helps make us the ONLY true secondary "School of Excellence."

**Monitoring:**

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

All agendas will be shared with the PLC administrator. All agendas and minutes will be housed in a shared folder with administration.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

David Pitts (pittsdm@bay.k12.fl.us)

**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.)

Professional learning communities have been at the forefront of transforming schools to improve student achievement. Effective PLCs are founded on the shared vision and values of improving learning outcomes for all students. When staff have ongoing, consistent meeting times for PLCs such that they are able to respond to students' needs in a timely manner, those responses are shown to have a greater impact in ensuring all students have equitable opportunities to learn and grow academically.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:**

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

When staff have ongoing, consistent meeting times for PLCs such that they are able to respond to students' needs in a timely manner, those responses are shown to have a greater impact in ensuring all students have equitable opportunities to learn and grow academically.

**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.

Grade level and departments will meet Thursday morning at 8:15 in the appropriate location.. During PLCs, departments will analyze district common assessment data with subject area/grade levels. Strategies will be shared by teachers who show growth.This is monitored and lead by department heads

facilitation with administrator check-ins. PLC minutes will be taken and shared to all team members. Administration will review them.

**Person Responsible:** David Pitts (pittsdm@bay.k12.fl.us)

**By When:** May 2024

**#6. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Teacher Attendance**

**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.

At Surfside, we have a total of 56 teachers. For the 2022-23 school year Surfside staff had a total of 535 days out of the classroom for sick or personal reasons and a total of 729.25 days out of the classroom for sick, personal, or TDY. This would be an average of 13 instructional days missed out of the classroom per teacher.

**Measurable Outcome:**

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

Our goal is to decrease the number of missed instructional days by 20%. This would be a decrease of 146 missed instructional days.

**Monitoring:**

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

Administration will monitor teacher absences in ASEOP monthly and track the data in a spreadsheet. We will monitor both personal/sick and TDY for each teacher.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

David Pitts (pittsdm@bay.k12.fl.us)

**Evidence-based Intervention:**

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

PBIS through monthly recognition of teachers with the lowest amount of missed instructional days.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:**

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

PBIS improves social, emotional, and academic outcomes. Positive recognition will increase morale and school culture.

**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.

- Weekly/Monthly monitoring of teacher attendance
- Reward incentives for perfect attendance
- Provide more access to district mental health resources
- TDY's will not be granted if subs aren't secured

**Person Responsible:** David Pitts (pittsdm@bay.k12.fl.us)

**By When:** Monthly

**#7. 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.

This is the first year we will have Surfside Academy, MKL satellite campus, due to this reason we don't have any data to provide an area of focus.

**Measurable Outcome:**

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

The SMS Academy will 100% enrich the lives of our students by use of the EnCore Curriculum, technology, and daily living skills

**Monitoring:**

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

IEP Goals  
EnCore

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

David Pitts (pittsdm@bay.k12.fl.us)

**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.)

Progress monitoring IEP goals and EnCore common assessments.  
Small Group Instruction

**Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:**

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

We defined evidence-based strategies as any school improvement strategy producing evidence to monitor or gauge progress toward our objectives. The rationale for using any strategy would be for the purpose of progress monitoring toward our stated goals.

**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.

- 1.) PLC meets to plan life skills (daily living) throughout the school year.
- 2.) Hold students to high expectations and make them accountable for their work.
- 3.) Identify personal IEP goals for each student
- 4.) Progress monitoring using IEP goals & EnCore Curriculum
- 5.) Fully understand the standard/domain of integration of knowledge and ideas and language and editing
- 6.) Utilize triad and district BCBA for social emotional goals and behavior plans
- 7.) Student Documentation in focus.
- 8.) Utilize new curriculum and resources

**Person Responsible:** David Pitts (pittsdm@bay.k12.fl.us)

**By When:** May 2024

- 1.) PLC meets to plan life skills (daily living) throughout the school year.
- 2.) Hold students to high expectations and make them accountable for their work.
- 3.) Identify personal IEP goals for each student
- 4.) Progress monitoring using IEP goals & EnCore Curriculum
- 5.) Fully understand the standard/domain of integration of knowledge and ideas and language and editing
- 6.) Utilize triad and district BCBA for social emotional goals and behavior plans
- 7.) Student Documentation in focus.
- 8.) Utilize new curriculum and resources

**Person Responsible:** David Pitts (pittsdm@bay.k12.fl.us)

**By When:** May 2024

- 1.) PLC meets to plan life skills (daily living) throughout the school year.
- 2.) Hold students to high expectations and make them accountable for their work.
- 3.) Identify personal IEP goals for each student
- 4.) Progress monitoring using IEP goals & EnCore Curriculum
- 5.) Fully understand the standard/domain of integration of knowledge and ideas and language and editing
- 6.) Utilize triad and district BCBA for social emotional goals and behavior plans
- 7.) Student Documentation in focus.
- 8.) Utilize new curriculum and resources

**Person Responsible:** David Pitts (pittsdm@bay.k12.fl.us)

**By When:** May 2024

- 1.) PLC meets to plan life skills (daily living) throughout the school year.
- 2.) Hold students to high expectations and make them accountable for their work.
- 3.) Identify personal IEP goals for each student
- 4.) Progress monitoring using IEP goals & EnCore Curriculum
- 5.) Fully understand the standard/domain of integration of knowledge and ideas and language and editing
- 6.) Utilize triad and district BCBA for social emotional goals and behavior plans
- 7.) Student Documentation in focus.
- 8.) Utilize new curriculum and resources

**Person Responsible:** David Pitts (pittsdm@bay.k12.fl.us)

**By When:** May 2024

## 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: Instructional Practice: Social Studies	\$0.00
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	\$0.00
3	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Science	\$0.00
4	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math	\$0.00
5	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Professional Learning Communities	\$0.00
6	III.B.	Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Teacher Attendance	\$0.00

7	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Small Group Instruction	\$0.00
<b>Total:</b>			<b>\$0.00</b>

**Budget Approval**

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

No