Three Oaks Middle School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Three Oaks Middle School

18500 3 OAKS PKWY, Fort Myers, FL 33967

http://okm.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.

To provide a quality education in a safe and well-managed environment.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Three Oaks Middle School is committed to focusing on student achievement strategies that enable all students to meet or exceed the rigorous district standards.

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
Walker, Forrest	Principal	Monitor progress, guide, and support teachers and the SIP team.
Rendon, Kristina	Assistant Principal	Monitor progress, guide, and support teachers and the SIP team.
Barta, Richard	Assistant Principal	Monitor progress, guide, and support teachers and the SIP team.
Laux, Jason	Teacher, K-12	PLC duties for the science department; collect and analyze data, and guide the department with decision-making on strategies to meet the goal.
Pennington, Lindsay	Teacher, K-12	PLC duties for the Math department; collect and analyze data, and guide the department with decision-making on strategies to meet the goal.
Summers, Rich	Teacher, K-12	PLC duties for the Social Science department; collect and analyze data, and guide the department with decision-making on strategies to meet the goal.
Rossi, Lillian	School Counselor	upport students with schedules and mental health, communicate with teachers and SIP team members.
Claprood, Julie	Teacher, K-12	Support students with schedules and mental health, communicate with teachers and SIP team members.

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.

TOMS process for involving all stakeholders begins first with the alignment of the leadership team and previous years' data analysis to discuss school-wide improvement goals, Along with plans to meet those goals. Next, the faculty is presented with current state of the school, what the plan of action is, and how we need to get there. Faculty members meet to provide input in the school improvement plan including; needs assessment, data review, and the plan for improvement within their department and grade level teams. Lastly, this school improvement plan is shared with TOMS families (parents, students, and community members) during the first School Advisory Council meeting in September to provide a laser focus of the schools goals and implementation of meeting the goals. SAC members offer feedback and input to enhance the school improvement plan and insight on the development process.

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 continuous School Improvement Plan for effective implementation will be modeled and monitored throughout our various Professional Learning Communities; department, grade level, and leadership platforms. Our visuals will consist of data walls represented by each content area along with smart goals. During our department level PLC's, teachers will focus on student by student, benchmark by benchmark, standard by standard in order to ensure all students achieve their academic goals. The administration team will conduct group and individual instructional walkthroughs to respective learning structures and provide feedback as it relates to academic pacing, scope, and sequence. The achievement level descriptors will assist our approach to ensuring rigorous content is being delivered so scholars are proficient in achieving mastery level skills.

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	42%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	68%
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: B 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	40	50	93	183
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	25	69	107
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	0	2	18
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	0	3	17
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	69	73	96	238
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	52	41	48	141
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	

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	49	43	67	159

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	2	1	4	7

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	52	62	72	186
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	16	15	41
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	2
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	0	5
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	53	56	68	177
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	54	45	63	162
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	42	38	47	127

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	2	3	1	6

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	52	62	72	186
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	16	15	41
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	2
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	0	5
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	53	56	68	177
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	54	45	63	162
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	42	38	47	127

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	2	3	1	6

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*	61	48	49	63	48	50	62		
ELA Learning Gains				50			55		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				29			35		
Math Achievement*	76	56	56	68	32	36	65		
Math Learning Gains				59			49		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				51			31		

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
Science Achievement*	64	45	49	58	51	53	63		
Social Studies Achievement*	71	64	68	74	53	58	75		
Middle School Acceleration	92	80	73	90	45	49	75		
Graduation Rate					44	49			
College and Career Acceleration					66	70			
ELP Progress	41	29	40	49	78	76	35		

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](https://www.floridacims.org).

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	405
Total Components for the Federal Index	6
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	59
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	591
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	36	Yes	4	
ELL	44			
AMI				
ASN	80			
BLK	45			
HSP	57			
MUL	76			
PAC				
WHT	79			
FRL	58			

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	27	Yes	3	1
ELL	40	Yes	3	
AMI				
ASN	67			
BLK	46			
HSP	50			
MUL	78			
PAC				
WHT	66			
FRL	50			

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	61			76			64	71	92			41
SWD	23			35			21	35	80		6	19
ELL	33			53			19	51	69		6	41
AMI												
ASN	71			85			80	83			4	
BLK	45			45							2	
HSP	47			64			47	57	91		6	38
MUL	67			70			77		90		4	
PAC												
WHT	69			83			76	77	92		5	
FRL	49			63			49	56	94		6	37

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	63	50	29	68	59	51	58	74	90			49
SWD	18	30	23	28	36	31	13	32				31
ELL	33	36	22	40	50	41	33	37	60			49
AMI												
ASN	77	56	30	76	55		85		92			
BLK	50	48		46	39							
HSP	50	45	26	54	53	41	40	60	85			44
MUL	88	67		82	73							
PAC												
WHT	70	52	29	78	63	61	68	85	92			
FRL	48	45	25	50	52	44	36	64	79			52

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	55	35	65	49	31	63	75	75			35
SWD	16	34	28	25	28	18	10	38				11
ELL	29	37	32	34	33	25	26	38	60			35

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
AMI												
ASN	83	67		77	70		70	100				
BLK	60	60	50	48	45	43	47					
HSP	49	48	31	52	44	29	49	61	67			33
MUL	71	64		86	57							
PAC												
WHT	70	60	39	74	52	31	75	82	78			
FRL	49	46	34	50	40	25	38	61	58			36

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	59%	44%	15%	47%	12%
08	2023 - Spring	56%	44%	12%	47%	9%
06	2023 - Spring	60%	44%	16%	47%	13%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	74%	52%	22%	54%	20%
07	2023 - Spring	46%	37%	9%	48%	-2%
08	2023 - Spring	82%	60%	22%	55%	27%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	64%	43%	21%	44%	20%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	96%	39%	57%	50%	46%

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	68%	59%	9%	66%	2%

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 English Language Arts preliminary data showed the lowest performance at 60%. Some contributing factors consists of a new curriculum process that entailed major adjustments to our normal teaching and learning due to rigorous benchmark content. This new curriculum was a challenge throughout our district based on preliminary data analysis. Additionally, one of our teachers was out the entire 1st semester due to health matters. Lastly, two-thirds of the leadership team was new and had to acclimate their talents and experiences from high school to the middle school curriculum.

