

Hillsborough County Public Schools

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

Randall Middle School

16510 FISHHAWK BLVD, Lithia, FL 33547

[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.

Randall Middle School will challenge our students to reach their highest academic potential while encouraging and supporting their social and emotional development as middle school students.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Randall Middle School will be the District's leading middle school in academics and extracurricular programs.

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
Mawhinney, Claire	Principal	Instructional leader who facilitates a vision, mission and goals among stakeholders. Leader in charge to advance all students with programs that ensure equity. Manages the facility to enhance learning. Identifies social/emotional and health programs to address the needs of students.
Gerding, Colin	Assistant Principal	Instructional leader who works to promote school vision alongside principal. Serves as main source of contact for the SAC and works alongside SAC chair to monitor progress towards goal on SIP.
Sanderson, William	Teacher, K-12	Responsible for facilitating SAC meetings and working with school leadership to monitor school data and progress towards SIP goals.

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 School Advisory Council (SAC) takes the lead on developing the SIP. Membership is open to all stakeholders and members are recruited starting in May of the previous year. A diverse council that reflects the demographics of the student body is formed. When the SIP was drafted, input from the leadership team, subject area leaders, and various members of SAC were briefed on the content, discussion was had, and changes were made as a result.

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))

SAC will meet monthly, and the SIP will be regularly referred to as the council analyzes data from progress monitoring assessments throughout the school year. Members of the leadership team and SAC are responsible for monitoring data and any findings will be reported in discussed at SAC meetings. Greatest areas of concern will be emphasized at the first SAC meeting of the year and will be a discussion point at each subsequent meeting. If changes to the plan are necessary, members will discuss within SAC and then revisions will be presented to the leadership team to be implemented.

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	35%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	18%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	N/A
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD) English Language Learners (ELL) Asian Students (ASN) Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: A 2019-20: A 2018-19: A 2017-18: A
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	37	52	60	149
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	31	24	59
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	3	6
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	12	19
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	38	55	57	150
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	19	30	65
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	0	0	0	0	0	37	36	56	129

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	11	21	34	66

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	0	1
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1

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	5	6	6	17
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	21	37	62
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	25	38	60	123
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	38	24	39	101
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	

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	5	6	11

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	3

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	5	6	6	17
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	21	37	62
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	25	38	60	123
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	38	24	39	101
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	

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	5	6	11

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	3

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	77		
ELA Learning Gains				58			65		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				47			48		
Math Achievement*	85	57	56	80	36	36	80		
Math Learning Gains				69			61		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				62			52		
Science Achievement*	73	44	49	72	52	53	73		
Social Studies Achievement*	91	66	68	91	58	58	87		
Middle School Acceleration	95	84	73	95	51	49	88		
Graduation Rate					46	49			
College and Career Acceleration					74	70			
ELP Progress		39	40		86	76			

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

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

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	84
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	418
Total Components for the Federal Index	5

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	72
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	649
Total Components for the Federal Index	9
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	56			
ELL	69			
AMI				
ASN	95			
BLK	68			
HSP	81			
MUL	82			
PAC				
WHT	84			
FRL	69			

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	46			
ELL	65			
AMI				
ASN	89			
BLK	58			
HSP	69			
MUL	75			
PAC				
WHT	73			
FRL	60			

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			85			73	91	95			
SWD	39			52			40	63	85		5	
ELL	59			73			50	95			4	
AMI												
ASN	89			94			96	100	98		5	
BLK	56			66			43	75	100		5	
HSP	72			82			67	92	92		5	
MUL	72			85			76	83	95		5	
PAC												
WHT	75			86			74	92	95		5	
FRL	56			67			55	78	91		5	

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21	ELP Progress
All Students	75	58	47	80	69	62	72	91	95			
SWD	36	40	34	42	57	43	25	71	63			
ELL	69	61	56	70	70	58	43	94				
AMI												
ASN	91	69		99	79		89	96	100			
BLK	60	50	39	58	46	42	58	67	100			
HSP	74	57	52	71	62	54	63	93	94			
MUL	75	56	46	84	62	75	80	100	96			
PAC												
WHT	75	58	45	82	72	66	72	90	94			
FRL	55	53	47	61	63	56	49	73	87			

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	77	65	48	80	61	52	73	87	88			
SWD	36	42	40	46	52	45	46	69	74			
ELL	62	72	59	60	43	8		73				
AMI												
ASN	93	87		95	79		82	100	98			
BLK	69	53	10	55	39	29	45	78				
HSP	77	70	50	74	57	38	75	83	87			
MUL	83	71	53	79	59	47	66	91	78			
PAC												
WHT	76	63	48	82	63	57	74	87	89			
FRL	59	55	32	63	54	45	51	75	79			

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	73%	47%	26%	47%	26%
08	2023 - Spring	64%	44%	20%	47%	17%
06	2023 - Spring	79%	47%	32%	47%	32%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	84%	53%	31%	54%	30%
07	2023 - Spring	45%	36%	9%	48%	-3%
08	2023 - Spring	87%	57%	30%	55%	32%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	72%	41%	31%	44%	28%

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	91%	64%	27%	66%	25%

III. Planning for Improvement

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

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

8th grade ELA showed the lowest performance in 2022-2023 school year. Out of 481 students tested, only 64% achieved a level 3 or higher.

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

The percent of students scoring a level 3 or higher on in ELA decreased by 8%. The main factor contributing to this decline is the implementation of the new BEST standards and new curriculum.

