

Bay District Schools

Jinks 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	26
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	26
VI. Title I Requirements	28
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	31

Jinks Middle School

600 W 11TH ST, Panama City, FL 32401

[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.

Develop well-rounded, goal-oriented, lifelong learners, and actively-engaged students while providing a safe and compassionate school family that fosters self-esteem, high expectations and respect for individual differences while in partnership with our community. (July 2023)

Provide the school's vision statement.

Seeking to teach, inspire and encourage our school community through relationship building, effective instruction, and purposeful learning. (July 2023)

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
May, Billy	Principal	Overseeing the overall mission of Jinks Middle School from visioning, planning, staffing, instructional leadership, budgeting, community relations, safety,
Rivers, Rickey	Other	Administrator in charge of PBIS, Safety, Maintenance, Conflict Resolution, Discipline
Miller, Jennifer	Instructional Coach	MTSS, Instructional Coaching
Taws, Mary Vickie	Teacher, K-12	Academics Lead
Rawson, Nancy	Behavior Specialist	PBIS and Mental Health
Marking, Jennie	Teacher, K-12	Acceleration Lead
Andrade, Ashley	Math Coach	Interventionist.
Whittaker, Keziah	Teacher, K-12	Science Lead
Swindell, Cynthia	Teacher, ESE	ASPIRE Lead and ESE Representative
Seng, Brock	Other	Media Specialist and Title I Liaison.
Floyd, Justin	Teacher, K-12	Social Studies Lead

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.

The School Leadership Team was convened for 8 days during the Summer of 2023. Data reviewed was pertinent achievement data, the climate survey, and discipline data. The climate survey mined data from the school staff and faculty, students and parents. This data was analyzed and it determined that attendance, student engagement, and student discipline were the main areas to prioritize. From there, the group devised an inservice training in concert with district initiatives that would be delivered during school based inservice. Findings were shared. Expectations were discussed. Plans were developed. The leadership of our team proved to be invaluable in the development of a plan that would feed into this school improvement plan. While the Leadership Team was the body that created the plan, it was shared with the School Advisory Council on 8-29-2023.

157 students last year missed 10% or more of their classes. This puts them in danger of failure according to school board policy.

There were more than 2200 student discipline referrals for the school year. The team determined that this is not only detrimental to the culture of the school, but is also has a negative effect on students in terms of engagement in the classroom and with the teacher. There is no substitute for an effective teacher so when a student is in the office, suspended out of school, or in the in-school suspension room, he or she is not learning.

Also based on the 21-22 Federal Index Data, one sub-group falls below the 41% proficiency sub-group. Students with Disabilities was 38% proficient and has been deficient for the past 3 years, placing Jinks Middle School into the ATSI Category.

In trying to stay ahead of the delay in data due to the migration from FSA to FAST, the team also dove into the FAST data. It is apparent that there will be gaps between Jinks and the State achievement levels. So the actions taken in terms of a complete overhaul of the School Wide Positive Behavior Support Program and in a new schedule that locks in our level 1 and level 2 learners to intervention during Critical Thinking class, will be productive for all students and not just the SWDs.

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))

Discussion of this very monitoring piece was held during school based inservice during August teacher work days. Our School Improvement Plan will be more of a playbook than a SIP. Monitoring pieces are placed in several action items (student behavior, progress monitoring) and this information is the discussion topic for our Professional Learning Communities (PLCs).

PLCs meet weekly and hot topics are progress monitoring, standards based instruction, bell to bell instruction, alignment of curriculum, instruction, and assessment, student discipline, best practices, etc.

Also the Jinks Administrative Team will conduct two differing types of walkthroughs this year. The first one is a calibration classroom walk thru. We will all enter the classroom with our eyes focusing on predetermined "look fors" that align with the SIP, discussions then will happen immediately in the hallway so the administrative team can "calibrate" what we saw with school expectations.. The other classroom walk thrus are done by a single administrator and will be more general, but still insuring that we are teaching to the standards and engaging students.

