Coleman Middle School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Coleman Middle School

1724 S MANHATTAN AVE, Tampa, FL 33629

[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.

To provide an education and the supports which enable each student to excel as a successful and responsible citizen.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Preparing students for life.

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
Jones, Anthony	Principal	
Seits, Theresa	Assistant Principal	
Chisholm, Robert	Assistant 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.

Meetings held over summer of 2023 with school administration, teachers, staff, and parents to develop plan in the form of small group data analysis, whole faculty reflection on practice, and review of school wide academic and culture data by school leaders.

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 team will meet monthly to review formative data. Each administrator will plan with their assigned subject area leader to track progress and plan for upcoming PLCs based on data in the areas of unit internalization, lesson planning, and/or test in hand assessment analysis.

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	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	31%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	17%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	N/A
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: A 2019-20: A 2018-19: A 2017-18: A
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	24	35	48	107
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	18	28	49
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	34	32	0	66
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	15	0	25
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	3	4	13

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	14	19	38

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	1	0	0	1
Students retained two or more times	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	18	26	31	75
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	15	24	44
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	4
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	2	6
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	20	29	65
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	16	19	52
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	37	47	46	130

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	2	4	6

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	1	1	2

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	18	26	31	75
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	15	24	44
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	4
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	2	6
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	20	29	65
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	16	19	52
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	37	47	46	130

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	2	4	6

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	1	1	2

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*	74	49	49	76	50	50	80		
ELA Learning Gains				59			61		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				45			54		
Math Achievement*	88	57	56	85	36	36	85		
Math Learning Gains				77			77		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				69			67		

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
Science Achievement*	71	44	49	76	52	53	72		
Social Studies Achievement*	89	66	68	89	58	58	92		
Middle School Acceleration	94	84	73	94	51	49	90		
Graduation Rate					46	49			
College and Career Acceleration					74	70			
ELP Progress	90	39	40		86	76	100		

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)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	84
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	506
Total Components for the Federal Index	6
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	74
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	670
Total Components for the Federal Index	9
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	50			
ELL	63			
AMI				
ASN	93			
BLK	45			
HSP	77			
MUL	78			
PAC				
WHT	86			
FRL	69			

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	48			
ELL	54			
AMI				
ASN	86			
BLK	50			
HSP	62			
MUL	69			
PAC				
WHT	79			
FRL	58			

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	74			88			71	89	94			90
SWD	40			53			42	71	42		5	
ELL	53			71			36				4	90
AMI												
ASN	90			96			80	100	100		5	
BLK	38			52			33	55			4	
HSP	72			80			57	88	86		5	
MUL	62			75			73	78	100		5	
PAC												
WHT	76			92			75	92	95		5	
FRL	55			70			58	72	91		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	76	59	45	85	77	69	76	89	94			
SWD	43	48	42	52	58	51	30	61				
ELL	58	42	38	67	58	55	46	67				
AMI												
ASN	79	67		90	91			90	100			
BLK	38	39	29	46	63	58	43	83				
HSP	65	48	34	72	65	51	67	71	88			
MUL	65	57	50	74	72		64	79	90			
PAC												
WHT	81	62	50	90	79	76	81	94	96			
FRL	54	48	39	61	58	55	51	74	80			

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	80	61	54	85	77	67	72	92	90			100
SWD	39	39	42	46	53	47	19	82				
ELL	64	72	63	64	67	64	44	75	82			100

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	86	63		94	81		64		100			
BLK	50	55	54	56	62	71		67				
HSP	68	63	53	78	76	68	63	89	87			
MUL	80	68	50	85	73	60	77	90	93			
PAC												
WHT	83	61	55	87	78	65	76	94	91			
FRL	68	56	51	73	66	55	63	83	74			

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	76%	47%	29%	47%	29%
08	2023 - Spring	68%	44%	24%	47%	21%
06	2023 - Spring	73%	47%	26%	47%	26%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	89%	53%	36%	54%	35%
07	2023 - Spring	48%	36%	12%	48%	0%
08	2023 - Spring	87%	57%	30%	55%	32%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	69%	41%	28%	44%	25%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	100%	55%	45%	50%	50%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	100%	49%	51%	48%	52%

CIVICS						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	88%	64%	24%	66%	22%

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.

