

Hillsborough County Public Schools

Rodgers Middle Magnet 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	25
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	0
VI. Title I Requirements	25
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

Rodgers Middle Magnet School

11910 TUCKER RD, Riverview, FL 33569

[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.

Work collaboratively to empower students to become a community of problem solvers and lifelong learners.

Provide the school's vision statement.

To promote a learning environment that is warm, safe, and caring for all.

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
Lane, Adam	Principal	Cultivate a generative learning environment for all students to achieve their maximum potential.
Duran, Miriam	Assistant Principal	Support the work of the teachers and provide students with a positive learning environment.
Carroll, Clay	SAC Member	Teacher, SAC Chair, and Curriculum Resource Teacher.
Carroll, Nathania	Other	Provide intervention strategies to improve student performance, prevent retention, and support a collaborative environment among students, teachers, and parents.

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.

To develop the SIP, the administration team began discussions during preplanning and then held meetings with faculty members before school on Tuesdays and two Mondays after school to discuss the goals and focuses of the 2023-2024 school year. There have also been discussions during our PTSA meetings to discuss the school environment, culture, and community involvement.

SIP Monitoring

Describe how the SIP will be regularly monitored for effective implementation and impact on increasing the achievement of students in meeting the State's academic standards, particularly for those students with the greatest achievement gap. Describe how the school will revise the plan, as necessary, to ensure continuous improvement. (ESSA 1114(b)(3))

The SIP will be monitored through Data analysis and disaggregation during faculty meetings and professional learning community sessions bi-monthly. Based on the study of the data, the school leaders and teachers will increase the focus on areas that are not progressing toward our goals.

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	67%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	88%
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: B 2018-19: B 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	70	106	153	329	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	22	68	91	181	
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	125	99	1	225	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	80	86	1	167	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	138	114	154	406	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	92	95	105	292	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	62	162	140	364	

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	8	6	17	31

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	85	117	135	337	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	54	73	142	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	10	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	10	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	73	62	65	200	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	88	87	71	246	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	150	130	174	454	

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	13	25	43	81

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	10	10
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2

Prior Year (2022-23) Updated (pre-populated)

Section 3 includes data tables that are pre-populated based off information submitted in prior year's SIP.

The number of students by grade level that exhibited each early warning indicator:

Indicator	Grade Level										Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	85	117	135	337	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	54	73	142	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	10	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	10	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	73	62	65	200	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	88	87	71	246	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	150	130	174	454	

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	13	25	43	81

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	10	10
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review**ESSA School, District and State Comparison (pre-populated)**

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school or combination schools). Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school.

On April 9, 2021, FDOE Emergency Order No. 2021-EO-02 made 2020-21 school grades optional. They have been removed from this publication.

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	44	49	49	43	50	50	41		
ELA Learning Gains				42			43		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				32			37		
Math Achievement*	52	57	56	43	36	36	42		
Math Learning Gains				52			37		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				57			28		
Science Achievement*	38	44	49	36	52	53	39		
Social Studies Achievement*	65	66	68	67	58	58	52		
Middle School Acceleration	76	84	73	67	51	49	54		
Graduation Rate					46	49			
College and Career Acceleration					74	70			
ELP Progress	39	39	40	56	86	76	55		

* 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	52
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	314
Total Components for the Federal Index	6
Percent Tested	98
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	50

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index

OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	495
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	96
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	23	Yes	4	2
ELL	30	Yes	4	1
AMI				
ASN	91			
BLK	39	Yes	2	
HSP	45			
MUL	60			
PAC				
WHT	63			
FRL	45			

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	28	Yes	3	1
ELL	39	Yes	3	
AMI				
ASN	76			
BLK	39	Yes	1	
HSP	49			

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY

ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
MUL	51			
PAC				
WHT	53			
FRL	44			

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	44			52			38	65	76			39
SWD	19			27			12	40			5	17
ELL	21			32			27	33			5	39
AMI												
ASN	77			95				100			3	
BLK	37			43			18	56			4	
HSP	35			44			33	56	65		6	35
MUL	46			58			50	67	77		5	
PAC												
WHT	55			61			52	74	75		5	
FRL	35			41			33	53	72		6	35

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	42	32	43	52	57	36	67	67			56
SWD	19	34	33	16	37	38	14	35				
ELL	28	34	26	24	44	54	15	68				56
AMI												
ASN	78	65		78	81							