The Jinks Leadership Team (JLT) will also be involved in monitoring the fidelity of the SIP. The JLT will host discussions about data where the information is "triangulated" which will insure that we are making even more accurate decisions about planning for instruction, placement decisions for interventions, or programming.

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	Yes
2022-23 Minority Rate	66%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	100%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	ATSI
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD)* English Language Learners (ELL) 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: D 2018-19: D 2017-18: C
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	3	22	6	31
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	4
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	1	5	10
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	13	23
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	74	71	47	192
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	81	86	64	231
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
	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	5	23	14	42

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	4	6
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	5	11

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	52	58	47	157
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	84	63	65	212
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	9	2	15
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	8	3	18
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	61	33	48	142
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	87	52	50	189
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5	7	20

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	82	59	57	198

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	5	19	11	35
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	11	6	21

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	52	58	47	157
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	84	63	65	212
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	9	2	15
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	8	3	18
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	61	33	48	142
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	87	52	50	189
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5	7	20

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	82	59	57	198

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	5	19	11	35
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	11	6	21

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*	36	50	49	45	53	50	40		
ELA Learning Gains				54			49		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				56			51		
Math Achievement*	39	60	56	44	41	36	39		
Math Learning Gains				60			49		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				55			41		

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
Science Achievement*	35	52	49	37	57	53	34		
Social Studies Achievement*	53	71	68	70	60	58	57		
Middle School Acceleration	74	64	73	72	53	49	78		
Graduation Rate					50	49			
College and Career Acceleration					77	70			
ELP Progress	48	42	40	36	63	76	55		

* 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	48
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	285
Total Components for the Federal Index	6
Percent Tested	97
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	53
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	529
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	30	Yes	4	1
ELL	22	Yes	1	1
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	34	Yes	1	
HSP	45			
MUL	42			
PAC				
WHT	61			
FRL	41			

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	38	Yes	3	
ELL	44			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	47			
HSP	52			
MUL	48			
PAC				
WHT	62			
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	36			39			35	53	74			48
SWD	16			23			16	33	64		5	
ELL	10			21			14	19			5	48
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	22			25			14	38	71		5	
HSP	30			36			34	48	74		6	45
MUL	36			45				44			3	
PAC												
WHT	51			53			53	73	73		5	
FRL	30			34			27	46	72		6	37

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	45	54	56	44	60	55	37	70	72			36
SWD	25	46	59	28	50	53	19	52				9
ELL	23	54	67	30	56	56	14	58				36
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	33	50	58	27	57	50	28	63	56			
HSP	35	54	66	41	58	58	19	78	71			39
MUL	45	56	36	40	61		50					
PAC												
WHT	62	57	48	62	63	60	58	71	77			
FRL	43	53	54	41	58	55	40	66	65			22

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	40	49	51	39	49	41	34	57	78			55
SWD	12	35	47	15	26	25	3	28				42
ELL	20	49	57	17	59	74	8	41				55

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
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	31	43	52	29	36	19	18	57				
HSP	35	51	54	37	60	71	30	53				53
MUL	37	35		44	42							
PAC												
WHT	51	54	56	48	55	48	49	63	84			
FRL	40	48	54	39	49	40	30	57	76			45

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	32%	48%	-16%	47%	-15%
08	2023 - Spring	41%	48%	-7%	47%	-6%
06	2023 - Spring	24%	46%	-22%	47%	-23%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	31%	55%	-24%	54%	-23%
07	2023 - Spring	39%	53%	-14%	48%	-9%
08	2023 - Spring	28%	61%	-33%	55%	-27%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	33%	51%	-18%	44%	-11%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	85%	57%	28%	50%	35%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	95%	50%	45%	48%	47%

CIVICS						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	51%	71%	-20%	66%	-15%

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.

