

Leon County Schools

Fairview Middle School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	11
III. Planning for Improvement	16
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	26
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	26
VI. Title I Requirements	28
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	29

Fairview Middle School

3415 ZILLAH ST, Tallahassee, FL 32305

<https://www.leonschools.net/fairview>

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.

Fairview Middle School is committed to critically-thinking young men and women who are engaged citizens in their school and in the community at large. In pursuing this mission, we dedicate ourselves to preparing our students to become confident, self-directed, life-long learners prepared to adapt effectively to the world of the future.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Fairview Middle School will provide opportunities for our students to engage with technology, collaborative learning, and self-directed projects in order for them to achieve their full potential as twenty-first century global citizens.

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
Edwards, Rusty	Principal	Provides instructional leadership; ensures that student learning is a priority; works collaboratively to develop and implement an instructional framework that aligns curriculum with state standards, effective practices, student learning needs and assessments; recruits, retains and develops an effective and diverse faculty and staff; employs and monitors a decision making process that is based on vision, mission and improvement priorities using facts and data; builds and maintains relationships with students, faculty, parents and community; creates school-wide goals and monitors outcomes, manages the fiscal resources of the school in a way that focuses on effective instruction, achievement of all students and optimal school operations; serves on school and district committees while participating in staff development opportunities.
Bell, Lyndsey	Assistant Principal	Supports the mission and vision of the school leader by: Overseeing curricular decisions and instructional material purchases; overseeing progress monitoring; managing assessments and exams; performing teacher observations; overseeing guidance and social studies departments; generating master and student schedules; overseeing student progress and quality points; planning and implementing professional development; referral coordinator; overseeing interns and practicum students; reviewing lesson plans; other duties as assigned.
Cole, Antwan	Assistant Principal	Supports the mission and vision of the school leader by: Processing discipline referrals and handling major offenses; working with teachers on classroom management strategies; MTSS team member; assisting with at risk students; managing the Crisis Response Plan; tracking at risk student discipline; managing facilities; managing the Maintenance Department; leading manifestation meetings; completing students code of conduct booklets; conducting Threat Assessment Team meetings; overseeing OFI and lunch detention; other duties as assigned.
Montgomery, LaToya	Assistant Principal	Supports the mission and vision of the school leader by: Ensuring that all staff is participating in and completing staff development and trainings; monitor at risk student attendance, provide before and after school supervision; LEA for IEP meetings; manage ESE intervention and team meetings; participate in MTSS; complete teacher and support staff observations; complete Level II investigations; assist with processing discipline referrals; complete suicide assessments; manage school-wide transportation; managing Title I compliance and programming; other duties as assigned.
Burns, Petra	Math Coach	Review student data and provide guidance in developing and spearheading teaching strategies and intervention for math students; plan and assist with student data chats; plan and implement department-wide approach to progress monitoring; other duties as assigned.

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Timmons, Tiffanie	Reading Coach	Review student data; coordinates district and state assessments; plans and implements school-wide progress monitoring; monitors and tracks student data; serves on MTSS; other duties as assigned.

Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Development

Describe the process for involving stakeholders (including the school leadership team, teachers and school staff, parents, students (mandatory for secondary schools) and families, and business or community leaders) and how their input was used in the SIP development process. (ESSA 1114(b)(2))

Note: If a School Advisory Council is used to fulfill these requirements, it must include all required stakeholders.

The school leadership team met and reviewed the data for Fairview Middle School, as a team we made decisions about how to best move our students and our data forward. The School Advisory Council was used to develop the plan, by providing input and feedback on the plan from last year as well as suggestions on moving forward. Teacher leaders from the subject areas identified as areas of need were gathered and reviewed the data to help with the creation of the school goals for the 23-24 school year. The team met and discussed the goals they presented and came to consensus on those goals based on our school data.

SIP Monitoring

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

The SIP will be monitored quarterly by the School Advisory Council, monthly by the leadership team as well as department leaders. During these reviews, student data will be monitored as well as best practices for instruction shared. We will use our Math and ELA coaches to push into classrooms to support quality instruction and rigor of standards.

Demographic Data

Only ESSA identification and school grade history updated 3/11/2024

2023-24 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Middle School 6-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	Yes
2022-23 Minority Rate	88%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	97%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	TSI
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No

2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD)* English Language Learners (ELL) Asian Students (ASN) Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)*
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: C 2019-20: B 2018-19: B 2017-18: C
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

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

Indicator	Grade Level										Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	84	81	103	268	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	91	65	63	219	
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	3	10	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	8	4	15	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	98	86	98	282	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	82	70	71	223	
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	36	28	32	96

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	8	2	10
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1

Prior Year (2022-23) As Initially Reported (pre-populated)**The number of students by grade level that exhibited each early warning indicator:**

Indicator	Grade Level										Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	51	56	57	164	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	4	6	20	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	18	5	28	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	20	11	36	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	66	74	95	235	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	90	0	84	270	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	54	6	13	73	

