
Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	9
III. Planning for Improvement	14
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	19
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	0
VI. Title I Requirements	19
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

Pierce Middle School

5511 N HESPERIDES ST, Tampa, FL 33614

[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.

Pierce Middle School will provide an environment of Respect, Responsibility and Pride in academics and behavior.

Provide the school's vision statement.

“Pierce Middle School will become the hub of the community through Respect, Responsibility and Pride inspiring students to become productive members of the community”.

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
	Assistant Principal	q

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.

-

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))

-

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	94%
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) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: C 2019-20: C 2018-19: C 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	0	0	0	0
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that have two or more early warning indicators:

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

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

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	81	53	98	232
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	55	49	120
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	75	82	99	256
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	70	98	113	281
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	75	82	99	256
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	71	99	113	283
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	135	133	157	425
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	29	26	62

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	3	1	1	5
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	1	6

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	81	53	98	232
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	55	49	120
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	75	82	99	256
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	70	98	113	281
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	75	82	99	256
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	71	99	113	283
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	135	133	157	425
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	29	26	62

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	3	1	1	5
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	1	6

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*	35	49	49	37	50	50	34		
ELA Learning Gains				43			38		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				34			32		
Math Achievement*	50	57	56	38	36	36	36		
Math Learning Gains				49			41		

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				50			40		
Science Achievement*	26	44	49	33	52	53	33		
Social Studies Achievement*	52	66	68	47	58	58	43		
Middle School Acceleration	94	84	73	88	51	49	67		
Graduation Rate					46	49			
College and Career Acceleration					74	70			
ELP Progress	22	39	40	31	86	76	38		

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

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

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	TSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	47
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	279
Total Components for the Federal Index	6
Percent Tested	98
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	TSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	45
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	450
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	99

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
Graduation Rate	

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	23	Yes	4	4
ELL	41			
AMI				
ASN	67			
BLK	31	Yes	2	1
HSP	47			
MUL	50			
PAC				
WHT	38	Yes	1	
FRL	47			

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	26	Yes	3	3
ELL	42			
AMI				
ASN	71			
BLK	33	Yes	1	
HSP	45			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	55			
FRL	45			

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	35			50			26	52	94			22
SWD	20			30			22	32			5	13
ELL	27			42			17	42	94		6	22
AMI												
ASN	60			73							2	
BLK	26			36			12	50			4	
HSP	35			50			29	51	93		6	22
MUL	27			73							2	
PAC												
WHT	35			56			7	55			4	
FRL	34			49			26	54	95		6	22

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	37	43	34	38	49	50	33	47	88			31
SWD	22	30	26	22	34	36	16	34				15
ELL	30	40	34	35	47	46	23	39	90			31
AMI												
ASN	62	47		90	83							
BLK	29	32	24	23	43	52	23	37				
HSP	36	43	35	38	47	47	33	49	88			31
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	47	60		51	62	67	45	50				
FRL	37	43	35	39	49	49	34	47	90			30

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	34	38	32	36	41	40	33	43	67			38
SWD	25	32	33	32	39	36	27	29				27
ELL	26	37	34	31	37	46	19	39	71			38
AMI												
ASN	67	53		73	47							
BLK	32	38	30	21	27	26	41	40				
HSP	33	37	32	37	41	44	29	42	65			38
MUL	60	50		50	60							
PAC												
WHT	34	34		41	48		45	53				
FRL	33	37	32	36	40	41	32	43	66			36

Grade Level Data Review– State Assessments (pre-populated)

The data are raw data and include ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data. The percentages shown here represent ALL students who received a score of 3 or higher on the statewide assessments.

An asterisk (*) in any cell indicates the data has been suppressed due to fewer than 10 students tested, or all tested students scoring the same.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
07	2023 - Spring	26%	47%	-21%	47%	-21%
08	2023 - Spring	22%	44%	-22%	47%	-25%
06	2023 - Spring	23%	47%	-24%	47%	-24%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	41%	53%	-12%	54%	-13%
07	2023 - Spring	24%	36%	-12%	48%	-24%
08	2023 - Spring	41%	57%	-16%	55%	-14%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	16%	41%	-25%	44%	-28%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	97%	55%	42%	50%	47%

CIVICS						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	43%	64%	-21%	66%	-23%

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.

8th Grade Science Assessment had the lowest performance, with only 15% of students scoring Proficient. Language acquisition as well as influx of new monolingual students last year are a considerable factor to the lower performance. Teacher stability in the science department was also a factor.

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

ELA scores declined from last year in all levels. Again, many of our students struggle with language acquisition, even past their first year in the country.

