

Hillsborough County Public Schools

Turkey Creek 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 | 14 |
| IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review | 20 |
| V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence | 0 |
| VI. Title I Requirements | 20 |
| VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus | 0 |

Turkey Creek Middle School

5005 S TURKEY CREEK RD, Plant City, FL 33567

[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.

Creating a safe environment where students are known, loved and challenged.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Successfully educating all students.

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 |
|-------------------|-----------------------|---|
| Prokop, Nicole | Rtl Resource | Oversees the RTI/MTSS Process Supports the PLC process for Electives Instructional Coaching as needed Assumes all other responsibilities determined by the Principal |
| Vaughn, Erin | Student Success Coach | PBIS Chair Supports the PLC process Student Coach caseload for EWS Assumes all other responsibilities determined by the Principal |
| Dorray, Jason | | Instructional Leader for the school Supports Social Studies Department Assumes all other responsibilities determined by the Principal |
| Houston, Jennifer | | Instructional Leader for all departments Supports the PLC process for Math Supports ESE / Access Department Assumes all other responsibilities determined by the Principal |
| Savino, Jaclyn | | Oversee the implementation and fidelity of areas of focus Work with District to determine school needs and professional development opportunities centered around school's area of focus |
| | | |

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 leadership team (including administration and resource teachers), the Subject Area Leaders team, SAC and PTSA all contribute to determining the instructional priorities and action steps for the SIP.

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 a part of the ILT and PLC process when monitoring data from the PM assessments. Weekly leadership meetings, weekly PSLT meetings and monthly SAC meetings will incorporate the data pertaining to the achievement gap.

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 | 75% |
| 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)* Black/African American Students (BLK)* Hispanic Students (HSP)* Multiracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)* |
| School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline. | 2021-22: C 2019-20: C |

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

Early Warning Systems

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

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|---|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|-----|-----|-----|-----|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | | |
| Absent 10% or more days | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 63 | 103 | 104 | 270 | |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 93 | 97 | 202 | |
| Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 22 | 14 | 37 | |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 12 | 17 | |
| Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 163 | 148 | 1 | 312 | |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 93 | 79 | 0 | 172 | |
| 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 | 12 | 9 | 21 | |

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 | 42 | 113 | 111 | 266 | |

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 | |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 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 | 80 | 82 | 93 | 255 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 73 | 56 | 135 |
| 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 | 111 | 92 | 101 | 304 |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 96 | 114 | 86 | 296 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C. | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 9 | 14 | 35 |

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 | 46 | 47 | 48 | 141 |

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 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 5 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 21 | 24 | 45 |

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 | 80 | 82 | 93 | 255 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 73 | 56 | 135 |
| 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 | 111 | 92 | 101 | 304 |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 96 | 114 | 86 | 296 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C. | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 9 | 14 | 35 |

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 | 46 | 47 | 48 | 141 |

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 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 5 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 21 | 24 | 45 |

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* | 28 | 49 | 49 | 32 | 50 | 50 | 31 | | |
| ELA Learning Gains | | | | 38 | | | 35 | | |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | 31 | | | 24 | | |
| Math Achievement* | 43 | 57 | 56 | 35 | 36 | 36 | 33 | | |
| Math Learning Gains | | | | 44 | | | 38 | | |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | 47 | | | 33 | | |
| Science Achievement* | 17 | 44 | 49 | 27 | 52 | 53 | 22 | | |
| Social Studies Achievement* | 54 | 66 | 68 | 60 | 58 | 58 | 46 | | |
| Middle School Acceleration | 72 | 84 | 73 | 83 | 51 | 49 | 68 | | |
| Graduation Rate | | | | | 46 | 49 | | | |
| College and Career Acceleration | | | | | 74 | 70 | | | |
| ELP Progress | 32 | 39 | 40 | 20 | 86 | 76 | 12 | | |

** 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 | 41 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students | No |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 6 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 246 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 6 |
| Percent Tested | 98 |
| Graduation Rate | |