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21	ELP Progress
BLK	29	36	32	30	44	53	29	45	52			
HSP	39	36	27	38	54	61	34	73	67			57
MUL	52	37	40	48	50		53	77				
PAC												
WHT	50	49	38	51	54	53	39	70	70			
FRL	34	38	31	32	47	56	25	62	58			54

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	43	37	42	37	28	39	52	54			55
SWD	12	37	41	19	26	24	18	30				33
ELL	19	35	33	35	31	28	18	30	50			55
AMI												
ASN	43	37		57	45		46					
BLK	31	33	27	23	25	21	24	39	30			
HSP	37	45	39	38	36	30	37	48	56			52
MUL	53	39		49	37	30	44	70	60			
PAC												
WHT	48	48	44	52	44	34	49	58	57			
FRL	35	39	36	35	33	27	34	42	46			54

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	47%	47%	0%	47%	0%
08	2023 - Spring	35%	44%	-9%	47%	-12%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	40%	47%	-7%	47%	-7%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	46%	53%	-7%	54%	-8%
07	2023 - Spring	36%	36%	0%	48%	-12%
08	2023 - Spring	57%	57%	0%	55%	2%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	36%	41%	-5%	44%	-8%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	89%	55%	34%	50%	39%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	91%	49%	42%	48%	43%

CIVICS						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	63%	64%	-1%	66%	-3%

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 lowest performance was 8th grade Language Arts at 35% proficient. The lowest performance was likely due to changes in the grade 8 personnel (Leaves, EPI, and schedule changes). A majority of the students had a permanent sub for all of the second semester.

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

The percentage of students proficient in Math dropped by 6%. Functions and statistics/probability/number sense remain areas where our school has traditionally struggled. Students have difficulty decoding vocabulary into expressions and equations.

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 components that had the greatest gap of 12 percent between school and state performance were 8th-grade Language Arts and 7th-grade Math. For 8th-grade ELA, the issue can primarily be attributed to most students' lack of a permanent instructor during the second semester. For 7th-grade math, students struggle with the fundamental skills required to progress from foundational to more complex skills.

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

Growth. All subjects grew from PM1 to PM3 of the FAST assessment. Math growth was contributed to the use of the IXL program. ELA growth was due to the use of the Achieve3000 Program. Social studies contributed growth towards realigning benchmarks.

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

A significant concern is the doubling of students who scored level 1 on the ELA assessment and the number of students with substantial reading deficiency.

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

Promote growth beyond typical yearly gains to close educational gaps and increase student proficiency. Improvement of the instructional practices and benchmark alignment of lessons in the classroom. Increased community involvement and ownership of student work and performance. Increase reading interventions within Science, Social Studies, and Language Arts to improve students' achievement levels and gains as a whole and with subgroups of students with disabilities, English Language Learners, and African American 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 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.

The Instructional Leadership Team will use "Look Fors" to collect ELA and Math proficiency data on benchmark-aligned instruction. Implement teaching coaching cycles, focusing on best practices, strategies, and pedagogy, tiered by experience, need, and student data.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Will increase student achievement levels across content areas by at least 5% points by utilizing Small Group Instruction based on the data available on students in each content area. This will be achieved by improving literacy across content areas with student-specific interventions/teaching strategies in these groups. An aligned approach to teaching reading comprehension is driven by the best practices established by the school district's ELA department. Consistency in decoding text, text marking, and understanding how to cite the important information in the text. This will need to be developed to help students build the skills to communicate their learning/thinking into their writing. We will be explicit about building connections between what we are reading and how to communicate the important concepts – analyze, interpret, and make inferences based on what we read.

Monitoring:

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

- ILT will review data collected during the previous month to identify trends and determine next steps
- The Assistant Principal for Curriculum meets monthly with the Math Coach to review weekly coaching calendars, analyze teacher coaching cycle data and student data, determine next steps, and re-tier teachers as needed.
- Demonstration of learning during workshops, Walkthroughs, Observations
- Walkthroughs and Observation
- Data collection from Formative Assessments and student work

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Adam Lane (adam.lane@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.)

The baseline, formative assessments, and Progress Monitoring data driven standards-based instruction.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

We need to be sure we are meeting the student's needs academically based on the information we gather from the Baseline Assessment, Formative Assessments, and Progress Monitoring throughout the year. This will help us design learning that is aligned with student needs.

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.

