Sergeant Paul R Smith Middle School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Sergeant Paul R Smith Middle School

14303 CITRUS POINTE DR, Tampa, FL 33625

[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.

Our Mission at Sgt. Smith is, "We will cultivate a learning environment that promotes scholarship, integrity, communication, and excellence." Our school webpage is: https://www.hillsboroughschools.org/smith

Provide the school's vision statement.

Our Vision at Sgt. Smith is, "Our journey at Sgt. Smith will propel us to be academically driven, self-confident, responsible citizens who will make positive contributions to the community."
Our school webpage is: https://www.hillsboroughschools.org/smith
Our current (23-24) PFE information is located on our main webpage under the "Resources" tab titled Parent and Family Engagement Plan.

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
Kleesattel, Rob	Principal	Responsible for school operations
Daigle, David	Assistant Principal	Responsible for instruction and curriculum
Perfetti, Marino	Behavior Specialist	SIP Chair
Jones, Michelle	Instructional Coach	Math Coach and classroom teacher
Anderson, Amy	Teacher, K-12	Subject Area Leader and classroom teacher

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.

SAC, Literacy Week - Amy Anderson, ELA SAL
PBIS Incentives & Initiatives - Marino Perfetti, Success Coach & FACE Liaison
RTI - Grade Team Leaders, Sheriss Crosskey, ESE Specialist; Fatima Stark, Assistant Principal

Our school's School Advisory Council (SAC) will be a group of stakeholders (teachers,

administrators, business partners, community members and students) who reflect our school's demographics. The group will be composed of mostly non-instructional members (students, community members, business partners) will continue to monitor the SIP and support/promote positive school culture initiatives. Their input on various school initiatives were taken in consideration when developing our SIP.

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))

The SIP plan incorporates our school priorities for the year. As such, our school priorities are discussed at every PLC, ILT and Faculty meeting. In addition, the School Culture goal is discussed at monthly PBIS meetings and at the Student Steering Committee. Subject Area Leaders will conduct monthly walk-throughs to look for evidence of our priorities in classrooms. FAST PM data will be used to monitor student progress and plan instruction for small groups. ILT will revise the plan if necessary.

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

2023-24 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Middle School 6-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	Yes
2022-23 Minority Rate	83%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	100%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	TSI
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD)* English Language Learners (ELL) Asian Students (ASN) Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: B 2019-20: B 2018-19: B 2017-18: B

School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	30	48	61	139
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	51	79	147
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	10	11	23
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	15	17	34
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	69	61	95	225
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	39	35	56	130
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	

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	17	55	59	131

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	2	1	2	5
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	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	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	33	37	75
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	44	36	69	149
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	49	29	60	138
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	

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	0	0	0	

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	0	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	30	48	61	139
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	33	37	75
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	10	11	23
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	15	17	34
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	44	36	69	149
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	49	29	60	138
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	

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	17	55	59	131

The number of students identified retained:

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

(Grade Level spans columns K–8)

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review

ESSA School, District and State Comparison (pre-populated)
Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school or combination schools). Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school.

On April 9, 2021, FDOE Emergency Order No. 2021-EO-02 made 2020-21 school grades optional. They have been removed from this publication.

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	51	49	49	47	50	50	46		
ELA Learning Gains				50			46		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				38			34		
Math Achievement*	63	57	56	58	36	36	47		
Math Learning Gains				69			43		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				66			30		
Science Achievement*	44	44	49	42	52	53	47		
Social Studies Achievement*	69	66	68	72	58	58	60		
Middle School Acceleration	90	84	73	91	51	49	72		
Graduation Rate					46	49			
College and Career Acceleration					74	70			
ELP Progress	66	39	40	40	86	76	43		

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

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

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	TSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	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)	TSI
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	573
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	25	Yes	4	4
ELL	53			
AMI				
ASN	81			
BLK	46			
HSP	62			
MUL	61			
PAC				
WHT	68			

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%**
FRL	61			

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	28	Yes	3	3
ELL	49			
AMI				
ASN	81			
BLK	59			
HSP	55			
MUL	58			
PAC				
WHT	63			
FRL	54			

Accountability Components by Subgroup
Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school. (pre-populated)

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
Subgroups	**ELA Ach.**	**ELA LG**	**ELA LG L25%**	**Math Ach.**	**Math LG**	**Math LG L25%**	**Sci Ach.**	**SS Ach.**	**MS Accel.**	**Grad Rate 2021-22**	**C & C Accel 2021-22**	**ELP Progress**
All Students	51			63			44	69	90			66
SWD	24			32			10	34			4	
ELL	36			56			33	52	77		6	66
AMI												
ASN	66			92			68	86	94		5	
BLK	43			48			25	67			4	
HSP	49			61			42	64	88		6	66
MUL	50			72							2	

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
PAC												
WHT	58			62			49	79	92		5	
FRL	45			59			42	60	87		6	75

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	47	50	38	58	69	66	42	72	91			40
SWD	8	23	24	15	45	55	7	45				
ELL	36	44	34	45	65	63	20	65	76			40
AMI												
ASN	72	64		85	86		80	83	100			
BLK	36	49	45	47	72	83	32	71	92			
HSP	44	49	39	54	67	66	33	71	89			35
MUL	53	64		53	60							
PAC												
WHT	53	48	33	68	72	70	64	70	89			
FRL	42	48	37	52	67	68	36	69	90			35

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	46	46	34	47	43	30	47	60	72			43
SWD	12	31	33	10	23	25	16	20				
ELL	35	46	36	39	44	40	26	41	79			43
AMI												
ASN	79	72		87	70		82	90	87			
BLK	31	37	38	29	37	26	38	57				
HSP	42	45	35	42	41	36	40	50	67			45
MUL	65	50		63	47							
PAC												
WHT	54	47	24	58	45	19	59	79	84			
FRL	40	43	34	40	39	32	39	52	66			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	45%	47%	-2%	47%	-2%
08	2023 - Spring	40%	44%	-4%	47%	-7%
06	2023 - Spring	46%	47%	-1%	47%	-1%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	61%	53%	8%	54%	7%
07	2023 - Spring	35%	36%	-1%	48%	-13%
08	2023 - Spring	59%	57%	2%	55%	4%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	42%	41%	1%	44%	-2%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	94%	55%	39%	50%	44%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	95%	49%	46%	48%	47%

CIVICS						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
N/A	2023 - Spring	68%	64%	4%	66%	2%

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.

