

Hillsborough County Public Schools

Tomlin 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	10
III. Planning for Improvement	15
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

Tomlin Middle School

501 N WOODROW WILSON ST, Plant City, FL 33563

[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 that enables each student to excel as a successful and responsible citizen.

Provide the school's vision statement.

To be a top performing middle school.

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
Johnson, Matthew	Principal	He is the Instructional Leader who ensures fidelity with our school's vision and mission. He is responsible for schoolwide accountability, school budget, Title 1 funding, contracts, evaluations, faculty meetings, Steering Committee, and he supports our Assistant Principals and instructional staff. He is visible around campus conducting walkthroughs and interacting with students.
Westover, Jessica	Assistant Principal	She is responsible for the master schedule, Interns, FTE, and Unit allocations. She also supports our counselors, instructional staff, Rti, AVID, and ESE teams. She is the school's testing administrator and also conducts walkthroughs and observations. She is visible around the campus and interacts with students daily.
Hosenbackez, Michelle	Assistant Principal	She is responsible for our Instructional Leadership Team (ILT) and is our Community and Engagement Lead. She also supports our counselors, instructional staff, clinic, and clerical staff. She manages teacher duty assignments, custodial operations, teacher incentives, and our School Safety Response Assessment (SSRA). She conducts observations and walkthroughs and interacts with students daily.
Keels, Donn	Assistant Principal	He is responsible for transportation, athletics, the master calendar of school events, building and textbook inventory, keys, and student incentives. He also supports our counselors, instructional staff, student nutrition department, School Advisory Council, and Relay for Life. He manages our Crisis Management Plan (CMP), ISS, and is our Great American Teach-In Coordinator, He conducts walkthroughs and observations.

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.

Tomlin's Instructional Leadership Team (ILT), teachers, and district resource staff all collaborated together to review school data to create our 23-24 school plan.

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))

Tomlin has implemented biweekly PLC time for each department. During this time, teachers will discuss common assessment data, review student progress, discuss interventions and best practices. At that time, they can adjust their next steps accordingly to meet the needs of the students while still aligning with the standards-based curriculum.

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	65%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	100%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	TSI
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD)* English Language Learners (ELL)* Asian Students (ASN) Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: C 2019-20: B

	2018-19: B 2017-18: B
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	85	138	160	383
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	70	101	179
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	9	27
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	28	48
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	128	165	195	488
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	105	108	115	328
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	45	99	151	295

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	50	94	108	252
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	66	79	155
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	125	93	130	348
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	148	118	135	401
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	15	29	59
	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	39	39	54	132

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	1	1
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	26	40	77

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	50	94	108	252
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	66	79	155
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	125	93	130	348
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	148	118	135	401
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	15	29	59
	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	39	39	54	132

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	1	1
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	26	40	77

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*	42	49	49	43	50	50	41		
ELA Learning Gains				43			40		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				34			29		
Math Achievement*	56	57	56	49	36	36	47		
Math Learning Gains				55			50		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				53			49		
Science Achievement*	35	44	49	33	52	53	40		
Social Studies Achievement*	69	66	68	72	58	58	59		
Middle School Acceleration	84	84	73	85	51	49	75		
Graduation Rate					46	49			
College and Career Acceleration					74	70			
ELP Progress	21	39	40	41	86	76	36		

* 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	51
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	307
Total Components for the Federal Index	6
Percent Tested	97
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	TSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	51
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	508
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	24	Yes	4	4
ELL	43			
AMI				
ASN	75			
BLK	26	Yes	1	1
HSP	49			
MUL	57			
PAC				

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%
WHT	66			
FRL	46			

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	30	Yes	3	3
ELL	39	Yes	3	
AMI				
ASN	70			
BLK	47			
HSP	47			
MUL	64			
PAC				
WHT	58			
FRL	47			

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	42			56			35	69	84			21
SWD	13			28			11	29	50		6	11
ELL	27			42			23	54	93		6	19
AMI												
ASN	67			83							2	
BLK	23			38			8	35			4	
HSP	37			52			30	64	90		6	22