Based on 2021 - 2022 School Grading Data the major component that is causing Jinks to be classified as ATSI is Students with Disabilities at 38% Proficient. However, more concerning is the achievement levels posted on the 22-23 FAST Scores. Math, Reading, Civics, Science are all showing achievement levels below the District and State Average. School Math Scores compared to District in 6th, 7th, and 8th Grades respectively were -24%, -14% and -33%. Those same Math Grade levels compared to the State are as follows, again respectively: -23%, -9% and -27%. ELA Scores compared to District for 6th, 7th, and 8th Grades respectively are: -16%, -7%, and -22%. Again, the same grade level scores compared to State levels respectively are: -15%, -6%, and -23%. Civics School Scores compared to the District are -20%. School Level Civics compared to State is -15%. Final comparison is Science. The School Science Scores were -18% and -11% compared to District and State respectively. The lowest identified scoring grade level was 6th Grade ELA at 24% proficient.

Leadership change caused a total of 24 teachers to leave Jinks during this calendar year. Many new and inexperienced teachers were brought on in their place. While talented, they are inexperienced. One cause for the scores to drop. A large number of discipline referrals is also problematic. Even though out of school suspension is a last resort, the time out of class for the students was massive either by out of school, in-school, or waiting for discipline. Bottom line was the students missed far too much instruction. Finally the Remediation time was ill planned and not in the best time slot, causing a very poor use of academic time.

It should be noted that when we compared data from 20-21 with 21-22, there were many increases in proficiencies and learning gains. The School earned a grade of B. Learning gains were a major reason in

earning that high performing grade. This team feels that by examining the newer data, we simply do not have time to wait and that our efforts must be focused on the newer FAST achievement. And the fact that we will have many students who scored low in both reading and math FAST, they are prime targets for learning gains to help offset lower achievement levels.

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

Math and Reading both are near 32% proficient. Realizing that there is a difference between FAST and the FSA Math of a year ago, that drop is still troubling. The same factors of inexperienced teachers, change in tests, too much time out of class, and poorly utilized remedial time coupled with a lack of certified math teachers was a factor.

The greatest difference between School and District lies with Math. The School is -24% compared to the District in Math. Reading is -15%.

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.

Math has the greatest gap between the school and the State Average. The major factor is the lack of certified Math Teachers. 2 certified teachers last year actually taught during their planning periods to cover vacancies that were never able to be filled by certified math teachers. Interesting fact; even though these teachers volunteered for this extra pay, they both transferred.

The Gap between Jinks Middle School and the State is as follows:

6th Grade: -23%

7th Grade: -9%

8th Grade: -33%

Given the fact that overall grade level performance is below the 41% threshold, we believe that the sub-groups will also decline.

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

The greatest improvement came from the acceleration points. Rough data shows 89% proficiency for the accelerated math classes of Algebra I and Geometry. The teachers had the latitude to bring those high fliers into enrichment periods to make sure they understood the tougher mathematic concepts in the accelerated courses.

As of October 2023, new data indicates the following most improved areas:

Algebra: School 85%, District 57%, and State 50% for differences of +28% over District and +35% over State.

Geometry: School 95%, District 50%, State 48%. Differences are +45% over District and +47% over State.

These very positive numbers are due to the fact that only our strongest Math Students take Algebra and Geometry in middle school. Most students take these courses in High School. These classes are taught by certified and highly qualified teachers.

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

157 students attended less than 90% of the time. School board policy states that a student is in danger of retention if less than 160 days are attended. That is very close to the 90% threshold. That is a quarter of our students. So this data point is directly related to our desire to increase time in class (engagement).

The other concern is the fact that 212 student earned at least one suspension. Of course, suspension forces missed classroom attendance and engagement.

D/F earned in core classes indicates deficiencies in a variety of areas which could be a result of missed instructiona time. It could also indicate a lack of compliance to individual educational plans, a poor level of fidelity implementing core curriculum / interventions, and even a lack of experienced instructors.