In Reading, 225 students scored at Level 1 or 2. 45% of students scored at or above proficiency. This was the first year of implementation for the new benchmarks and state assessment. In addition, the teachers were using a new curriculum.

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

There was a 4% decline in Civics. Several factors contributed to this decline including a new teacher for 8th grade Civics and multiple teacher turnovers.

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.

13% more students score at a level 1 in 7th grade math than the State. However, in Hillsborough County, the only students that take 7th grade math are students that are 1's & 2's. So, it is not surprising that many are still a level 1.

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

7th grade math had an increase in proficiency from the prior year of +41%. In 2022, only 7% were 3+ and in 2023 48% were 3+.

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

225 students were a level 1 in Reading.
139 students had 10% or more absences.

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

Increase overall ELA scores by implementing small group instruction.
Increase Civics scores by implementing small group instruction.
Implement PBIS with fidelity.

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

#1. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Other

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

During the 2022-2023 SY, we experienced an increase of
disobedient/insubordinate and disruptive incidents. To counter
the increase we will strengthen our PBIS to create a positive, safe
and inclusive environment.

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

Reduce the number of referrals by 25%

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

Behavior data will be shared monthly at PBIS meetings and
monthly at faculty meetings. Incidents are tracked through
Behavior Tracker, Behavior Footprint and the Remediation Plan.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Marino Perfetti (marino.perfetti@hcps.net)

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.)

Implementation of PBIS plan

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

PBIS is a research-based framework for implementing
schoolwide systems of behavioral
support, in a tiered continuum based on student responsiveness
to intervention, to help
prevent and reduce undesired behavior and improve social and
academic outcomes for all
students in a school. (from www.pbis.org)

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.

Monthly PBIS Committee Meetings
Monthly Student Steering Committee
PBIS Store (Shark Store)

Shark Fin Initiative
Spirit Week Events

Person Responsible: Marino Perfetti (marino.perfetti@hcps.net)

By When: 2023-2023 SY

#2. 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.

Targeted small group instruction meets the needs of all learners, while addressing our ESSA subgroups that require intervention.
With proper implementation and ongoing support from instructional coaches, teachers will be best equipped to meet the needs of learners.

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

ELA Achievement points will increase by 3% to 48%.
Math Achievement points will increase by 3% to 59 %.
Civics Achievement points will increase by 3% to 71 %.
Science Achievement points will increase by 3% to 45 %.

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

The site based Instructional Leadership Team will conduct regular walk-throughs of classrooms and meet every two weeks to identify trends and support needs.
Content PLCs will meet twice a month and include small group instruction in the planning process.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

David Daigle (david.daigle@hcps.net)

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.)

Small Group Instruction

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

John Hattie's research was used to select this strategy. According to his research, this Response to Intervention has an effect size of 1.29.

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.

Walk-throughs by ILT

Person Responsible: David Daigle (david.daigle@hcps.net)

By When: Monthly

PLC planning for Small Group Instruction- Groups created based on data; Benchmark aligned feedback; Routine

Person Responsible: David Daigle (david.daigle@hcps.net)

By When: Monthly

ESE specialist will provide professional development for teachers focusing in on small group instruction, inclusive practices, research based instructional strategies. Thre will also be a parent night to assist parents to with student executive functioning skills and also aiding parents with their own educational planning methods.

Person Responsible: Sheriss Crosskey (sheriss.crosskey@hcps.net)

By When: By the end of the 2023-2024 school year.

CSI, TSI and ATSI Resource Review
Describe the process to review school improvement funding allocations and ensure resources are allocated based on needs. This section must be completed if the school is identified as ATSI, TSI or CSI in addition to completing an Area(s) of Focus identifying interventions and activities within the SIP (ESSA 1111(d)(1)(B)(4) and (d)(2)(C).

-For the 2023-2024 school year we are planning to have whole day department PLC planning meetings and using a portion of our Title 1 funds to pay for substitute teachers to cover the various department teachers. During these PLC meetings we will focus on our SWD subgroup and plan to improve their academic levels above 50% in various academic areas.

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 plan will be disseminated via SAC Committee Meetings, Title 1 Annual Meetings, and our school district website.

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))

Our school plans to build positive relationships with parents via Open House, Conference nights and Family Engagement nights such as Spanish heritage night for families, which we held last year. Throughout the school year, multiple opportunities are available to students outside of academics. Some of
those opportunities include:

PBIS - Spirit week, theme days, Friendship Week (Spring)
Hispanic Heritage night
Student Advisory Council
NJHS
Clubs during and after school
Competitions
Literacy Week
Sports
Additionally, our school's School Advisory Council (SAC) will be a group of stakeholders (teachers, administrators, business partners, community members and students) who reflect our school's demographics. The group will be composed of mostly non-instructional members (students, community members, business partners) will continue to monitor the SIP and support/promote positive school culture
initiatives.

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))

Sgt. Smith also operates with grade-level teams and team leaders. In these teams, students who need additional support will be identified and the team will discuss interventions.

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))

100% CEP

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))

-

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))

-

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).

-

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))

-

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))

-