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 state average for students scoring a level 3 or higher on the 7th grade FSA was 47%. The average at RMS students scoring a level 3 or higher on the 7th grade FSA was 73%. Scores in 7th grade ELA have been consistent throughout the past three years. With the implementation of new curriculum and standards, scores may fluctuate until teachers and students are comfortable with the new ones.

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

6th, 7th, and 8th grade achievement levels in math showed at least a 9% growth. Actions for the 2022-2023 school year included common planning time for all math teachers as well as time for "lunch and learns" where teachers were able to provide extra support to students during their lunch periods.

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

The number of students who scored a level 1 on ELA assessments is consistent with the areas of greatest decline. There were 150 students who scored a level 1 on the assessments across all three grade levels.

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

The highest priority for the 2023-2024 school year will to be increase ELA scores, specifically in 8th grade. This will be achieved by focusing on opportunities for collaboration in PLCs and ongoing professional development on aligning standards to the curriculum. Also, there will be continued focus on providing a school environment that is safe for all students.

Area of Focus

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

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to 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.

ELA achievement has remained stagnant in 6th and 7th grade. 8th grade students scoring at a level 3 or above decreased by 8% in the 2022-2023 school year.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Students scoring level 3 or higher in ELA on district and statewide assessments in 6th, 7th, and 8th will increase to 82%, 76%, and 67% respectively on the third progress monitoring assessment in May 2024.

Monitoring:

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

Baseline scores, midyear assessments, and statewide testing data will be assessed throughout the year. Data will be discussed in PLCs and Instructional Leadership Team meetings. Through the Touch Base on 20 meetings, data will be assessed on a schoolwide level at least once a quarter.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Claire Mawhinney (claire.mawhinney@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.)

Teachers will utilize the Drop Everything and Read time that is incorporated into the bell schedule to promote literacy across grade areas and subject levels. Also, as an AVID focused school we will be enhancing lessons by ensuring every student is practicing ELA skills through WICOR in every class on campus.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

DEAR time allows opportunity for students to increase their literary skills using a variety of materials and ensures a consistent and dedicated time each day to enforce the skills. WICOR strategies allow teachers to specific target skills used in the classroom and provides consistency within the school culture.

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.

Structure PLCs for planning and data analysis.

Person Responsible: Sandra Lefevre (sandra.lefevre@hcps.net)

By When: All year/end of year

Assist teachers in use of curriculum materials for re-teach lesson.

Person Responsible: Sandra Lefevre (sandra.lefevre@hcps.net)

By When: All year/end of year

Assess for standards mastery and reteach when needed using small group instruction.

Person Responsible: Colin Gerding (colin.gerding@hcps.net)

By When: All year/end of 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.

With the implementation of the new BEST standards and new curriculum for ELA and math, focusing on effectively aligning the curriculum and teacher instruction to the state standards will help boost student achievement.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Students scoring level 3 or higher in ELA on district and statewide assessments in 6th, 7th, and 8th will increase to 82%, 76%, and 67% respectively on the third progress monitoring assessment in May 2024.

Monitoring:

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

Baseline, midyear, and state assessment results will be analyzed to determine alignment of instruction to the curriculum. Implementation of the standards will be discussed in ELA and Math department PLCs and within the grade levels.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Claire Mawhinney (claire.mawhinney@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.)

Classroom walkthroughs and demonstration classrooms will be utilized to monitor alignment of the state standards to the curriculum. Common assessments will be developed in PLCs and used throughout.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Classroom walkthroughs and demonstration classrooms provide administrators and teachers with the opportunity to observe implementation of the new curriculum and standards. Teachers will be able to share instructional strategies and best practices with one another and collaborate to reinforce effective strategies.

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.

Assess for standards mastery and reteach when needed using small group instruction.

Person Responsible: Colin Gerding (colin.gerding@hcps.net)

By When: All year/end of year

Plan for common assessments

Person Responsible: Colin Gerding (colin.gerding@hcps.net)

By When: All year/end of year

#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.

The "sense of belonging" category on the Panorama survey is an important indicator of school climate and culture. Last year, 39% of students said they had a sense of belonging in the school.

Measurable Outcome:

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

We would like for all our school climate areas in Panorama to increase by at least one percentage point or more. We would like to see an upward trend in all these areas, particularly the area of "Sense of belonging." The "sense of belonging" component of the Panorama survey will increase at least from 39% to 45% or more.

Monitoring:

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

In the first quarter, admin and staff will begin early membership drives for all clubs. In November, the admin and JROTC club will host a Veteran's Day assembly for students, parents, and community members. Throughout the year, admin and the social worker will utilize the Panorama lessons on creating a sense of belonging. Also, faculty, staff, and the PBIS lead will incorporate caught soaring incentives throughout the year.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Claire Mawhinney (claire.mawhinney@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.)

PBIS caught soaring interventions, school wide clubs, and the Veteran's Day assembly will be implemented to create a positive climate and culture.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

A positive PBIS system in place can help improve climate and culture and the sense of belonging students feel. Also, inviting students to participate in clubs and stakeholders to participate in campus events such as the Veteran's Day assembly, faculty and staff can improve climate and culture of the school.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Begin early membership drives for as many clubs as possible.

Person Responsible: Claire Mawhinney (claire.mawhinney@hcps.net)

By When: End of quarter 1

Caught soaring incentives.

Person Responsible: Claire Mawhinney (claire.mawhinney@hcps.net)

By When: All year/end of year

Veteran's Day assembly for all students, families and the community.

Person Responsible: Claire Mawhinney (claire.mawhinney@hcps.net)

By When: November

Utilize Panorama lessons on creating a sense of belonging.

Person Responsible: Claire Mawhinney (claire.mawhinney@hcps.net)

By When: All year/end of year