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

The greatest decline from our prior year data was in 7th grade math due to the misalignment of assessments and advance 7th grade students taking the 8th grade tests.

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.

Our school data did not have any gaps when compared to the state average. We will continue to work on our main areas of focus where we can still improve our assessment scores to avoid any possible gaps that may be produced in the future.

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

Our Math preliminary data component showed the most improvement this school year. The math team continuously viewed student data via ALEKs and performance matters. We also devised an intervention process for our level 2 and level 3 students. Our 7th grade on level scholars achieved 46% proficiency which was outstanding.

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

Based on the Early Warning System data from Part 1, absenteeism and students suspensions raise a huge concern toward overall student achievement. Our belief is that students who attend school on a consistent basis and their focus is on learning will achieve at their highest personal potential in all areas.

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

Create a positive culture and safety for all students and staff
Student achievement in all content areas
Increase in student attendance
Decrease in student discipline
Professional development/leadership and transitional growth in staff

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

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

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

The percentage of Three Oaks Middle School students showing proficiency in ELA decreased from 68% in the 2021-2022 school year to 60% in the 2022-2023 school year.

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

During the 2023-2024 school year, Three Oaks Middle School will increase the number of students earning proficiency in ELA Achievement from 60% to 66%.

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

Review Lesson Plans
Monitor scope and sequence - academic pacing - achievement level descriptors
Weekly PLC meetings
i-Ready lessons and passing percentages
FAST Progress Monitoring Baseline and Midpoint scores

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Forrest Walker (forrestwa@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.)

ELA and Reading disaggregated
All level 1 and 2 students receive an extra block of Reading class
Implementation of Studysync, a new ELA curriculum
Each quarter, all content areas will teach a reading strategy specific to their subject. The reading strategy for each quarter will be decided upon in faculty meetings.
Daily 10 minutes of content reading in each class
Once per quarter Close Reads will be implemented in all core classes
To increase student engagement, teachers will use random selection to call on students for answers.

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

Weekly progress monitoring of formative and summative assessments by teachers.
Weekly PLC meetings by departments to analyze data and differentiate instruction.
iReady reports will be reviewed quarterly.

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

https://www.floridacims.org

#2. 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.

The percentage of Three Oaks Middle School students showing proficiency in 7th grade math increased from 4% to 46% in the 2022-2023 school year.

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

During the 2023-2024 school year, Three Oaks Middle School will increase the number of students earning proficiency in 7th grade Math Achievement from 46% to 50%.

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

Review Lesson Plans
Monitor scope and sequence - academic pacing - achievement level descriptors
Weekly PLC meetings
i-Ready reports
FAST Progress Monitoring Baseline and Midpoint scores
ALEKS reports

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Forrest Walker (forrestwa@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.)

Disaggregated Math
i-Ready lessons and diagnostics assessments
ALEKS
Teachers will use random selection to call on students.

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

Weekly progress monitoring of formative and summative assessments by teachers.
Weekly PLC meetings by departments to analyze data and differentiate instruction.
ALEKs reports will be reviewed quarterly.

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 Science

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

The percentage of Three Oaks Middle School students showing proficiency in 8th grade science increased from 62% to 65% in the 2022-2023 school year.

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

During the 2023-2024 school year, Three Oaks Middle School will increase the number of students earning proficiency in 8th grade science Achievement from 65% to 68%.

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

Review Lesson Plans
Monitor scope and sequence - academic pacing - achievement level descriptors
Weekly PLC meetings
CK12.org
Survivor Science
Khan Academy

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Kristina Rendon (kristinalr@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.)

Common assessments
Exemplars
Vocabulary builder
CK12.org
Khan Academy

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

Weekly progress monitoring of formative and summative assessments by teachers.
Weekly PLC meetings by departments to analyze data and differentiate instruction.
Assessment reports will be reviewed quarterly.

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 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.

Students who focus on learning while in school and not receive referrals and/or suspensions will achieve their highest personal potential. A positive culture will sustain and alter the learning trajectory of our ELL and scholars with disabilities via an environment that embraces acceptance and accommodate their personal learning growth.

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

During the 2023-2024 school year, Three Oaks Middle School will decrease the number of students with one or more suspensions from 41 to 30 students.

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

FOCUS Analytics Report
Early Warning System Report

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Lynsey Doughty (lynseycd@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.)

PBIS
Restorative Practice
Mentor program
High Reliability Schools Level 1 Certification

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

This process will assist and motivate scholars to be independent thinkers and maintain an honest mindset while treating others with 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 process to review the school improvement funding allocations and to ensure resources are allocated based on needs will be monitored weekly by our leadership team: Administration, School Counselors, LMHP, Social Worker, ESE Department Head, and Intervention Specialist. Our SIP Coordinator will also provide monthly updates to our SAC Members regarding interventions and activities supporting our ESE and ELL student population. Our Professional Learning Communities will monitor the specificities and growth of this focus group and ascertain intervention processes pertaining to there overall needs.

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: ELA	$0.00
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math	$0.00
3	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Science	$0.00
4	III.B.	Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Early Warning System	$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