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index

| | |
|--|-----|
| ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI) | TSI |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students | 42 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students | No |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 5 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 417 |
| 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 | 23 | Yes | 4 | 4 |
| ELL | 34 | Yes | 4 | |
| AMI | | | | |
| ASN | | | | |
| BLK | 29 | Yes | 2 | 1 |
| HSP | 40 | Yes | 4 | |
| MUL | 36 | Yes | 1 | |
| PAC | | | | |
| WHT | 49 | | | |

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% |
|----------------------|--|---------------------------|--|--|
| FRL | 38 | Yes | 2 | |

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 | 25 | Yes | 3 | 3 |
| ELL | 27 | Yes | 3 | 2 |
| AMI | | | | |
| ASN | | | | |
| BLK | 35 | Yes | 1 | |
| HSP | 39 | Yes | 3 | |
| MUL | 48 | | | |
| PAC | | | | |
| WHT | 53 | | | |
| FRL | 40 | Yes | 1 | |

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 | 28 | | | 43 | | | 17 | 54 | 72 | | | 32 |
| SWD | 18 | | | 28 | | | 9 | 37 | | | 4 | |
| ELL | 17 | | | 33 | | | 8 | 41 | 72 | | 6 | 35 |
| AMI | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ASN | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| BLK | 20 | | | 36 | | | 0 | 59 | | | 4 | |
| HSP | 25 | | | 41 | | | 16 | 47 | 76 | | 6 | 32 |
| MUL | 39 | | | 33 | | | | | | | 2 | |

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 |
|-----------|----------|--------|-------------|-----------|---------|--------------|----------|---------|-----------|-------------------|---------------------|--------------|
| PAC | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 36 | | | 49 | | | 21 | 70 | 69 | | 5 | |
| FRL | 26 | | | 40 | | | 14 | 50 | 66 | | 6 | 29 |

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 | 32 | 38 | 31 | 35 | 44 | 47 | 27 | 60 | 83 | | | 20 |
| SWD | 20 | 31 | 27 | 19 | 32 | 36 | 11 | 37 | | | | 10 |
| ELL | 17 | 30 | 27 | 18 | 33 | 44 | 7 | 45 | | | | 20 |
| AMI | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ASN | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| BLK | 24 | 39 | 38 | 27 | 48 | 50 | 20 | | | | | |
| HSP | 27 | 34 | 26 | 30 | 40 | 47 | 21 | 58 | 83 | | | 20 |
| MUL | 57 | 54 | | 36 | 46 | | | | | | | |
| PAC | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 43 | 48 | 47 | 48 | 51 | 41 | 44 | 67 | 87 | | | |
| FRL | 28 | 37 | 32 | 31 | 41 | 47 | 22 | 57 | 79 | | | 24 |

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS

| Subgroups | ELA Ach. | ELA LG | ELA LG L25% | Math Ach. | Math LG | Math LG L25% | Sci Ach. | SS Ach. | MS Accel. | Grad Rate 2019-20 | C & C Accel 2019-20 | ELP Progress |
|--------------|----------|--------|-------------|-----------|---------|--------------|----------|---------|-----------|-------------------|---------------------|--------------|
| All Students | 31 | 35 | 24 | 33 | 38 | 33 | 22 | 46 | 68 | | | 12 |
| SWD | 16 | 25 | 19 | 19 | 24 | 29 | 12 | 31 | | | | |
| ELL | 17 | 28 | 24 | 22 | 30 | 29 | 6 | 33 | 69 | | | 12 |
| AMI | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ASN | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| BLK | 12 | 17 | 21 | 8 | 28 | 38 | 6 | 35 | | | | |
| HSP | 27 | 33 | 25 | 30 | 35 | 29 | 17 | 39 | 64 | | | 12 |
| MUL | 38 | 31 | | 46 | 54 | | | | | | | |
| PAC | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 44 | 43 | 24 | 45 | 46 | 45 | 35 | 68 | 79 | | | |
| FRL | 28 | 33 | 22 | 30 | 35 | 31 | 19 | 40 | 65 | | | 13 |

