Ramblewood Middle School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Ramblewood Middle School

8505 W ATLANTIC BLVD, Coral Springs, FL 33071

[no web address on file]

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

I. School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

The mission at Ramblewood Middle School is to ignite student passion for lifelong learning through advanced technology, rigorous classroom instruction, and community outreach create civic-minded citizens with global perspectives.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The school's vision is to empower students to meet today's challenges
to build a better future.

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
Kirk, Andrew	Principal	

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 SIP is developed by the SAC committee and additional school administrators with support from community 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))

Progress monitoring with the FAST PM 1 and PM 2 and CFA (common formative assessments) will drive additional instructional considerations for students.

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	79%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	76%
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) Asian Students (ASN) Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: B 2019-20: A 2018-19: A 2017-18: B
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	93	89	139	321
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	70	58	61	189
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	2
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	4	20
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	62	70	107	239
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	45	61	81	187
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	11	19	30

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	58	82	118	258

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	9
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	10

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	74	117	99	290
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	36	66	52	154
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	8	8	22
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	31	52	85
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	62	99	98	259
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	100	110	94	304
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	15	7	25

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	123	110	315

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	3	5	9
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	10

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	74	117	99	290
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	36	66	52	154
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	8	8	22
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	31	52	85
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	62	99	98	259
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	100	110	94	304
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	15	7	25

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	123	110	315

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	3	5	9
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	10

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*	58	53	49	53	54	50	50		
ELA Learning Gains				55			48		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				51			32		
Math Achievement*	60	56	56	51	41	36	44		
Math Learning Gains				65			33		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				55			29		

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
Science Achievement*	49	50	49	42	52	53	42		
Social Studies Achievement*	75	67	68	74	63	58	67		
Middle School Acceleration	70	70	73	75	51	49	67		
Graduation Rate					49	49			
College and Career Acceleration					70	70			
ELP Progress	71	42	40	47	74	76	44		

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	64
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	383
Total Components for the Federal Index	6
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	57
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	568
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	35	Yes	2	
ELL	54			
AMI				
ASN	82			
BLK	58			
HSP	62			
MUL	57			
PAC				
WHT	68			
FRL	54			

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	37	Yes	1	
ELL	50			
AMI				
ASN	81			
BLK	53			
HSP	55			
MUL	62			
PAC				
WHT	60			
FRL	53			

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	58			60			49	75	70			71
SWD	29			35			19	48	42		5	
ELL	40			51			29	66	65		6	71
AMI												
ASN	76			84			65	91	94		5	
BLK	54			52			41	69	72		5	
HSP	58			59			48	77	65		6	67
MUL	47			60			57	64			4	
PAC												
WHT	63			70			57	80	69		5	
FRL	50			52			40	68	58		5	

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS

Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21	ELP Progress
All Students	53	55	51	51	65	55	42	74	75			47
SWD	27	43	42	24	52	50	11	47				
ELL	44	54	55	45	65	53	14	59	61			47
AMI												
ASN	75	74		78	78		77	88	94			
BLK	48	52	49	41	61	52	35	68	72			
HSP	51	57	57	50	65	59	38	72	64			40
MUL	58	66		50	69		54	75				
PAC												
WHT	59	51	36	64	66	55	47	82	83			
FRL	47	53	50	44	64	53	31	73	63			

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	50	48	32	44	33	29	42	67	67			44
SWD	22	30	25	15	21	20	22	35	55			
ELL	40	52	47	31	29	36	10	56				44

						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	71	68		60	45		65	100	67			
BLK	44	42	33	38	28	27	32	67	57			
HSP	49	51	32	38	28	29	38	55	64			44
MUL	35	34	10	28	40	55	30	45				
PAC												
WHT	57	49	35	56	41	28	54	78	74			
FRL	44	45	32	38	30	23	37	64	66			

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	53%	49%	4%	47%	6%
08	2023 - Spring	54%	49%	5%	47%	7%
06	2023 - Spring	54%	50%	4%	47%	7%

