Wilson Middle School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Wilson Middle School

1005 W SWANN AVE, Tampa, FL 33606

[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.

Bulldogs will persevere to become compassionate citizens and successful life-long learners!

Provide the school's vision statement.

Woodrow Wilson Middle School students will be prepared for life.

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
Fantauzzo, Keith	Principal	Coordinate the completion of the SIP, represent admin at SAC meetings, continually monitor SAP and make adjustments as needed.
Batista, Amanda	Assistant Principal	Assist in the completion of the SIP, represent admin at SAC meetings in the absence of the principal, continually monitor SAP and make adjustments as needed.
Werb, Heather	Teacher, K-12	Assist in the completion of the SIP, represent admin at SAC meetings in the absence of the principal, continually monitor SAP and make adjustments as needed.
Mirasola, Monica	Other	Assist in the completion of the SIP, represent admin at SAC meetings in the absence of the principal, continually monitor SAP and make adjustments as needed.
Bobo, Michael	Assistant Principal	Assist in the completion of the SIP, represent admin at SAC meetings in the absence of the principal, continually monitor SAP and make adjustments as needed.

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.

SIP developed by the school leadership team, reviewed with the staff during pre-planning and solicited feedback. The plan was also reviewed by our SAC where we also solicited feedback from families and students.

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))

Our SIP will be reviewed quarterly by the school leadership team and updated as needed.

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	26%
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: 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	21	27	29	77
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	15	28	44
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	8
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	4
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	21	15	21	57
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	6	9	27
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	2	3	10

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	11	15	34

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	2	6	3	11
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	19	15	24	58
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	14	24	40
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	13	22	20	55
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	23	15	48
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	2	5

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	1	3	5	9

The number of students identified retained:

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

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

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

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	19	15	24	58
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	14	24	40
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	13	22	20	55
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	23	15	48
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	2	5

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	1	3	5	9

The number of students identified retained:

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

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review

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

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

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	79	49	49	76	50	50	73		
ELA Learning Gains				55			63		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				42			42		
Math Achievement*	87	57	56	80	36	36	73		
Math Learning Gains				75			63		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				59			43		
Science Achievement*	70	44	49	72	52	53	66		
Social Studies Achievement*	90	66	68	89	58	58	85		
Middle School Acceleration	77	84	73	87	51	49	87		
Graduation Rate					46	49			
College and Career Acceleration					74	70			
ELP Progress	69	39	40	59	86	76	65		

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	79
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	472
Total Components for the Federal Index	6
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	69
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	694
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	100
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	61			
ELL	57			
AMI				
ASN	93			
BLK	62			
HSP	75			
MUL	85			
PAC				
WHT	83			

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	71			

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	37	Yes	1	
ELL	55			
AMI				
ASN	90			
BLK	55			
HSP	67			
MUL	77			
PAC				
WHT	72			
FRL	58			

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	79			87			70	90	77			69
SWD	55			59			21	78	91		5	
ELL	48			64			27	77			5	69
AMI												
ASN	95			90							2	
BLK	58			71			54		64		4	
HSP	75			79			59	78	83		5	
MUL	68			88			82	94	94		5	

| 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	81			89			75	93	77		5	
FRL	65			76			57	85	80		6	60

| 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	76	55	42	80	75	59	72	89	87			59
SWD	32	35	35	37	49	24	0	59	58			
ELL	48	52	44	52	64	56	55	60	64			59
AMI												
ASN	88	76		94	94				100			
BLK	45	42	42	44	62	70	35	73	82			
HSP	71	56	42	68	69	59	69	92	77			
MUL	76	53		84	78	67		79	100			
PAC												
WHT	80	55	40	86	77	52	76	91	88			
FRL	57	46	42	60	66	57	46	78	72			60

| 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	73	63	42	73	63	43	66	85	87			65
SWD	25	41	34	29	46	47	21	33	50			
ELL	46	58	55	39	47	32		71				65
AMI												
ASN	88	79		82	57							
BLK	39	43	42	31	32	20		60				
HSP	66	58	51	61	58	38	53	70	85			67
MUL	78	75		68	64							
PAC												
WHT	77	66	35	82	67	52	71	91	88			
FRL	54	57	48	51	52	34	47	65	76			62

Grade Level Data Review– State Assessments (pre-populated)
The data are raw data and include ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.
The percentages shown here represent ALL students who received a score of 3 or higher on the statewide
assessments.

An asterisk (*) in any cell indicates the data has been suppressed due to fewer than 10 students tested, or
all tested students scoring the same.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
07	2023 - Spring	78%	47%	31%	47%	31%
08	2023 - Spring	76%	44%	32%	47%	29%
06	2023 - Spring	73%	47%	26%	47%	26%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	83%	53%	30%	54%	29%
07	2023 - Spring	35%	36%	-1%	48%	-13%
08	2023 - Spring	89%	57%	32%	55%	34%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	70%	41%	29%	44%	26%

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

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	89%	64%	25%	66%	23%

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.

Our lowest performance was in the area of 8th grade science, 70% of our 8th graders scored at the proficient level which is down 2% from last year. The 8th grade assessment includes a combination of learning from all three years of science (6th, 7th and 8th grade). We've noticed gaps in learning beginning with the 6th grade content and we have plans to ensure this does not occur again.

