

Hillsborough County Public Schools

Farnell Middle School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	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	0
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

Farnell Middle School

13912 NINE EAGLES DR, Tampa, FL 33626

[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.

Farnell Middle School strives to educate and nurture the whole child while maintaining high academic standards with respect for diverse learners. We seek active involvement with the community. We value a safe learning environment for all.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Farnell Middle School aims to be a united community of learners committed to achieving our maximum potential

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
Lockett, Kelinda	Principal	
Guerra, Cheryl	Assistant Principal	
Alvarado, Allan	SAC Member	
Reitnauer, Amy	Other	
Hartman, Jonah	Other	
Hartman, Holly	Other	
Narayan, Rekha	Other	

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.

Administrations collaborates monthly with the Leadership team and works with PLCs to review data, instructional trends, and student achievement. Based on these discussions and the feedback from student and parent surveys, our instructional priorities were developed.

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))

Administration meets weekly to review instructional trends based on walkthroughs. ILT and Literacy ILT develop professional development based on trends. PLC facilitators rotate through a cycle of data analysis, planning for targeted instruction, implementing strategies, and ongoing assessment. We currently have vacancies in critical areas, ELL and ESE. We have gained support from District personnel, however ongoing site based support is still in development.

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	49%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	29%
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: 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	33	54	85	172
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	24	29	61
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	9	11
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	56	71	0	127
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	29	27	0	56
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	13	30	40	83

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	40	47	66	153
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	18	14	36
Course failure in 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	35	33	42	110
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	36	39	37	112
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

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	1	4	5	10

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	6	4	0	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	40	47	66	153
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	18	14	36
Course failure in 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	35	33	42	110
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	36	39	37	112
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

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	1	4	5	10

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	6	4	0	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*	74	49	49	75	50	50	75		
ELA Learning Gains				66			64		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				52			46		
Math Achievement*	82	57	56	76	36	36	73		
Math Learning Gains				75			60		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				66			52		
Science Achievement*	75	44	49	69	52	53	69		
Social Studies Achievement*	82	66	68	88	58	58	78		
Middle School Acceleration	90	84	73	97	51	49	86		
Graduation Rate					46	49			
College and Career Acceleration					74	70			
ELP Progress	74	39	40	77	86	76	75		

* 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	80
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	477
Total Components for the Federal Index	6
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	74

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	741
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	43			
ELL	67			
AMI				
ASN	95			
BLK	64			
HSP	72			
MUL	86			
PAC				
WHT	81			
FRL	68			

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	38	Yes	1	
ELL	70			
AMI				
ASN	87			
BLK	63			
HSP	70			

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%
MUL	77			
PAC				
WHT	75			
FRL	65			

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			82			75	82	90			74
SWD	31			48			37	43	58		5	
ELL	58			67			56	57	88		6	76
AMI												
ASN	94			97			97	91	98		5	
BLK	51			72			50	70	75		5	
HSP	66			73			61	72	88		6	71
MUL	75			85			86	92	91		5	
PAC												
WHT	75			83			78	84	89		6	76
FRL	59			71			57	74	79		6	70

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	75	66	52	76	75	66	69	88	97			77
SWD	24	34	31	32	51	45	20	65				
ELL	63	67	58	73	73	61	52	81	97			77
AMI												
ASN	90	80	60	95	90		83	97	98			

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
BLK	59	67	53	50	63	59	71	80				
HSP	69	64	56	65	71	66	52	85	100			71
MUL	83	73	67	77	69	67	71	89	100			
PAC												
WHT	75	63	47	79	75	66	75	88	96			90
FRL	62	63	51	56	63	60	49	74	96			71

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	75	64	46	73	60	52	69	78	86			75
SWD	22	40	38	23	44	50	30	32	60			
ELL	51	64	51	59	55	49	33	63	91			75
AMI												
ASN	89	79	59	90	61		86	93	95			
BLK	62	53	15	47	43	33	50	67	53			
HSP	59	57	39	57	53	50	48	65	78			71
MUL	86	75	85	73	63		90	80	67			
PAC												
WHT	78	63	47	78	63	56	75	82	90			80
FRL	60	56	41	53	51	48	57	64	80			81

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	63%	47%	16%	47%	16%
08	2023 - Spring	68%	44%	24%	47%	21%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	74%	47%	27%	47%	27%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	79%	53%	26%	54%	25%
07	2023 - Spring	51%	36%	15%	48%	3%
08	2023 - Spring	88%	57%	31%	55%	33%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	73%	41%	32%	44%	29%

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

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	78%	64%	14%	66%	12%

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.