Our 69% pass rate on 2023 Science SSA, while ranking 9th among HCPS middle schools, represents a 7% drop from prior year. Our 76% pass rate on the 2022 Science FCAST ranked 2nd among HCPS middle schools.

Factors include:
-Staffing issues in Science over 8th graders years at Coleman
-Virtual instruction
-Need for refined systems for tracking targeted students thru common formative assessments.

Trends across all proficiency data showed a need to focus on those students who were at a high level 2/ low level 3 from the 2023 state assessments.

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

Overall, Science showed the greatest decline from prior year. However, ELA Proficiency also showed a subtle decline on the 2022 FSA at 76% and 72% on the 2023 FAST assessment. Reasons for this are:
-Missing a teacher resulting in large class sizes.
-New standards, curriculum resources and new state and district progress monitoring assessments.
-Collectively, all grade levels struggled primarily with reading across genres and vocabulary.
-Lack of a writing component as the school has scored high in this area in the past.
-Introduction of focus on small group instruction

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.

Our school scored above the state average in all areas of proficiency measured on the 2023 FAST and EOC assessments.

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

Math proficiency on the 2022 FSA was 85% and 90% on 2023 FAST assessment.

Math PLC focus on standard aligned practice as well as using formative data to identify targeted standards to address in re-teaching. The math department has a track record of high performance with a team that has remained largely intact for years.

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

Proficiency in 8th Grade Science
Literacy gains at all 3 grade levels

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

-Top 3 among HCPS in READING GAINS
-Finish #1 among HCPS in Level 5 for each cell of school grade

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

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Differentiation

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.

Gaps in school proficiency overall ELA, Science, and Civics rest at percentages of level 2 and low level 3 readers performing at proficiency on state assessments.

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

-Top 3 among HCPS in READING GAINS
-Finish #1 among HCPS in Level 5 for each cell of school grade

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

-Collaboration between SALs and Admin around PLC agendas/protocols for alignment with school priority and identification of targeted students prior to PLCs
-Walkthrough and coaching of teachers centered on their goals based on the instructional priority
-Test in Hand common assessments given in each subject area of school grade

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Anthony Jones (anthony.jones@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.)

Daily differentiation of teacher time with targeted students based on formative assessments.

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

Focus on the differentiation of teacher time will steer PLC and walkthrough protocols to identify students in each class in need of additional support from the teacher based on formative assessments. The student who need the most support should garner the lion's share of the teacher's time.

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.

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

#2. 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.

We have worked for the last 3 school years (2020-21, 2021-22, and 2022-203) on school/student culture via THE COBRA WAY. The COBRA WAY is an acronym (Courteous, Optimistic, Brave, Responsible and Active)
that describes our student expectations; our schoolwide expectations were developed by a voluntary committee of school staff over the last two school years.

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

Continued increases in perception data in the following areas which increased in 2023 over 2022:
-Across my school, there are consistent expectations and consequences for student behavior
-My school is a good place to work and learn
-My school is fun and joyful
-School leaders promote a safe and productive learning environment
-School leaders provide me with support
-Teachers and leaders at my school address misbehavior

We will also track factors of student perception around social awareness, growth mindset, self-efficacy, and emotional regulation which increased from 2022 to 2023

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

We will also continue our book study of Leader in Me by Steven Covey. Our ILT read Leader in Me last year
and this year our goal is for the ILT to share the "7 habits" with staff in order to continue our learning on the
importance and impact of teacher and student efficacy.

In addition, we continue to offer opportunities for teachers to collaborate and have their voices heard via committees, surveys, etc in order to build a culture of trust and a collective effort towards our school wide SIP goal. We also introduced teacher goal setting this year and encouraged teachers to set goals with students.

Finally, we address the tangible side of a positive staff climate via various teacher appreciation events and recognition from peers and administration.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Anthony Jones (anthony.jones@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.)

Staff are being divided in groups of the 7 Habits to work on presentations for staff as it relates to goals. Teachers are setting a Leader In Me goal where they will reflect with colleagues and administration on progress.

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

Students at school will benefit from positive validation of behavior via the Cobra Points system. This year we will add the PBIS component of a token economy via the PBIS "app." and a school store. Our goal is to increase clarity of expectations for students in all school settings to reduce student rule infractions and reward positive behavior.

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.

No action steps were entered for this area of focus