Gulf Middle School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Gulf Middle School

1809 SW 36TH TER, Cape Coral, FL 33914

http://gfm.leeschools.net/

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Lee County School Board on 10/17/2023.

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.

Gulf Middle School will provide a world-class education; defined by high-expectations and real-world experiences by way of a safe and nurturing environment that fosters well-informed and educated contributing members of society.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Gulf Middle School envisions every student reaching their highest potential by encouraging the value in life-long learning and an appreciation for what success looks like in an ever-changing global economy.

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
Moreland, James	Principal	
Winfield, Emma	Assistant Principal	
Toadvine, Matthew	Assistant Principal	
Edwards, Michelle	Dean	

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.

Faculty, teachers, students, parents, and community members are stakeholders in promoting a positive school culture and environment. Leading indicators for stakeholders in promoting a Safe and Orderly Environment that Supports Cooperation and Collaboration are as follows: (1) The faculty and staff perceive
the school environment as safe and orderly. (2) Students, parents, and the community perceive the school
environment as safe and orderly. (3) Teachers have formal roles in the decision-making process regarding
school initiatives. (4) Teacher teams and collaborative groups regularly interact to address common issues
regarding curriculum, assessment, instruction, and the achievement of all students (5) Teachers and staff
have formal ways to provide input regarding the optimal functioning of the school. (6) Students, parents, and community have formal ways to provide input regarding the optimal functioning of the school. (7) The
success of the whole school, as well as individuals within the school, is appropriately acknowledged (8)

The
fiscal, operational, and technological resources of the school are managed in a way that directly supports
teachers.

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))

Through our PLCs, we will monitor the data and identify areas of need. We will then modify instruction
(small
group targeted lessons) to target these areas. We will revise the plan as determined by progress
monitoring data.

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	46%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	84%
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	55	55	55	165
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	37	52	96
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	0	0	7
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	0	0	13
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	50	65	65	180
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	48	35	36	119
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that have two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	37	44	40	121

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	2	3

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	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	55	55	55	165
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	37	52	96
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	0	0	7
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	0	0	13
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	50	65	65	180
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	48	35	36	119
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	37	44	40	121

| **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	2	3

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review

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

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

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	60	48	49	59	48	50	62		
ELA Learning Gains				55			59		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				45			44		
Math Achievement*	72	56	56	64	32	36	64		
Math Learning Gains				69			56		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				65			51		
Science Achievement*	63	45	49	59	51	53	66		
Social Studies Achievement*	70	64	68	77	53	58	71		
Middle School Acceleration	89	80	73	76	45	49	72		
Graduation Rate					44	49			
College and Career Acceleration					66	70			
ELP Progress	53	29	40	27	78	76	51		

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	68
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	407
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	60
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	596
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	33	Yes	4	
ELL	64			
AMI				
ASN	88			
BLK	59			
HSP	66			
MUL	64			
PAC				
WHT	73			

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	64			

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	3	
ELL	48			
AMI				
ASN	85			
BLK	49			
HSP	58			
MUL	68			
PAC				
WHT	64			
FRL	57			

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	60			72			63	70	89			53
SWD	21			45			22	43			4	
ELL	46			71			50	65	100		6	53
AMI												
ASN	76			100							2	
BLK	56			53				69			3	
HSP	61			70			57	65	88		6	56
MUL	63			66				64			3	

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	60			74			68	73	89		5	
FRL	56			66			60	68	89		6	47

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	59	55	45	64	69	65	59	77	76			27
SWD	14	39	39	31	61	62	8	42				
ELL	38	61	63	47	57	59	24	56				27
AMI												
ASN	75	82		92	91							
BLK	43	47	36	46	60	60	43	54				
HSP	54	54	52	62	69	66	45	80	73			28
MUL	72	48		67	62		92					
PAC												
WHT	62	56	39	65	70	64	68	77	77			
FRL	55	54	45	60	70	70	53	69	76			21

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	62	59	44	64	56	51	66	71	72			51
SWD	14	32	33	16	37	33	20	25				
ELL	29	57	53	41	61	61	21	38				51
AMI												
ASN	84	69		94	63		80					
BLK	44	34	31	44	53	44	45	56				
HSP	60	65	49	59	54	54	63	64	66			50
MUL	70	38		73	76		77	91				
PAC												
WHT	64	59	44	66	56	46	68	76	71			
FRL	55	54	45	57	51	40	64	66	65			47

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	53%	44%	9%	47%	6%
08	2023 - Spring	57%	44%	13%	47%	10%
06	2023 - Spring	56%	44%	12%	47%	9%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	67%	52%	15%	54%	13%
07	2023 - Spring	41%	37%	4%	48%	-7%
08	2023 - Spring	83%	60%	23%	55%	28%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	61%	43%	18%	44%	17%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	94%	39%	55%	50%	44%

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

CIVICS						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	65%	59%	6%	66%	-1%

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.