SWD, Black, and Free/Reduced price lunch students continue to perform below 70%. SWD/ ESE is an area where, as a school, we have not been fully staff for over a year.
Spring 2023 ELA proficiency in grades 7 and 8 were below 70%.
Spring 2023 Math proficiency in grade 7 were below 65%.

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

ELA proficiency has been declining over the past 5 years. The ELA / Reading department is working to establish structures for targeted instruction and differentiation based on formative assessment to track student progress throughout the year to navigate toward mastery.

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.

SWD/ ESE is an area where, as a school, we have not been fully staff for over a year.

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

8th grade Science showed the most improvement from 2022 to 2023. Canvas lessons were developed for student targeted review. Students were incentivized for completing and mastering reviews based on their individual needs.

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

SWD/ ESE is an area of concern where, as a school, we have not been fully staff for over a year.

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

1. Targeted instruction to support all levels of learners each day
2. Enhancing schoolwide literacy plan to support increased reading achievement.
3. Enhance student connections to the school environment through PBIS and mentoring programs

Area of Focus

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

#1. 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.

Teachers will utilize data in PLCs to plan targeted instruction for all students with a particular focus on SWD. SWD are performing far below the schoolwide averages.

Measurable Outcome:

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

By PM3, SWD will score within 25 points of their traditional counterparts.

Monitoring:

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

Teachers and PLC groups will utilize PM and Common assessments to plan targeted instruction and monitor and address student progress throughout the year.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Kelinda Lockett (kelinda.lockett@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.)

Planning protocols, differentiated instruction, teacher led small groups

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

As teachers monitor and analyze data in PLCs, they can plan for the needs of the students and then address those needs in targeted learning groups.

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.

Teacher training on teacher led small groups and differentiation. Then model classrooms for teacher led small groups to support implementation.

Person Responsible: Kelinda Lockett (kelinda.lockett@hcps.net)

By When: end of semester 1 and ongoing

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Benchmark-aligned 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.

Students will have daily opportunities to engage in standards aligned reading, writing, and inquiry.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Students will produce content specific written or speaking tasks reflecting understanding / mastery of content.

Monitoring:

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

PLC planning, data analysis and administrator walkthroughs

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Kelinda Lockett (kelinda.lockett@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.)

Teacher training by our Literacy ILT for common schoolwide strategies and common language around literacy.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

When students are able to practice strategies consistently throughout their day, it solidifies learning and builds skills to increase mastery and achievement.

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.

Implement L-ILT team members, plan PD topics and PD calendar for schoolwide development

Person Responsible: Amy Reitnauer (amy.reitnauer@hcps.net)

By When: Preplanning

Monitor implementation of strategies across all content areas

Person Responsible: Kelinda Lockett (kelinda.lockett@hcps.net)

By When: ongoing

Reflect on outcomes regularly by reviewing student data and student work; adjust plan as needed

Person Responsible: Kelinda Lockett (kelinda.lockett@hcps.net)

By When: ongoing

#3. 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.

Our school will regularly recognize and celebrate achievement and citizenship

Measurable Outcome:

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

Student involvement and feelings of connection to the school will increase as reflected in the panorama survey.

Monitoring:

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

Student surveys conducted each quarter

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Cheryl Guerra (cheryl.guerra@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.)

Incorporating PBIS Tier 1 schoolwide, grade level, and classroom
Connect - A - Kid Mentoring program
Student clubs

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Middle school students are looking for a place to "belong" . Surveying our students and understanding what interests them and what we are lacking as a school in regard to those interests are things we will implement.

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.

Establish PBIS committee - led by APA
Establish and recruit mentors for Connect A Kid
Advertise student clubs for sign up

Person Responsible: Kelinda Lockett (kelinda.lockett@hcps.net)

By When: preplanning / ongoing

survey students regarding effectiveness of interventions and other interests

Person Responsible: Cheryl Guerra (cheryl.guerra@hcps.net)

By When: quarterly

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).

-