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 | 25% | 47% | -22% | 47% | -22% |
| 08 | 2023 - Spring | 20% | 44% | -24% | 47% | -27% |
| 06 | 2023 - Spring | 30% | 47% | -17% | 47% | -17% |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|-------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 06 | 2023 - Spring | 47% | 53% | -6% | 54% | -7% |
| 07 | 2023 - Spring | 26% | 36% | -10% | 48% | -22% |
| 08 | 2023 - Spring | 46% | 57% | -11% | 55% | -9% |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
|---------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 08 | 2023 - Spring | 15% | 41% | -26% | 44% | -29% |

| ALGEBRA | | | | | | |
|---------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| N/A | 2023 - Spring | 81% | 55% | 26% | 50% | 31% |

| CIVICS | | | | | | |
|--------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| N/A | 2023 - Spring | 51% | 64% | -13% | 66% | -15% |

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.

Language Arts and Reading showed the lowest performance with a 4% increase of Level 3+ from PM2 to PM3 in 6th grade. 5% increase in 7th grade and 8% increase in 8th grade. Both Language Arts and Reading had substitutes covering multiple vacancies. Resource teachers were placed in the classroom and there was a Literacy coach vacancy second semester.

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

Schoolwide 6th, 7th and 8th graders showed improvement from PM1 to PM3. The lowest three performing groups of students were the Students with disabilities (ESE), ELL and Hispanic subgroups of students. More than 300 students scored a Level 1 on their PM3. Contributing factors include attendance and behavior.

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.

TCMS Science SSA scores had the greatest gap with 15% scoring at a Level 3 or higher. Factors contributing to this gap involve the lack of permanent, certified teachers in the science department with rigorous instruction.

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

Schoolwide 6th, 7th and 8th graders showed improvement from PM1 to PM3. Teachers did small group instruction, classroom pull outs, ELP, and analyzed student data to drive instruction. The largest growth was in math. Scores from PM2 to PM3 increased: 27% in 6th grade, 14% in 7th grade and 21% in 8th grade. 81% of students scored a Level 3 or higher in Algebra 1 EOC. PLCs focused on improving student achievement through differentiation and data chats with individual students.

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

The lowest three performing groups of students were the Students with disabilities (ESE), ELL and Hispanic subgroups of students. More than 300 students scored a Level 1 on their PM3. Contributing factors include attendance and behavior.

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

1. Teachers are planning quality core instruction with rigorous learning activities. Students can communicate the what and the why. Learning is supported by the Literacy Coach leading PLCs incorporating data analysis and creating rigorous lesson plans.
2. Connection with peers, teachers, academics, and the school community. PBIS is an integral part of the culture at TCMS. We are implementing positive reinforcement for attendance and behavior. TCMS incorporated a Student Success Coach and Rtl resource to monitor tardies, EWS and restorative practices with students.

We have joined forces with the migrant program, Hispanic Pathways and Metropolitan Ministries to bridge the gap with our Hispanic subgroup.

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.

Teachers are planning quality core instruction with rigorous learning activities. Students can communicate the what and the why. School-wide 6th, 7th, and 8th grade growth from PM1 to PM3 in each subject area was evident and increased. Ranging from 3% to 7% growth included more than 300 students at a Level 1 in ELA.

Measurable Outcome:

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

The achievement level for all students will increase 3% in ELA, Math and Science from PM1 administered in September to PM3 administered in May.

Monitoring:

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

Each member of the leadership team will support a specific department. The member of the leadership team along with the SALs (Subject Area Leaders) will conduct weekly walkthroughs to identify trends. Leadership and the SALs will have weekly meetings to discuss action steps and data trends. All trends will be shared with the ILT on a monthly basis.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jaclyn Savino (jaclyn.savino@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 leadership team and the SALs will identify teachers of mastery and teachers that need support through instructional coaching. Scheduling observations and coaching opportunities will happen regularly. Teachers will be supported through department PLCs and grade level PLCs monthly that will allow data discussions based on data chats and analysis.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The Literacy Coach will maintain the tracking of professional development needs and communicate with administration as needed. Weekly instructional planning meetings for all ELA teachers are documented. Utilizing ongoing professional development through whole group faculty meetings and PLCs with regular follow up and accountability measures will promote the understanding of grade level standards alignment. Working teachers and instructional plans through the PLC inquiry cycle will help identify students that may need additional support and assist teachers in spiraling standards into future lessons.