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

1. Common Planning for Content Areas to: increase the effectiveness of PLCs; build collegiality among teachers and increase their collective efficacy; increase time to work on alignment, planning, and assessment to standards; plan together for common board configuration; increase time for data analysis and planning; create time for professional development, i.e., small group instruction, and development / discussion of PBIS.
2. Improve CHAMP (Critical Thinking) Class. Schedule all level 1 and 2 students into remedial CHAMP classes and utilize I-Ready as a main curriculum. CHAMP will focus more on extended time on the program and the remedial class teachers will pull small groups together based on I-READY reports. Students will not schedule out their assigned CHAMP class without a triangulation of data that indicates proficiency.
3. Develop partnerships with mentors and business partners to foster positive relationships and motivation for students.
4. Expand PBIS to enhance teacher ability to manage classroom a wider variety of incidents thus keeping the student in the classroom rather than sending them out for referral, in-school suspension or out of school suspension. Explore and develop tools for classroom management based on Kagan's Win/Win Discipline.
5. Increase access to technology at school by purchasing chromebooks and carts.

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 Early Warning System

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

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

Student Discipline: An upswing from 1500 to 2200 discipline referrals from the 21-22 to the 22-23 school years occurred. Not only does excessive referrals damage the climate, it keeps students from being academically engaged. Additionally, Students With Disabilities are often over represented in suspensions compared to their non-disabled peers.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Office referrals will be reduced by 30% for the school year 2023-2024, including Students With Disabilities.

Monitoring:

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

Dr. Rickey Rivers will pull monthly discipline reports and report to the Leadership Team for monitoring. Specific interventions will be created for specific problem behaviors, i.e., zero referrals in the lunchroom will earn outside time after lunch. Individually, a student may be connected with a mentor for Check In Check Out.

Additionally, MTSS-B Data Chats will be conducted on a monthly basis.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Rickey Rivers (riverrd@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.)

Positive Behavior Intervention and Support is a program that basically teaches expectations to students in a variety of settings that will help them be more productive in the school and the classroom. It is a program to define, reward, and consequent behaviors for all students, including SWDs. John Hattie measures a student's ability to control his or her self as an above average influence on achievement (0.66) Additionally, teacher collective efficacy will improve due to better classroom management (Hattie 1.34).

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

More time on task. More time with confident and effective teachers. More focus. More productive struggle. More problem solving and critical thinking. All of these are benefits of simply being in class and being in control of one's behavior. Well managed classrooms will increase this desired engagement.

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.

Update PBIS Expectations. Use CHAMP Class for the first 2 weeks of school to teach and practice the expectations and explain how compliance with the program pays off intrinsically and with rewards. The Jinks PBIS program was developed this past July by the leadership team and is known as STING. It was shared during School Based Inservice in August before the first day of school.

Win/Win Discipline was introduced during Pre-School Inservice. PLCs will choose differing strategies to implement and report back out to full faculty.

Interest surveys will be administered to students to find meaningful rewards for compliance to school wide expectations.

Person Responsible: Rickey Rivers (riverrd@bay.k12.fl.us)

By When: End of August, but program is year long.

PBIS PLC will develop various incentives for students that can be purchased with STING Bucks.

Person Responsible: Rickey Rivers (riverrd@bay.k12.fl.us)

By When: September 15 2023 and on going.

PBIS PLC will review discipline data on a monthly basis and report out to Leadership Team and faculty. Work with principal to determine share date and method. Analysis of student, infraction, location, time of day will also be studies.

Person Responsible: Rickey Rivers (riverrd@bay.k12.fl.us)

By When: Pull data for end of the month and discuss at the next available PLC Day.

#2. ESSA Subgroup 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.

The Federal Index for 2021-2022 (most recent) shows that our Students with Disabilities (SWDs) scored 38% proficient where the target is 41%. This is the 3rd year in a row that this sub-group has been below the threshold.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Students with Disabilities will show learning gains on the applicable achievement tests (FAST or FSAA). Since this is the first year (23-24) that learning gains can be computed for FAST, these scores from 22-23 will be baseline. 50% of our SWDs will show learning gains on the appropriate assessments.

Monitoring:

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

Data Chats with teachers will occur during PLCs and with the Leadership Team to monitor FAST PM1 and FAST PM2, I-READY, Common Assessments, and classroom grades.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Billy May (maybs@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.)

Response to intervention: SWDs in mainstream or inclusive classrooms should be exposed to Tier 1 instruction with the entire class. Students not mastering at the Tier 1 level are then targeted for Tier 2 instruction that would be a more intensive, individualized or small group strategy, and without progress then moved to the most intensive level of intervention, Tier 3.

