

Hillsborough County Public Schools

Memorial 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	20
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	0
VI. Title I Requirements	20
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

Memorial Middle School

4702 N CENTRAL AVE, Tampa, FL 33603

[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.

The faculty and staff of Memorial Middle School will collaboratively use every available resource to foster an environment of high expectations which supports the physiological, social, emotional, and academic needs of every student.

Provide the school's vision statement.

We support the District's vision of Preparing Students for Life, and are working to ensure that our students leave our school equipped with the tools they need to graduate on time.

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
Gillyard, April	Principal	The principal serves as the instructional leader, engages stakeholders, and collaborates with others.
Robinson, Tehia	Assistant Principal	Coach and develop teacher capacity; give feedback to teachers; facilitate department goals
Mertens, Jane	Instructional Coach	lesson plan with teacher; coaching cycles; support student growth; facilitate professional learning; monitor teacher progress and provide resources and curriculum guidance to teachers.
Thornton, Trenika	Instructional Coach	lesson plan with teacher; coaching cycles; support student growth; facilitate professional learning; monitor teacher progress and provide resources and curriculum guidance to teachers.
Weaver, William	Instructional Coach	lesson plan with teacher; coaching cycles; support student growth; facilitate professional learning; monitor teacher progress and provide resources and curriculum guidance to teachers.

Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Development

Describe the process for involving stakeholders (including the school leadership team, teachers and school staff, parents, students (mandatory for secondary schools) and families, and business or community leaders) and how their input was used in the SIP development process. (ESSA 1114(b)(2))

Note: If a School Advisory Council is used to fulfill these requirements, it must include all required stakeholders.

The leadership team analyzes data and formulates the improvement plan which is then presented to all stakeholders for input and feedback.

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 administration and instructional coaches will monitor the incoming progress monitoring assessments monthly and meet with teachers to update the plan for instruction. The leadership team monitors data to develop subgroup list to provide interventions for added support.

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	93%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	100%
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: 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	52	87	75	214	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	38	43	91	
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	128	86	0	214	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	60	40	0	100	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	23	30	23	76	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	20	16	45	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	27	43	29	99	
	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	39	71	63	173

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	1	1	2
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	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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	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	

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	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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	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	

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	

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*	38	49	49	30	50	50	31		
ELA Learning Gains				49			36		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				48			34		
Math Achievement*	58	57	56	39	36	36	31		
Math Learning Gains				60			44		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				63			43		
Science Achievement*	30	44	49	25	52	53	23		
Social Studies Achievement*	46	66	68	77	58	58	39		
Middle School Acceleration	80	84	73	80	51	49	73		
Graduation Rate					46	49			
College and Career Acceleration					74	70			
ELP Progress	39	39	40	35	86	76	63		

** 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	49
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	291
Total Components for the Federal Index	6

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index

Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index

ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	51
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	506
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	98
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	16	Yes	4	1
ELL	45			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	32	Yes	1	
HSP	48			
MUL	51			
PAC				
WHT	60			
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	33	Yes	3	
ELL	44			
AMI				
ASN	89			
BLK	45			
HSP	50			
MUL	58			
PAC				
WHT	53			
FRL	51			

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	38			58			30	46	80			39
SWD	12			24			9	25			5	10
ELL	29			56			16	41	88		6	39
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	26			46			16	41			4	
HSP	38			59			28	43	83		6	39
MUL	44			57							2	
PAC												
WHT	51			71			56	63			4	
FRL	36			56			29	43	84		6	33

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	30	49	48	39	60	63	25	77	80			35
SWD	14	39	40	15	49	60	6	43				30
ELL	23	42	37	32	53	56	20	74	72			35
AMI												
ASN	83	82		92	100							
BLK	22	43	58	32	65	72	15	56				
HSP	29	49	44	37	56	58	24	86	82			34
MUL	50	36		64	83							
PAC												
WHT	38	57	60	45	61		38	73				
FRL	30	49	47	39	60	62	25	77	82			36

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	31	36	34	31	44	43	23	39	73			63
SWD	2	22	32	8	25	27	7	16				41
ELL	24	41	46	31	47	50	15	35	75			63
AMI												
ASN	62	58		79	69							
BLK	17	20	20	15	31	30	9	29	55			
HSP	31	40	38	33	47	50	25	38	82			63
MUL	50			30								
PAC												
WHT	47	40	46	43	50	36	40	54				
FRL	31	36	33	31	44	43	22	38	75			62

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	28%	47%	-19%	47%	-19%
08	2023 - Spring	26%	44%	-18%	47%	-21%
06	2023 - Spring	27%	47%	-20%	47%	-20%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	51%	53%	-2%	54%	-3%
07	2023 - Spring	44%	36%	8%	48%	-4%
08	2023 - Spring	46%	57%	-11%	55%	-9%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	23%	41%	-18%	44%	-21%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	93%	55%	38%	50%	43%

CIVICS						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	34%	64%	-30%	66%	-32%

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.

77% of students scored below proficiency in science due to the low percentage of reading proficiency and academic vocabulary knowledge.

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

Our civics scores went from 77% to 39% from 2022 to 2023. This is due to a district scheduling model where we offered a pre-civics course to the level 1 students in order to give them an additional year to be proficient in the civics standards. Therefore, only levels 2-5 students tested in 2022. All students tested in 2023, that included level 1-5 students.