Civics demonstrated the lowest performance. We had a new teacher, new to civics instruction, which led to lower than typical performance overall. This teacher made up 45% of our civics performance.

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

Civics demonstrated the lowest performance. We had a new teacher, new to civics instruction, which led to lower than typical performance overall. This teacher made up 45% of our civics performance.

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.

Gulf Middle School has exceeded all state averages.

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

Within the departments which demonstrated positive growth between 2022 and 2023, 8th grade mathematics resulted in the greatest increase from a 78% to 94%.

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

Increase reading interventions through reading and subject areas.

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

Our highest priorities for 2023-2024 will be Civics followed by reading.

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 Math

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.

There was a change in testing for this past school year, our school saw a decrease in 6th grade math proficiency when comparing previous year proficiency to end of year proficiency.

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

Students in 6th grade will increase their proficiency from 67% to 70% based on end of year progress monitoring measures.

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

Data will be reviewed regularly and shared appropriately during PLC and grade level meetings. Teachers will identify students and specifically target them for increased opportunities for engagement and practice.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:
Matthew Toadvine (mathewjt@leeschools.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:
Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Teachers across all disciplines will use Marzano's High Yield Strategies. Teachers will specifically use the strategies that have been identified by the school as focus strategies. These strategies include Numbered Heads together, distributed summarizing and writing to raise achievement.

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

These strategies have been proven to lead to increased learning gains and increased understanding of standards.

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.

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

There was a change in testing for this past school year, our school saw a decrease in ELA proficiency. This is a concern for our students' success in the future.

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

Students will increase their proficiency in ELA from 58% to 60% based on end of year progress monitoring measures.

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

Data will be reviewed regularly and shared appropriately during PLC and grade level meetings. Teachers will identify students and specifically target them for increased opportunities for engagement and practice.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Emma Winfield (emmamw@leeschools.net)

Evidence-based Intervention: Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Teachers across all disciplines will use Marzano's High Yield Strategies. Teachers will specifically use the strategies that have been identified by the school as focus strategies. These strategies include Numbered Heads together, distributed summarizing and writing to raise achievement.

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

These strategies have been proven to lead to increased learning gains and increased understanding of standards.

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.

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Social Studies

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 school saw a decrease in civics proficiency when comparing previous year proficiency to end of year proficiency.

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

Students in civics will increase their proficiency from 69% to 72% based on end of year progress monitoring measures.

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

Data will be reviewed regularly and shared appropriately during PLC and grade level meetings. Teachers will identify students and specifically target them for increased opportunities for engagement and practice.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

James Moreland (jameswmo@leeschools.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:
Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Teachers across all disciplines will use Marzano's High Yield Strategies. Teachers will specifically use the strategies that have been identified by the school as focus strategies. These strategies include Numbered Heads together, distributed summarizing and writing to raise achievement.

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

These strategies have been proven to lead to increased learning gains and increased understanding of standards.

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.

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

#4. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Teacher Retention and Recruitment

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.

Over the past few years, we have see a higher turnover in teaching staff as veteran teachers retire. There is a need to provide more support for our new teachers coming in.

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

All of our teachers will participate in instructional rounds this school year. They will each make 3 visits a colleague's classroom and observe a lesson. They will then complete a reflection sheet about the observation.

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

The reflection sheet will be a google form that will provide school administration with information about the completion rates, the observations, the needs and opportunities for growth based upon the teacher's reflections on the visits.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

James Moreland (jameswmo@leeschools.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.)

Regularly include teacher voice in decision-making through leadership meetings, SAC and staff meetings

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

This fosters a culture of trust, freedom and respect.

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.

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

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).

The School District of Lee County follows all state and federal guidelines when allocating school funding. The schools are budgeted in multi-faceted methods based on the student's needs. Initially, the schools are tiered based on the following criteria: student proficiency, learning gains, struggling schools, % of new teachers, % of ELL students, and percentage of ESE students for academic support and funding purposes. Content tiers are also established to provide instructional support resources based on individual student group needs. Within each school's Title I, SAI, and UniSIG plans, as appropriate, there is a requirement to address ESSA student groups through high-quality instruction and monitoring systems. School funding needs are addressed weekly throughout the school year in collaboration with principal supervisors and the budget department. Principal supervisors provide ongoing monitoring of student data and underperforming subgroups through monthly visits and data chats.

Budget to Support Areas of Focus

Part VII: Budget to Support Areas of Focus

The approved budget does not reflect any amendments submitted for this project.

1	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math	$0.00
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	$0.00
3	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Social Studies	$0.00
4	III.B.	Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Teacher Retention and Recruitment	$0.00
		Total:	$0.00

Budget Approval

Check if this school is eligible and opting out of UniSIG funds for the 2023-24 school year.

Yes