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
MUL	55			58							2	
PAC												
WHT	52			66			46	82	82		5	
FRL	35			49			27	62	85		6	16

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	43	43	34	49	55	53	33	72	85			41
SWD	16	28	27	19	35	36	10	38	64			
ELL	25	33	29	31	48	48	9	57	71			41
AMI												
ASN	73	70		73	64							
BLK	31	44	35	32	44	52	32	56	100			
HSP	35	41	33	44	52	52	22	68	84			41
MUL	62	52		66	73		58	71				
PAC												
WHT	54	47	33	58	61	57	49	79	83			
FRL	36	40	34	43	51	52	26	66	84			39

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	41	40	29	47	50	49	40	59	75			36
SWD	9	28	30	16	39	45	14	31	67			15
ELL	24	35	29	27	38	41	12	42	50			36
AMI												
ASN	75	67		100	85							
BLK	30	32	24	30	41	45	25	42				
HSP	34	38	29	38	43	44	30	51	68			35
MUL	39	39		48	48							
PAC												
WHT	52	43	33	61	60	66	52	72	81			

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
FRL	36	37	29	40	46	47	33	53	70			38

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	37%	47%	-10%	47%	-10%
08	2023 - Spring	36%	44%	-8%	47%	-11%
06	2023 - Spring	47%	47%	0%	47%	0%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	64%	53%	11%	54%	10%
07	2023 - Spring	23%	36%	-13%	48%	-25%
08	2023 - Spring	53%	57%	-4%	55%	-2%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	34%	41%	-7%	44%	-10%

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	*	49%	*	48%	*

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

III. Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis/Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources.

Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year's low performance and discuss any trends.

The data point that showed the lowest performance was Science at 34% proficiency, with an increase of bottom quartile students scoring at a level 1 or 2. Students have a need for reading strategies to understand Science concepts being covered. Tomlin's ESE and ELL students are underperforming in Literacy.

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

The greatest decline was in social studies, which declined by 4%. One of the factors connected to this decline is our students' ELA levels, as our 7th and 8th grade ELA scores were +10% below the state average. Students have a need for reading strategies to tackle the content they were exposed to in Civics.

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 greatest gap when compared to the state average is ELA with a 7% difference. One of the factors contributing to this gap is, it was the first year with a new curriculum and focus for ELA teachers and students. Lack of clarity, support, training, and receptiveness by educators would be other factors contributing to this decline.

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

Math showed the most improvement and this was the first-year math implemented new benchmarks. Teachers were well-trained, prepared, and supported during the transition to the new benchmarks. The state created clarities for teachers to understand the intent of the benchmark.

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

In order for students to have the opportunity to receive quality instruction, they need to be in school regularly. An area of concern for some of our students is low or inconsistent attendance. Another area of concern is the number of students scoring at Level 1 on statewide ELA and/or Math assessment.

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

1. Standard-aligned planning
2. Standard-aligned delivery
3. Standard-aligned assessments
4. Cultivating positive relationships amongst stakeholders

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.

Our focus this year will be on the relationships built (teacher/teacher, teacher/student, student/student). We wish to see the level of "incidents" reduce regarding referrals. With a referral being considered a last resort, this makes it appear that there were several negative interactions occurring on campus. Since a culture is "what you allow," we want to ensure we have structures in place to make a more positive impact.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Our measurable outcome is to reduce the number of discipline incidents by 30% for the 23-24 school year. This goal will be obtained by offering professional development and support to our teachers, as they implement Tier 1 Interventions. This will be measured by the number of students referred to the Rti for behavior monitoring.

Monitoring:

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

Tomlin's Rti Team will monitor Tier 1 and Tier 2 behaviors to help ensure a positive learning environment.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Matthew Johnson (matthewr.johnson@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.)

Restorative practices
Rti coaching
Behavior Specialist Support
Training Tigers Program

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

These practices equip students and teachers with tools to help them create and maintain positive relationships.

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.

Faculty & Staff review potential interventions available that focus more on restoration through positive relationship building rather than "punishment."