Establish a resource room where SWDs can receive more intensive instruction in a smaller class size on an as needed basis.

Push in certified ESE teacher to regular education classrooms to support SWDs in least restrictive environment.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

RTI has a very positive effect size (0.73) based on 180 studies and over 21,000 students.

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.

PLCs monitor student data for FAST PM 1 and PM2, I-READY, Common Assessments, and grades. Best practices discussed and put into action based on these discussions.

Person Responsible: Billy May (maybs@bay.k12.fl.us)

By When: PLC minutes will be reported within 2 weeks of the assessments.

Fidelity of Critical Thinking Class (CHAMP Time). SWDs in inclusion and mainstream classes who scored level 1 on FAST are assigned a permanent CHAMP teacher where extended time on I-Ready is administered. Reports will be monitored monthly to insure increased time on task is being obtained. Data from IREADY reports should then be utilized by Math Foundations Teachers and Reading Intervention Teachers for small group and individualized instruction.

Person Responsible: Jennifer Miller (millerjr@bay.k12.fl.us)

By When: When first data reported from FAST and I-Ready, the cycle can begin. This assessment window for PM1 opens during the month of August.

Compliance with Individual Education Plans, 504 Plans, English Language Learner Plans, Positive Behavior Intervention Plans.

Person Responsible: Billy May (maybs@bay.k12.fl.us)

By When: Immediately and Ongoing

Provide Student Plans to Teachers. Train teachers how to navigate the new FOCUS Platform that includes individualized student plans. Provide a list of student plans to faculty quarterly.

Ensure that plans are followed and that proper documentation is occurring.

Person Responsible: Billy May (maybs@bay.k12.fl.us)

By When: September 30, 2023. Then quarterly updates.

#3. 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.

FAST PM3 Reading data for 2023 proved to be below State Averages:

8th Grade 41% Proficient, State 47%

7th Grade 32% Proficient State 47%

6th Grade 23% Proficient State 47%

Measurable Outcome:

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

Student Proficiency Scores for each Grade level will improve by 10% in each Grade Level for the 2024 FAST PM3.

Monitoring:

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

FAST PM 1 and FAST PM 2, I-READY Beginning and Mid Year, Classroom Grades, and Common Assessments will all be used to track improvement and direct instruction on skill deficiencies.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jennifer Miller (millerjr@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.)

Increased time on Task: Students are assigned into Critical Thinking classes according to the FAST PM3 ELA scores. They will have an additional 30 minutes per day on the I-Ready Program with the CHAMP Teacher. This information will be used by the Reading Teachers for planning and small group instruction.

Ensure fidelity with implementation of Reading Curriculum and Pacing Guide.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

I'Ready has been the program of choice for level 1 and 2 students in Bay District Schools. It is available already. Teachers and students are familiar with the program. The reports given allow teachers to plan for individual instruction. Hattie quotes an effect size of 0.60 for technology used for students with learning needs, which is a better than average effect. 125 studies and over 16,000 students in the studies.

Also, efficient time on task instruction that follows pacing guides and ELA curriculum for Tier I students.

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.

I-Ready Training for all intensive reading teachers. Pulling IREADY lessons for CHAMP time that will support weaknesses shown by the IREADY reports.

Schedule professional development sessions ensure fidelity with programs being used (IREADY), Pacing, and Curriculum with District ELA Leaders. (Tracy Rogers).

Person Responsible: Jennifer Miller (millerjr@bay.k12.fl.us)

By When: Two times this year: September and January.

Professional development for teachers to utilize small group instruction.

Person Responsible: Jennifer Miller (millerjr@bay.k12.fl.us)

By When: After initial I-Ready Training in September, but before the October 31, 2023

#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.

Math FAST Proficiency Scores for PM3 are below the State Average:

8th Grade: 29% State Avg: 55%
 7th Grade 38% State Avg: 48%
 6th Grade 31% State Avg: 55%

Measurable Outcome:

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

Each Grade Level will increase the FAST Math PM3 Proficiency Scores by 10%.