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

The largest gap between PMS and the district scores is in 8th grade science. Those scores lag behind the district 26 points in proficiency scores. Science is a reading heavy assessment, which relies on the acquisition and application of Tier 2 and 3 specialized vocabulary.

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

Math, in all grade levels, improved in Proficiency - 6th by 10%, 7th by 17%, 8th by 11%, Algebra by 3%. There was a concerted effort to improve math coaching and academic support to students in those

classes. With the Math Coach and district support, there was a focused effort on collaborative planning and differentiating for levels of learners. For Algebra, students who are at risk of not scoring in the proficient levels are supported by a Research class that reinforces the concepts learned each day.

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

Language acquisition and development are concerning, especially as we enroll new monolingual students. This can impact use across Social Studies, Science, and Reading.

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

Increasing the use of ESOL strategies in all classrooms

Increasing the use of content-based reading lessons focused on reading comprehension and vocabulary acquisition

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.

Focusing on connections between students and teachers. Research supports the idea that students learn best from people they trust.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Students will feel safe and connected to the school environment, measured by the Panorama survey.

Monitoring:

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

Admin and Success Coaches will monitor student and teacher connectedness via PLCs and a student focus group.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Pablo Gallego Alvarez (pablo.gallegoalvarez@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.)

Student Interest Clubs - We will be conducting a club period for all students on a bi-monthly basis.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Using the clubs, all students will have a connection to the school that is outside the scope of the educative environment. This allows the students to see the school as a support for them in the real world. Also, by having a club for all students, all teachers must also sponsor a club. This will allow for the teachers to connect with their students in a way removed from curriculum and grades. This will also allow them to connect with students who may not be their own, furthering the positive culture of the school.

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.

Draft teachers interest in clubs

Person Responsible: Pablo Gallego Alvarez (pablo.gallegoalvarez@hcps.net)

By When: End of Quarter 1

Schedule and host club fair

Person Responsible: Pablo Gallego Alvarez (pablo.gallegoalvarez@hcps.net)

By When: End of October

Draft students into clubs based on interests

Person Responsible: Pablo Gallego Alvarez (pablo.gallegoalvarez@hcps.net)

By When: Dec 1st

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Hispanic

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 population of our school is 86% Hispanic, with over 30% of our students labelled as current ELL students. 25% of our students are monolingual in Spanish. This presents several challenges as it relates to curriculum and mastery of learning.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Our goal is to increase proficiency in all areas across contents - increasing in grade band language arts proficiency and math proficiency by 5% points, from 16% proficiency in Science 3 (8th grade) to 22% proficiency. from 43% proficiency in Civics to 50%, and from 97% proficiency in Algebra 1 to 100%.

Monitoring:

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

The work for this will be monitored via PLCs, Coaching Cycles, and Classroom Observations.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Pablo Gallego Alvarez (pablo.gallegoalvarez@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.)

Collaborative Planning surrounding the use of ESOL and Reading strategies in all contents

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The areas we saw the greatest growth in were also the areas where we implemented and supported collaborative planning in last year's work.

Collaborative planning allows teachers to share the best instructional practices for a given activity or standard. By collaborating, teachers can ensure they are providing a consistent and engaging lesson across the department and PLC.

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.

Professional Learning on collaborative planning

Person Responsible: Pablo Gallego Alvarez (pablo.gallegoalvarez@hcps.net)

By When: End of Q1

Create time and structure for collaborative planning

Person Responsible: Pablo Gallego Alvarez (pablo.gallegoalvarez@hcps.net)

By When: End of Q1

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).

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.

We use parentlink to disseminate the majority of our messages. This will be sent via text and email as a means to view.

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 LIA program is an arm of outreach in the community. They work with community leaders to provide support and relationships.

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)

We are implementing a Dual Language program for incoming 6th graders. This will currently allow for the students to receive daily instruction in both Spanish and English in History and in Science. In the following years, this will expand to 7th, and then 8th grade as well.

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))

NA

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 receive Guidance Classroom lessons monthly centered around the needs of the participants - be it bullying, mental health, healthy relationships, etc.

We also have a Success Coach who the students can seek assistance from in order to mediate their issues with others.

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))

NA

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).

We are using a token economy built upon recognizing both preferred behavior and improved behavior. Also, students enrolled in the CCEIS program are being referred to counseling provided via the district (Haven). This allows students who are struggling to gain coping skills.

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))

Our focus on professional learning will be two-fold - cultural and instructional. For cultural needs, we are focused on building relationships between teachers and students. We are using these professional learning opportunities to explore classroom culture and relationships as modeled and used in other classrooms in the school. For instructional needs, our coaches (Math, Writing, Reading, ELL) are working in tandem to provide resources and support to use reading and ESOL strategies in lessons across all contents.

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))

NA