- Professional Development Workshop for Literacy using Informational Text for Teacher (Duran)
- Teacher Coaching Cycles on the Best Practices for Teaching Literacy on Informational Text (Duran)
- Leadership Team will use "Look Fors" to assess fidelity and needs for further Professional Development (Duran)
- ILT will analyze student work and data from assessments (Lane)
- Bootcamps for Students (Benoit, Duran)
- Professional Development to enhance Teachers knowledge and practices for Small Group Instruction (Lane)

Person Responsible: [no one identified]

By When:

#2. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Other**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed.

One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Connections between the content/learning students are exposed to in class and their future success is crucial in building the level of ownership needed for student achievement to improve. Students and families need to understand how it is connected to be invested in learning the content/skills outlined in the standards. We must increase the meta-cognitive aspects of education for everyone involved and raise students' self-efficacy. This requires believing what we do is worthwhile and connected to future aspirations.

Measurable Outcome:

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

One year's worth of growth in each subject area and/or a 5% increase in English Language Arts, Math, Science, and Social Studies proficiency level. Meet or exceed the district average on the Insight Survey.

Monitoring:

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

- Surveys of students, parents, and community members
- Formative Assessments/ Qualitative Data/Walkthroughs/Observation

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

[no one identified]

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.)

- Family Learning Nights (FLN) that are ELA, Math, and Science focused and aligned to student grade levels. Parents attend sessions to build their capacity to help their children at home. Students engage in learning activities to strengthen their academic skills. Parents and students will be provided with books, manipulatives, journals, and supplies for use during FLN and home use.
- Family Learning Nights to engage parents and build their capacity to assist their students, help monitor their progress, and stress the importance of increasing their ability to use English.
- Student learning and Projects shared during conference night
- Student-led Conferences at Conference Night

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Insight Survey and other qualitative data were collected through discussions with stakeholders regarding the connection between academic learning (BEST Standards) and student goals and aspirations. Research demonstrates that students are more engaged when they are involved in establishing the activities for them or are provided choices, but more importantly, when they see a connection to their aspirations or goals. The pandemic exasperated the gap in student engagement in middle school. We need to do more work to help them see the connection between being in school, putting forth effort, and succeeding later in life.

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.

- Educate and inform the entire School Community about the 5 Cambridge Attributes and how they can and will be leveraged to drive academic achievement. (C. Carroll)
- Professional Development on the 5 Cambridge Attributes (Lane, C. Carroll)
- Schedule Parent and Family Nights/Events (Lane, N. Carroll)
- Consistent Communication with Families (Lane)

Person Responsible: [no one identified]

By When:

#3. 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.

Increase the achievement level for our Students with Disabilities meeting proficiency in Language Arts. We need to do more to help our students meet the expected proficiency levels set forth by the State of Florida so they can be successful in life. This would also mean a substantial amount of our students made academic gains.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Increase the achievement level for ELA from 15% to 20%.

Monitoring:

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

- Assessment data, formative assessments, walkthroughs, observational data
- Surveys, Sign in sheet
- Academic Bootcamps to assess student learning and thinking

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

[no one identified]

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.)

- Family learning nights to help engage parents in the learning process, stress the importance, give them tips and resources for helping their students improve Literacy and own their learning
- Small Group Instruction
- Bootcamps
- Technology (One to One)
- Teacher Professional Development

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

- Increased family engagement and understanding of the expectations for student learning can and will lead to improved academic education for students. BY helping parent stay informed and part of the process, they can help their student be more engaged and learn more
- Small groups or differentiating the learning to meet the student's needs is one of the most effective ways to maximize instructional time and move students academically.
- Bootcamps provide a chance to do Mini-Lessons on topics where students need remediation or opportunities to accelerate student learning based on the Formative Assessments
- One to One Technology provides a chance to use Reading programs for students to interact with text at their specific level of learning or to work on particular skills.

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.

- Schedule Parent and Family Night (Lane, N. Carroll)
- Professional Development on Small Group Instruction
- Professional Development on Standards-Based Instruction
- Analyze Data
- Schedule PLC's and Common Planning Time for Teachers
- Review Baseline and Formative Assessment Data

Person Responsible: [no one identified]

By When:

#4. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to English Language Learners**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.

English Language Learners' achievement in Language Arts is 5%. We need to increase the percentage of students meeting proficiency so they can meet the standards set forth and be successful in life.