Monitoring:

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

FAST Math PM 1 and PM 2, I-READY Beginning and Mid Year Assessments, Classroom Grades, and Common Assessments.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Ashley Andrade (andraam1@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.)

More time on task, specifically I-READY Math for Level 1 and Level 2 Students. They will get this extra time during Critical Thinking class (CHAMP). The reports generated from these extra sessions will be shared with the student's Math Foundations teacher to direct instruction and remediate weaknesses in small groups.

Develop CHAMP Activities that will improve performance according to identified weaknesses from IREADY reports.

Implement Math curriculum and pacing guide with fidelity.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

I-Ready has been the program of choice for remediation in Bay District Schools for Level 1 and Level 2 students. It is available and both students and many teachers are familiar with the program. Additionally, Hattie scores the effect size for technology programs for students with learning needs at 0.60, which is a better than average effect.

Implement with fidelity Math Curriculum and Pacing Guide to improve time on task.

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.

I-Ready Training already scheduled for September 2023 and January 2024.

PLC training on Curriculum and Pacing with District Leads (Allison Gilliland and Keith Barnes)

Person Responsible: Ashley Andrade (andraam1@bay.k12.fl.us)

By When: 2 sessions completed by January 2024.

Professional Development in the use of data from various assessments to direct small group instruction.

Person Responsible: Ashley Andrade (andraam1@bay.k12.fl.us)

By When: October 31,2023

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).

To date the funding for school improvement have discussed with the Leadership Team and under the guidance of some district level personnel. At the district, Eugenia Robinson our Title I Director. Jim Loyed is our Chief Financial Officer. Three main sources of funding are from the District; the Title I Budget, the School Budget, and teacher allocations. The ideas for purchasing were approved by the leadership team and the proper district officials. All budgets are monitored and updated bi-weekly. The Leadership Team recommends an expenditure and it goes through an approval process with District Review. Changes to budgets and the Plan are made immediately.

Changed IEP Management Model from several case managers to one manager, autism teachers managing their own IEPs, and SLP managing here own IEPs. This created more open sections in the master schedule to reduce the class size. (Combination of Title I and Unit Allocaton)

Created Common Planning for all Core Teachers. This enables more time for data review, professional development, peer interactions which are invaluable for new teachers, planning and pacing. (Unit Allocation)

Leadership Team met for 8 days this summer to plan PBIS. (Combination of School and Title I budgets).

Purchased additional chromebooks (75) and chromebook carts (3) to assist in technology being accessible to all and to speed standardized testing. (Title I)

4 intervention teachers. 1 classroom teacher. 1 ESE teacher. (Combination Title I and Unit Allocation.)

Purchased Win Win Discipline books (20). (School Budget)

PBIS teaching materials, banners, posters. (School Budget)

Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE)

Area of Focus Description and Rationale

Include a description of your Area of Focus (Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA) for each grade below, how it affects student learning in literacy, and a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed. Data that should be used to determine the critical need should include, at a minimum:

- The percentage of students below Level 3 on the 2022 statewide, standardized ELA assessment. Identification criteria must include each grade that has 50 percent or more students scoring below level 3 in grades 3-5 on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.
- The percentage of students in kindergarten through grade 3, based on 2021-2022 end of year screening and progress monitoring data, who are not on track to score Level 3 or above on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.
- Other forms of data that should be considered: formative, progress monitoring and diagnostic assessment data.

Grades K-2: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

N/A

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

N/A

Measurable Outcomes

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each grade below. This should be a data-based, objective outcome. Include prior year data and a measurable outcome for each of the following:

- Each grade K -3, using the coordinated screening and progress monitoring system, where 50 percent or more of the students are not on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment;
- Each grade 3-5 where 50 percent or more of its students scored below a Level 3 on the most recent statewide, standardized ELA assessment; and
- Grade 6 measurable outcomes may be included, as applicable.

Grades K-2 Measurable Outcomes

N/A

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

N/A

Monitoring

Monitoring

Describe how the school’s Area(s) of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcomes. Include a description of how ongoing monitoring will impact student achievement outcomes.