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

Looking at our Civics data, we noticed that 92% of the students scored at the proficient level on the first pre-measure in August. This percentage went down to 89% for the End of Course exam in May. When we investigated the cause, we were told that the pre-measure in August only tested prior knowledge. Future and current content was measured in December and May.

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.

We outperformed the state in all areas again in 2022-2023.

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

Our math scores went up four percentage points compared to last year. In addition to adding quality math teachers to our staff, we offered weekly tutoring for all students throughout the school year including test prep sessions just before semester testing.

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

The number of students that are consistently absent from school is too high in each grade level.

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

- Teachers will focus each of their lessons on the benchmarks
- Teachers will assess for understanding throughout each lesson and utilize teacher led small group instruction to target individual students' gaps in learning
- Total student absences will decrease this school year

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.

Deliberate focus on Purpose for Learning -Teachers will develop lessons that have a rigorous learning purpose and are aligned with the benchmarks so that students become invested in the content

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

At least 95% of instructional personnel will earn a rating of at least Accomplished in the area of Purpose for Learning on their final evaluation

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

Each teacher will receive an observation or a walkthrough each month throughout the 2023-2024 school year. Administration will discus results weekly and provide assistance as needed

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Keith Fantauzzo (keith.fantauzzo@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.)

Following the district's recommendations and requirements for the evaluation of instructional personnel, we will complete the required observations for each teacher and perform walkthroughs each month to monitor progress in this area

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The only way to know for sure what is happening in our classrooms is to be present in our classrooms

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.

Review expectations with staff

Person Responsible: Keith Fantauzzo (keith.fantauzzo@hcps.net)

By When: Before August 10 2023

Administration will conduct required observations and walkthroughs with each teacher at least once monthly

Person Responsible: Keith Fantauzzo (keith.fantauzzo@hcps.net)

By When: Throughout the school year

Administration will meet to discuss results of observations/walkthroughs

Person Responsible: Keith Fantauzzo (keith.fantauzzo@hcps.net)

By When: Weekly

Based on the results of the data analysis from the observations and walkthroughs, admin will develop a plan for the teachers who have not reached the Accomplished rating in the area of Purpose for Learning

Person Responsible: Michael Bobo (michael.bobo@hcps.net)

By When: Throughout the school year

During the final evaluation conferences, teachers will be informed of their rating in the area of Purpose for Learning

Person Responsible: Keith Fantauzzo (keith.fantauzzo@hcps.net)

By When: May 2024

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Small Group 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.

Progress Monitoring - Teachers will progress monitor their students throughout the year and within each lesson to identify learning gaps and utilize teacher-led small group instruction to work with students based on their individual needs

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

At least 95% of instructional personnel will earn a rating of at least Accomplished in the area of Engagement in Learning on their final evaluation to include identifying them as using teacher-led small group instruction

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

Each teacher will receive an observation or a walkthrough each month throughout the 2023-2024 school year. Administration will discuss results weekly and provide assistance as needed

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Keith Fantauzzo (keith.fantauzzo@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.)

Following the district's recommendations and requirements for the evaluation of instructional personnel, we will complete the required observations for each teacher and perform walkthroughs each month to monitor progress in this area

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The only way to know for sure what is happening in our classrooms is to be present in our classrooms

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.

Review expectations with staff

Person Responsible: Keith Fantauzzo (keith.fantauzzo@hcps.net)

By When: Before August 10 2023

Administration will conduct required observations and walkthroughs with each teacher at least once monthly

Person Responsible: Keith Fantauzzo (keith.fantauzzo@hcps.net)

By When: Throughout the school year

Administration will meet to discuss results of observations/walkthroughs

Person Responsible: Keith Fantauzzo (keith.fantauzzo@hcps.net)

By When: Throughout the school year

Based on the results of the data analysis from the observations and walkthroughs, admin will develop a plan for the teachers who have not reached the Accomplished rating in the area of Engagement in Learning

Person Responsible: Michael Bobo (michael.bobo@hcps.net)

By When: Throughout the school year

During the final evaluation conferences, teachers will be informed of their rating in the area of Engagement in Learning

Person Responsible: Keith Fantauzzo (keith.fantauzzo@hcps.net)

By When: May 2024

#3. 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.

Our theme for this school year is WORKING WITH EACH OTHER & FOR EACH OTHER focusing on how the actions of one can affect the entire staff and student body.

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

We will see at least a 5% decrease in each of the areas of our Early Warning System

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

During the bi-weekly Student Services meetings, members of the team will dissect current data for attendance, suspensions, ELA, Math & Reading performance

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Amanda Batista (amanda.batista@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.)

Based on current data, individual and small group sessions will be developed focusing on individual student deficiencies in the areas of attendance, suspensions, ELA, Math & Reading performance

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Working with students and families individually creates a sense of family when the focus is on their child's best interests

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.

During the bi-weekly Student Services meetings, members of the team will dissect current data for attendance, suspensions, ELA, Math & Reading performance

Person Responsible: Amanda Batista (amanda.batista@hcps.net)

By When: Throughout the school year

Based on current data, student services team members will create plans based on students' individual needs

Person Responsible: Amanda Batista (amanda.batista@hcps.net)

By When: Throughout the school year

Individual and/or group sessions will be conducted to assist with students' individual deficiencies

Person Responsible: Amanda Batista (amanda.batista@hcps.net)

By When: Throughout the school year

<div style="background-color:#2c2c6c; color:white; text-align:center; padding:10px;">

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).

</div>

-