Measurable Outcome:

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

The number of English Language Learners meeting proficiency in Language Arts will increase from 5% to 15%.

Monitoring:

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

- Assessment data, formative assessments, walkthroughs, observational data
- Surveys, Sign in sheets,

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Miriam Duran (miriam.duran@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.)

- Family learning nights to help engage parents in the learning process, stress the importance, give them tips and resources for helping their students improve Literacy and own their learning
- Teacher Professional Development
- Reading and Writing Bootcamps
- Small Group Instruction
- Technology

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Increased family engagement and understanding of the expectations for student learning can and will lead to improved academic learning for students. BY helping parent stay informed and part of the process, they can help their student be more engaged and learn more.

- Small groups or differentiating the learning to meet the student's needs is one of the most effective ways to maximize instructional time and move students academically.
- Bootcamps provide a chance to do Mini-Lessons on topics where students need remediation or opportunities to accelerate student learning based on the Formative Assessments
- One to One Technology provides a chance to use reading programs for students to interact with text at their specific level of learning or to work on specific skills.

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.

- Schedule Parent and Family Night (Lane)
- Professional Development in Small Group Instruction
- Professional Development on Standards-Based Instruction
- Analyze Data
- Schedule PLC's and Common Planning Time for Teachers
- Review Baseline and Formative Assessment Data

Person Responsible: [no one identified]

By When:

#5. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Black/African-American**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 number of Black students meeting Proficiency is currently 33% in Language Arts. We need to be sure more of our students are meeting the Proficiency levels set forth.

Measurable Outcome:

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

The number of Black students meeting Proficiency in ELA will increase from 33% to 38%.

Monitoring:

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

- Assessment data, formative assessments, walkthroughs, observational data
- Surveys, Sign-in sheets,

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

[no one identified]

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.)

- Family learning nights to help engage parents in the learning process, stress the importance, give them tips and resources for helping their students improve Literacy and own their learning
- Teacher Professional Development
- Reading and Writing Bootcamps
- Small Group Instruction
- Technology

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Increased family engagement and understanding of the expectations for student learning can and will lead to improved academic education for students. By helping parent stay informed and part of the process, they can help their student be more engaged and learn more.

- Small groups or differentiating the learning to meet the student's needs is one of the most effective ways to maximize instructional time and move students academically.
- Bootcamps provide a chance to do Mini-Lessons on topics where students need remediation or opportunities to accelerate student learning based on the Formative Assessments
- One to One Technology provides a chance to use reading programs for students to interact with text at their specific level of learning or to work on particular skills.

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.

- Schedule Parent and Family Night (Lane)
- Professional Development in Small Group Instruction
- Professional Development on Standards-Based Instruction
- Analyze Data
- Schedule PLC's and Common Planning Time for Teachers
- Review Baseline and Formative Assessment Data

Person Responsible: [no one identified]

By When:

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 pre-planning, we met with the Title I Supervisor to discuss how Title I funds were budgeted for the year. The leadership team and Steering committee meet monthly to discuss school climate, culture, and instructional needs.

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 administration will have afterschool meetings every month that are coordinated with the PTSA. Parents can learn about the School Improvement Plan and the school's progress toward the goals. The SIP will also be readily available for reading at <https://www.hillsboroughschools.org/domain/3617>.

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 began the year by spending the first few weeks building positive rapport between teachers and students. Teachers used an "All About Me" form and other methods for spending time to learn about the student's strengths, interests, talents, and aspirations. Our plan includes leveraging our Cambridge Attributes to help students focus on learning and understand how these attributes can be used to build a lifetime of success (Based on Cambridge Research). We will be underpinning and

supporting the integration of these Attributes with 7 Mindsets and the 7 Habits of Highly Effective Teens schoolwide. This, combined with a renewed effort (post-pandemic) to bring families and community members back on campus, will help us build a stronger school community. Our overarching goal is to help students maximize their lifetime experience by leveraging their strengths, learning from failures, and bolstering their self-efficacy. The Family Engagement Plan is available at <https://www.hillsboroughschools.org/domain/3617>.

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)

Area of Focus 1: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Benchmark-aligned Instruction

- The Instructional Leadership Team will use "Look Fors" to collect ELA and Math proficiency data on benchmark-aligned instruction. Implement teaching coaching cycles, focusing on best practices, strategies, and pedagogy, tiered by experience, need, and student data.

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