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.

Engage staff in professional development through PLCs and use of an inquiry cycle to improve student learning and teacher practice. (Literacy Coach, Shannon Burky)

Person Responsible: Jaclyn Savino (jaclyn.savino@hcps.net)

By When: Monthly; as needed

Weekly walkthroughs utilizing the four principles of effective instruction by designated leadership member to identify grade level standard alignment and use of planned instruction and rigorous learning activities.

Person Responsible: Jaclyn Savino (jaclyn.savino@hcps.net)

By When: Weekly; as needed.

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

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Connection with peers, teachers, academics, and the school community is one of the Instructional Priorities for the 2023-2024 school year.

Measurable Outcome:

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

The number of students with < 90% attendance will be reduced by 5% and Turkey Creek will drop in rank from "Very High" using the SafeSchoolsforAlex.org discipline data across the state related to incidents per 100 students to "High" or lower in regard to Violent Incidents on campus.

Monitoring:

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

The priority is being monitored through the EWS data and incorporating the Student Success Coach and Rtl resource positions. These positions are supporting students with 2 or more indicators through restorative practices, check in and check out interventions, alternative passing and mentoring/counseling programs. All leadership are contributing to transition duties reducing tardies to class and maintaining supervision in all areas.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Nicole Prokop (nicole.prokop@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.)

TCMS will incorporate tardy sweeps every period every day. Leadership members and staff with monitoring abilities will be present and support supervising transitions in the hallways. TCMS has an assistant teacher supporting the In-School Suspension program to allow students to be present for instruction. PBIS at TCMS has incorporated a framework for classroom management plans including buddy classrooms for students needing a time out / break and utilizing the behavior tracker with parent contact prior to referrals (for Tier 2). Tier 1 is supported with monthly incentives for attendance and being on time to class as well as weekly and daily incentives for positive behavior (including but not limited to game room tickets, lunch with friends weekly, tangible snacks and school supplies for purchase with the token economy, etc.).

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Students in class and engaged will support instructional growth and progress as well as emphasize safety. The assistant teacher in charge of ISS utilizes communication to attain rigorous lesson plans and applicable classwork for the students to maintain pacing and accountability for their instruction.

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.

TCMS will incorporate tardy sweeps every period every day. Leadership members and staff with monitoring abilities will be present and support supervising transitions in the hallways.

Person Responsible: Nicole Prokop (nicole.prokop@hcps.net)

By When: Daily; as needed.

TCMS has an assistant teacher supporting the In-School Suspension program to allow students to be present for instruction. The assistant teacher in charge of ISS utilizes communication to attain rigorous lesson plans and applicable classwork for the students to maintain pacing and accountability for their instruction.

Person Responsible: Jason Dorrar (jason.dorrar@sdhc.k12.fl.us)

By When: Daily; as needed.

Teachers turned in classroom management plans and were coached to utilize the behavior tracker with parent contact prior to referrals (for Tier 2).

Person Responsible: Erin Vaughn (erin.vaughn@sdhc.k12.fl.us)

By When: Each semester; daily; as needed.

PBIS Tier 1 has weekly and daily incentives for positive behavior (including but not limited to game room tickets, lunch with friends weekly, tangible snacks and school supplies for purchase with the token economy, etc.).

Person Responsible: Erin Vaughn (erin.vaughn@sdhc.k12.fl.us)

By When: Daily; weekly; as needed.

Tier 1 is supported with monthly incentives for attendance and being on time to class as well as Quarterly Celebrations for progress monitoring and attendance.

Person Responsible: Nicole Prokop (nicole.prokop@hcps.net)

By When: Monthly; every 9 weeks

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).

-

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.

TCMS incorporates a SAC (School Advisory Council) and PTSA (Parent Teacher Student Association) to communicate beyond the website, Facebook and Sway platforms. Parentlinks are sent home weekly to provide parents up to date information about the school. TCMS provides Spanish and English versions of all documents and provides translators to help families communicate with school to feel welcomed and involved.