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Evidence-based Practices/Programs

Description:

Describe the evidence-based practices/programs being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each grade and describe how the identified practices/programs will be monitored. The term “evidence-based” means demonstrating a statistically significant effect on improving student outcomes or other relevant outcomes as provided in 20 U.S.C. §7801(21)(A)(i). Florida’s definition limits evidence-based practices/programs to only those with strong, moderate or promising levels of evidence.

- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs meet Florida’s definition of evidence-based (strong, moderate or promising)?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align with the district’s K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align to the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards?

Rationale:

Explain the rationale for selecting practices/programs. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting the practices/programs.

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs address the identified need?
- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken to address the school’s Area(s) of Focus. To address the area of focus, identify 2 to 3 action steps and explain in detail for each of the categories below:

- Literacy Leadership
- Literacy Coaching
- Assessment
- Professional Learning

Action Step

Person Responsible for Monitoring

Title I Requirements

Schoolwide Program Plan (SWP) Requirements

This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A SWP and opts to use the SIP to satisfy the requirements of the SWP plan, as outlined in the ESSA, Public Law No. 114-95, § 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

Provide the methods for dissemination of this SIP, UniSIG budget and SWP to stakeholders (e.g., students, families, school staff and leadership and local businesses and organizations). Please articulate a plan or protocol for how this SIP and progress will be shared and disseminated and to the extent practicable, provided in a language a parent can understand. (ESSA 1114(b)(4))
List the school's webpage* where the SIP is made publicly available.

School Improvement Plans are made publically available via the Florida Department of Education, CIMS website: <https://www.floridacims.org/plans>. This link is available for parents and the community on the school's webpage (bayschools.com/jms/Home.aspx). The yearly BDS Title I Newsletter will provide the CIMS link to the SIP/SWP. The newsletter is translated into the language parents can understand and distributed to parents via PeachJar. Paper copies of the plan are provided upon request. Information about our School, including the location of the SIP and/or updates to the plan are also disseminated via paper notices sent home, Facebook, PeachJar, Everbridge and/or Parent Portal. The SIP/SWP will be discussed at the Title I Annual Meeting and during School Advisory Council Meetings. The SAC will progress monitor the implementation of the plan.

Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission, support the needs of students and keep parents informed of their child's progress.

List the school's webpage* where the school's Family Engagement Plan is made publicly available. (ESSA 1116(b-g))

With the input of parents, a Parent and Family Engagement Plan (PFEP) has been developed for the 23-24 school year and a summary of the PFEP is disseminated electronically to parents at the beginning of the year. The PFEP outlines the meetings, workshops, and communications planned to engage parents, build parents' capacity in order to be fully involved in their child's education, meet their child's needs and increase academic achievement; which will fulfill the school's mission. It also outlines the training for teachers, administrators, and the other staff to promote positive relationships with parents. The PFEP is available on the school's website at bayschools.com/jms/Home.aspx. Parents are able to monitor their child's progress 24/7 using the Parent Portal. The following Title I expenditures will support the implementation of the PFEP: 1 Parent Liaison. Supplies for parent engagement.

Describe how the school plans to strengthen the academic program in the school, increase the amount and quality of learning time and help provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum. Include the Area of Focus if addressed in Part III of the SIP. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)ii)

At Jinks Middle School, we utilize rigorous instruction and productive PLCs to guide our faculty to help our students reach their achievement goals. Our job is to maintain instructional momentum and as such we use Title 1 funds such as 1 classroom teacher, 1 ESE teacher, 2 intervention teachers, 1 classroom paraprofessional, "Enriching Students" license, Instructional supplies, 75 Chromebooks and 3 carts to enhance and engage instruction. These resources allow us to focus on teaching quality curriculum and enhancing the quality of instruction by not only maintaining instructional momentum but providing hands-on instruction and creating core memories for our students.