				MATH		
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	65%	54%	11%	54%	11%
07	2023 - Spring	61%	51%	10%	48%	13%
08	2023 - Spring	39%	46%	-7%	55%	-16%

				SCIENCE		
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	48%	38%	10%	44%	4%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	84%	48%	36%	50%	34%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	94%	46%	48%	48%	46%

BIOLOGY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	*	63%	*	63%	*

CIVICS						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	73%	64%	9%	66%	7%

III. Planning for Improvement

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

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

The trends show that SWD groups are not making the same gains as general education students.

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

Civics for 7th-grade students is the only area that had a decline in scores from prior year. Changes in educators and student attendance issues are some of the reasons why there was a decline.

Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends.

As a group, our scores are above the district and state averages. Math acceleration continues to improve math scores in 6th and 7th-grade testing.

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

This year there is a greater push for literacy in content areas and across all subjects and class periods.

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

Attendance is an area that needs attention. Having students in front of a teacher helps engage them and motivate them to learn. Focusing on level 1 student via a culture of literacy and literacy in content areas will also enhance student achievement.

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

Closing the achievement gap in SWD students in reading and math scores. Continue the upward trend increasing science scores for grade 8.

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

#1. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Other

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

A reward system has been set in place twice a quarter for students who are successfully participating and engaging in academic classes to celebrate additional student success, both academic and behavioral.

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

By the spring of 2024, there will be a decrease in behavior referrals of 5% and a decrease in class recovery work and missed academic classes.

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

Pinnacle grade checks will be completed at the time of interim reports and report cards.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Andrew Kirk (andrew.kirk@browardschools.com)

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.)

District-led professional development on classroom strategies to support SWD/ELL students and mainstream education. Autism professional development: classroom strategies for de-escalation and social-emotional support of mainstream SWD.
School-led professional development for reward system and reward room.

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

Based on discipline records from the 2022-2023 school year, referrals for minor classroom misbehavior were overly used thus need to find positive interventions to help curve the behavior of 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.

Creation of a reward room and incentive for the students to make the right choice and succeed academically.

Person Responsible: Andrew Kirk (andrew.kirk@browardschools.com)

By When: Checking during interim reports and report cards.

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

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

We identified that the students with disabilities had lower ELA and math achievement than the state average.

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

By spring 2024, the sub-group of students (SWD) will increase by 5% in both ELA and Math FAST PM 3.

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

Data from F.A.S.T PM 1 & 2, grade level Common Formative assessments (CFA), SucessMaker (Math), HMH.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Andrew Kirk (andrew.kirk@browardschools.com)

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.)

Extended learning opportunity camps will be offered to SWD students prior to other students. This will give us an opportunity to extend remediation or enrichment opportunities to SWD students.

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

ELO camps have shown that they help students with testing strategies and additional exposure to material.

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.

Creation of extended learning opportunities camps for tested areas in ELA, math, science and civics.

Person Responsible: Andrew Kirk (andrew.kirk@browardschools.com)

By When: Prior to FAST PM 2 and FAST PM 3 testing.

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).

Using Title I funds, ELO camps will provide remediation and enrichment opportunities for students within the SWD subgroup. School and community-sponsored activities are also a focus for the positive culture and environment in celebrating student success. These activities are enabling us to include additional students who are making learning gains and completing course work successfully.

Title I Requirements

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

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

The SIP is discussed with faculty and all stakeholders during monthly School Advisory Council meetings. Feedback is collected, and adjustments are made to meet individual student and teacher needs.

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))

Parent communication is conducted via the website, social media pages, parentlinks, and additional notices sent home. The quarterly family education meetings are face-to-face community engagement activities to increase participation and family collaboration.

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))

To increase academic success for all students, funds will be allocated to create virtual and face-to-face extended learning opportunities. The area of focus will be our SWD.

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 1 monies will help with the coordination and integration of additional services.