Person Responsible: Matthew Johnson (matthewr.johnson@hcps.net)

By When: End of August

Administration will review discipline data trends each week, monitoring types of incidents, areas incidents occur, and personnel involved.

Person Responsible: Michelle Hosenbackez (michelle.hosenbackez@hcps.net)

By When: Monitored weekly

The RTI Team will meet weekly to review each grade level's ABC's (Attendance, Behavior, Course Performance). The goal of the reviews will be to shift students from negative actions towards positive results.

Person Responsible: Daphne Blanton (daphne.blanton@hcps.net)

By When: Monitored monthly

There will be a daily push back onto the teachers and student services team to hold restorative interactions with students for minor negative behaviors.

Person Responsible: Jessica Westover (jessica.westover@hcps.net)

By When: Ongoing process

Capacity building opportunities for families to support family and community engagement and strengthen positive relationships amongst stakeholders.

Person Responsible: Daphne Blanton (daphne.blanton@hcps.net)

By When: Ongoing throughout the year

#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.

Tomlin will focus on benchmark-aligned instruction through planning. Our focus on planning will allow us to incorporate strategies that will support the learning of our SWD and ELL subgroups. With our subgroups in mind, we will develop strategic lessons that will reach the needs of ALL students.

Measurable Outcome:

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

By December 2023, at least 80% of all teachers will implement benchmark-aligned lessons. By May 2024 95% of all teachers will implement benchmark-aligned lessons. These lessons will be supported and developed during weekly common planning and bi-weekly collaborative Data-to-Planning PLC's. This outcome will be measured through department walk-through forms and data to planning PLC forms.

Monitoring:

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

We will monitor the outcome of our goal through bi-weekly Data-to-Planning PLC forms and department walk-through forms.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Matthew Johnson (matthewr.johnson@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.)

Bi-Weekly Data-to-Planning PLCs
Weekly Collaborative Common Planning

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Bi-weekly data planning PLC's give teachers the opportunity to analysis their data with their peers and develop interventions to support the acceleration of all students. Additionally, during these PLC's teachers will discuss the upcoming benchmarks and reflect on best practices and strategies to support the learning of students, specifically our SWD and ELL students.

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.

Teachers will participate in Bi-Weekly Data to Planning PLCs

Person Responsible: Matthew Johnson (matthewr.johnson@hcps.net)

By When: Bi-Weekly

District Resource Teachers will support teachers in developing Benchmark-Aligned lessons.

Person Responsible: Matthew Johnson (matthewr.johnson@hcps.net)

By When: Ongoing, monthly

Teachers will be provided feedback through department walkthroughs.

Person Responsible: Matthew Johnson (matthewr.johnson@hcps.net)

By When: Ongoing-Weekly

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).

Progressing monitoring data will be regularly reviewed by our Instructional Leadership Team (ILT) to ensure resources are supporting student success.

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.

Ensuring that Tomlin's stakeholders have relevant and reliable information is important. Information will be shared with the faculty and staff at the August 29th faculty meeting and with community stakeholders at the September 21st Conference Night. The SIP will also be available online once approved.

Administrators will be available to answers any questions and offer any needed clarity. The School Improvement Plan (SIP) will also be available on the school's website:

<https://www.hillsboroughschools.org/tomlin>

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))

We understand the importance of having a positive relationship with all of Tomlin's stakeholders. Keeping that in mind we plan to maintain an active communication system since we know it is a key to building strong school/home relationships. We will utilize the automated callout service to send messages via phone messages and text to parents/guardians. We will also utilize Canvas and our school's web page. The Family Engagement Plan will also be available on the school's website:

<https://www.hillsboroughschools.org/tomlin>

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)

At Tomlin we plan on strengthening the academic program of the school by ensuring that our educators have the appropriate training, coaching, and time needed to plan benchmark-aligned lessons, with a focus on differentiated delivery and benchmark-based assessments. Additionally, we have a focus on increasing the amount of time spent on quality instruction by supporting educators with the development of classroom procedures that will allow for a predictable classroom environment. Having classroom procedures will allow for more focus on student learning.

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))

N/A