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.

ELA proficiency. Teachers were unfamiliar with the requirements of the new reading benchmarks; students were lacking necessary foundational skills which hampered their ability to comprehend grade level text; the English Language Learners represent a significant percentage of our population.

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

Math proficiency. All teachers committed to incorporating the unit common assessments with implementing the end in mind process to identify misconceptions and challenges students will face.

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

Attendance.

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

Literacy across all content areas.

Improving attendance.

Improving overall school community and respect among all stakeholders

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.

Only 11% of students with disabilities scored at the proficiency level in ELA.

Measurable Outcome:

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

50% of the students with disabilities will show a year's worth of growth from 2023 to 2024 in ELA.

Monitoring:

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

Progress Monitoring Assessment (State)

Benchmark Assessments (Adopted curriculum)

Standards based in-class assessments (Language Live- District curriculum)

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jane Mertens (jane.mertens@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.)

Language Live, the district adopted curriculum

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Language Live is an evidence based district adopted curriculum as voted on by the adoption committee and teachers.

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.

1. Language Live training - summer
2. Professional Learning Opportunities
3. Professional Study Day
4. Learning Strategies course for only students with disabilities to help build foundational skills
5. ILT-PLC-Learning Pods

Person Responsible: Jane Mertens (jane.mertens@hcps.net)

By When: By the end of the first semester

#2. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Early Warning System**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.

Based on the attendance summary and the student panorama survey, student attendance was at 88% for the daily attendance rate for the 2022-23 school year and the level of student respect and community will increase.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Daily student attendance will increase to 93% for the 2023-24.

The level of respect will increase from 33% to 50% among students and their interaction with teachers and their peers.

Monitoring:

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

-Monitoring Attendance Weekly as members of the admin/student services team will be working/monitoring high attendance students.

-Monitoring the behavior of tier 2/3 students as members of the admin/student services team will be working/monitoring the students weekly.

-student weekly progress reports

-Weekly check-ins

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Tehia Robinson (tehia.robinson@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.)

Attendance incentive for students monthly; grade level teams have incentives to monitor and incentive perfect attendance.

Teach students strategies and ways to cope rather than feeling the need to take matters into their own hands (whether this be violently or verbally disrespectful).

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The rationale for selecting this specific strategy is because student behavior management strategies is already embedded in our curriculum. We can continue to build on these foundations that are being taught within the classroom.

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.

1. Building relationships through clubs
2. Monthly attendance incentives
3. Field trips tied to attendance and course performance
4. Student Government, NJHS, student organizations
5. School counselor sessions on handling stress and coping strategies
6. Monthly parent information meetings and community events

Person Responsible: Tehia Robinson (tehia.robinson@hcps.net)

By When: On-going monthly

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA**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.

48% of our students scored a Level 1
 22% of our students scored a Level 2
 30% of our students scored a Level 3 or higher

Measurable Outcome:

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

35% of our students will score a level 3 or higher on the Spring 2024 ELA state assessment.

Monitoring:

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

Progress Monitoring Assessment (State)
 Benchmark Assessments (Adopted district curriculum)
 Standards based in-class assessments

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

William Weaver (william.weaver@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.)

Doug Fisher's curriculum literacy model through StudySync, the district adopted curriculum, which develops background knowledge, academic vocabulary, modeling, close reading, benchmark aligned questioning progressions and differentiation. All these components work toward building fluency and comprehension.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

StudySync is an evidence-based district adopted curriculum as voted on by the adoption committee and teachers.

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.

1. BEST standards training
2. StudySync training
3. Professional Learning Communities
4. Site based coaching and feedback by instructional coaches and admin
5. Instructional Learning Team & Learning Pod (on site professional development) provided by instructional coaches

Person Responsible: Trenika Thornton (trenika.thornton@hcps.net)

By When: ON-going - monthly and weekly coaching and feedback by instructional coaches

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)).

During the monthly SAC meetings, the budget is presented to the stakeholders to discuss the funding for programs aligned to student achievement. Stakeholders could make recommendations for adjustments or new programs.

Title I Requirements

Schoolwide Program Plan (SWP) Requirements

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

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

The SIP is presented at each monthly School Advisory Council meeting and faculty meetings. The SAC chair is bilingual, and all the information is presented in both languages.
webpage: <https://www.hillsboroughschools.org/memorial>

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 students, parents, families, and other community stakeholders through various activities such as Grandparent's Day Breakfast, PTSA meetings, student performances, Memorial Gives Back community event (twice a year), Hispanic Heritage Month Activities, Conference Nights (four times a year), Elective Showcase Evenings, Parent Involvement Monthly Meetings, Girl Scout Troop, Boys Night Out & Girls Night Out (Fridays- Monthly), and other mentor groups. You can find all this information on our webpage: <https://www.hillsboroughschools.org/memorial>.

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)

These are some of the activities that are planned to strengthen the academic program outside of the classroom with hopes to increase exposure to more learning opportunities. Here are some examples:

History Fair 6th-8th, Spelling Bees, Slam Showcase - Poetry, Multimedia of books, STEM Fair, National Junior Honor Society, Black History Brain Bowl Competition, and After school Tutoring Program.

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))

The SIP plan is used to address the academic needs of all students to ensure their academic, social, emotional needs are being met.

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))

n/a

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))

n/a

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).

n/a

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))

n/a

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))

n/a