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))

Beyond the SAC (School Advisory Council) and PTSA (Parent Teacher Student Association) and the website, Facebook and Sway platforms; the needs of students are also communicated through Canvas and Synergy. Parent nights, community events, parentlinks, conference night, award ceremonies and progress reports are ways we help keep parents informed of their students' progress. Our FACE resource engages in families and helps support their needs with our resources. We are partnered with Pathways to Hope to help families and students with the needs. We provide school supplies, clothes, and other items to help keep students in school and successful.

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)

The Literacy Coach will maintain the tracking of professional development needs and communicate with administration as needed. Weekly instructional planning meetings for all ELA teachers are documented. Utilizing ongoing professional development through whole group faculty meetings and PLCs with regular follow up and accountability measures will promote the understanding of grade level standards alignment. Working teachers and instructional plans through the PLC inquiry cycle will help identify students that may need additional support and assist teachers in spiraling standards into future lessons. Each member of the leadership team will support a specific department. The member of the leadership team along with the SALs (Subject Area Leaders) will conduct weekly walkthroughs to identify trends. Leadership and the SALs will have weekly meetings to discuss action steps and data trends. All trends will be shared with the ILT on a monthly basis. The leadership team and the SALs will identify teachers of mastery and teachers that need support through instructional coaching. Scheduling observations and coaching opportunities will happen regularly. Teachers will be supported through department PLCs and grade level PLCs monthly that will allow data discussions based on data chats and analysis.

If appropriate and applicable, describe how this plan is developed in coordination and integration with other Federal, State, and local services, resources and programs, such as programs supported under ESSA, violence prevention programs, nutrition programs, housing programs, Head Start programs, adult education programs, career and technical education programs, and schools implementing CSI or TSI activities under section 1111(d). (ESSA 1114(b)(5))

The number of students with < 90% attendance will be reduced by 5% and Turkey Creek will drop in rank from "Very High" using the SafeSchoolsforAlex.org discipline data across the state related to incidents per 100 students to "High" or lower in regard to Violent Incidents on campus.

Optional Component(s) of the Schoolwide Program Plan

Include descriptions for any additional strategies that will be incorporated into the plan.

Describe how the school ensures counseling, school-based mental health services, specialized support services, mentoring services, and other strategies to improve students' skills outside the academic subject areas. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(I))

TCMS provides opportunities for student to seek help at any time during the day. We have counselors, social worker, psychologist, success coach and an RTI specialist that is available at point of the school day. Students are given access to second step curriculum, PBIS character training, outside agencies to help with mental health.

Describe the preparation for and awareness of postsecondary opportunities and the workforce, which may include career and technical education programs and broadening secondary school students' access to coursework to earn postsecondary credit while still in high school. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(II))

Students are exposed to CTE classes such as ag, culinary, technology that provide them opportunities to develop a skill for the workforce. Avid provides students the opportunity to engage in post-secondary educational activities to help them focus their goals for college.

Describe the implementation of a schoolwide tiered model to prevent and address problem behavior, and early intervening services, coordinated with similar activities and services carried out under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. 20 U.S.C. 1400 et seq. and ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(III).

TCMS uses our MTSS/RTI weekly meeting to prevent and address problem behavior. Our success coach uses proactive strategies to help student stay on track and decrease behavior concerns. Teachers follow IEP, 504s and behavior plans to promote student success. Alternative passing, safety plans, check and connects, and other daily tasks are carried out with ESE and all students on our campus when needed.

Describe the professional learning and other activities for teachers, paraprofessionals, and other school personnel to improve instruction and use of data from academic assessments, and to recruit and retain effective teachers, particularly in high need subjects. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(IV))

Professional Development will be done based on teacher and student needs. Teachers will participate in a Teach Me Tuesday Model of PD where they will get to choose a session, they see fits their needs. Data collection of formal and informal data will determine the successful implementation of the new strategy, instructional activity, policy, or procedures.

Describe the strategies the school employs to assist preschool children in the transition from early childhood education programs to local elementary school programs. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(V))

N/A