If appropriate and applicable, describe how this plan is developed in coordination and integration with other Federal, State, and local services, resources and programs, such as programs supported under ESSA, violence prevention programs, nutrition programs, housing programs, Head Start programs, adult education programs, career and technical education programs, and schools implementing CSI or TSI activities under section 1111(d). (ESSA 1114(b)(5))

Title III, ESSER, Immigrant, and local funds are coordinated to provide office staff in the bilingual center who assist families new to the community with school registration; ESOL Resource Teachers who

support teachers of ELL students; bilingual paraprofessionals who assist students into classrooms; curriculum resources; supplies; and parent involvement resources for students to be successful.

Title II and local funds provide ongoing professional development for teachers and administrators to support the implementation of best practices for continuous improvement, ensure that instructional practices and strategies align with the rigorous state standards, and promote accelerated learning and differentiated instruction to meet students' individual needs. Funds provide opportunities for teachers to add endorsements for Autism, Reading, ESOL, and Gifted as well as obtaining certification for critical shortage areas. New teachers are provided sustained support for staff training specialists and content area instructional specialists to facilitate their development.

The State's mental health allocation is coordinated with ESSER/ARP funds to provide the school with a mental health team to provide equitable access to behavioral support services within the school, addressing barriers to academic and social success, while enhancing students' emotional development, well-being, and safety through the multi-tiered systems of support within the school.

Title IX, Part A funds provide social workers, student support care managers, and intervention teachers to work with students who have been identified as homeless to remove barriers that prevent regular attendance, full participation, and academic success.

Title I, Part D funds provide a transition specialist to coordinate with schools to ensure that students and their educational records successfully transition to and from the juvenile detention system.

Optional Component(s) of the Schoolwide Program Plan

Include descriptions for any additional strategies that will be incorporated into the plan.

Describe how the school ensures counseling, school-based mental health services, specialized support services, mentoring services, and other strategies to improve students' skills outside the academic subject areas. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(I))

Students at Jinks Middle School are provided wrap-around services to improve students' skills outside the academic subject areas. The guidance department works alongside a school-based team of mental health professionals, as well as outside mental health providers to ensure students' needs are met. The focus is to provide equitable access to behavioral support services within each school, addressing barriers to academic and social success, while enhancing students' emotional development, well-being and safety through the multi-tiered systems of support within the school.

Describe the preparation for and awareness of postsecondary opportunities and the workforce, which may include career and technical education programs and broadening secondary school students' access to coursework to earn postsecondary credit while still in high school. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(II))

N/A

Describe the implementation of a schoolwide tiered model to prevent and address problem behavior, and early intervening services, coordinated with similar activities and services carried out under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. 20 U.S.C. 1400 et seq. and ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(III).

PLC and MTSS data chat processes are implemented and overseen by the principal or designee. PLCs collect and utilize data to determine and plan for supporting the needs of students in core and intervention, School-wide Character Education and behavioral expectations, campus rules, individual

classroom rules/procedures, and progress monitored. Title I expenditures include funding one behavior paraprofessional to support these processes.

Describe the professional learning and other activities for teachers, paraprofessionals, and other school personnel to improve instruction and use of data from academic assessments, and to recruit and retain effective teachers, particularly in high need subjects. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(IV))

ONgoing professional development is provided for teachers and administrators to support the implementation of best practices for continuous improvement, ensure that instructional practices and strategies align with the rigorous state standards, and promote accelerated learning and differentiated instruction to meet student' individual needs. Funds provide opportunities for teachers to add endorsements for Autism, Reding, ESOL, and Gifted as well as obtaining certification for critical shortage areas. New teachers are provided sustained support form staff training specialists and content area instructional specialists to facilitate their development. Title I funds support professional development by paying for subs for ESE and behavior planning.

Describe the strategies the school employs to assist preschool children in the transition from early childhood education programs to local elementary school programs. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(V))

N/A

Budget to Support Areas of Focus

Part VII: Budget to Support Areas of Focus

The approved budget does not reflect any amendments submitted for this project.

1	III.B.	Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Early Warning System	\$0.00
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: ELA	\$0.00
3	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	\$0.00
4	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00

Budget Approval

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

No