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	56	81	72	209

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	6	7	1	14
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	6	15

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	51	56	57	164	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	4	6	20	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	18	5	28	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	20	11	36	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	66	74	95	235	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	90	0	84	174	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	54	6	13	73	

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	56	81	72	209

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	6	7	1	14
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	6	15

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*	43	52	49	48	53	50	47		
ELA Learning Gains				50			45		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				27			26		
Math Achievement*	47	58	56	50	34	36	44		
Math Learning Gains				64			37		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				49			16		

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
Science Achievement*	35	51	49	49	55	53	46		
Social Studies Achievement*	71	75	68	57	61	58	55		
Middle School Acceleration	79	67	73	87	47	49	70		
Graduation Rate					51	49			
College and Career Acceleration					76	70			
ELP Progress	20	42	40	54	73	76			

* In cases where a school does not test 95% of students in a subject, the achievement component will be different in the Federal Percent of Points Index (FPPI) than in school grades calculation.

See [Florida School Grades, School Improvement Ratings and DJJ Accountability Ratings](#).

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	TSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	49
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	295
Total Components for the Federal Index	6
Percent Tested	96
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	TSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	54
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	535
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	95
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	29	Yes	4	4
ELL	37	Yes	1	
AMI				
ASN	96			
BLK	42			
HSP	51			
MUL	64			
PAC				
WHT	70			
FRL	40	Yes	2	

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	27	Yes	3	3
ELL	49			
AMI				
ASN	95			
BLK	43			
HSP	50			
MUL	55			
PAC				
WHT	76			
FRL	40	Yes	1	

Accountability Components by Subgroup

Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school. (pre-populated)

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2021-22	C & C Accel 2021-22	ELP Progress
All Students	43			47			35	71	79			20
SWD	20			29			13	53			4	
ELL	38			52							3	20
AMI												
ASN	95			99			89	100	98		5	
BLK	31			33			22	63	60		5	
HSP	39			54			38	74			4	
MUL	54			55			60	64	85		5	
PAC												
WHT	63			68			50	81	87		5	
FRL	29			33			22	59	58		5	

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	48	50	27	50	64	49	49	57	87			54
SWD	19	35	23	22	43	31	16	27				
ELL	58	50	0	65	67							54
AMI												
ASN	96	84		100	95		97	95	100			
BLK	34	41	26	34	53	48	29	46	80			
HSP	47	45	8	55	63		64	58	60			
MUL	49	50		51	64	30	53	67	78			
PAC												
WHT	69	64		70	81		78	78	92			
FRL	29	37	28	30	52	42	25	43	70			

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	47	45	26	44	37	16	46	55	70			
SWD	18	32	31	10	13	10		23				
ELL	62	62		71	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
AMI												
ASN	95	84		96	78		100	97	97			
BLK	30	33	24	28	23	14	27	39	53			
HSP	61	49		52	46	20	40	91	47			
MUL	65	48		64	59			71	64			
PAC												
WHT	75	70		71	63		82	75	80			
FRL	25	28	20	22	22	16	23	32	42			

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	48%	49%	-1%	47%	1%
08	2023 - Spring	38%	49%	-11%	47%	-9%
06	2023 - Spring	38%	48%	-10%	47%	-9%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	41%	55%	-14%	54%	-13%
07	2023 - Spring	38%	51%	-13%	48%	-10%
08	2023 - Spring	34%	49%	-15%	55%	-21%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	14%	38%	-24%	44%	-30%

ALGEBRA

Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	95%	58%	37%	50%	45%

GEOMETRY

Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	100%	58%	42%	48%	52%

BIOLOGY

Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	90%	65%	25%	63%	27%

CIVICS

Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	69%	72%	-3%	66%	3%

III. Planning for Improvement**Data Analysis/Reflection**

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources.

Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year's low performance and discuss any trends.

Science showed the lowest performance compared to previous years. This was due to several factors including a delayed impact as science is not tested in middle school until 8th grade. This year we are taking a more proactive approach to Science by offering Science Bootcamp which will act a supplement to classroom instruction.

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

While our students showed a decline in the areas of ELA and Math proficiency, Science showed the greatest decline from 49% in the 21-22 school year to 37% in the 22-23 school year. The Science decline is a direct correlation to the decline in reading proficiency, and comprehension. Our students who did not do well in ELA also did not do well on the Science test. This correlation shows that our students need additional instruction in Language Arts, and comprehension skills in Science.

Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends.

The component with the greatest gap compared to the state average was science, with a gap of 7%. ELA had a gap of 6%, Math also had a gap of 6%. The greatest factor that contributed to this gap is a delayed impact as science is not tested in middle school until 8th grade. This year we are taking a more proactive approach to Science by offering Science Bootcamp which will act a supplement to classroom instruction.

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

Civics showed the greatest improvement from 57% in the 21-22 School year to 71% in the 22-23 school year which is a growth of 14%. The greatest contributing factor was collaborative planning with the Civics team, as well as classroom walkthroughs done by members of the team to other Civics classrooms. The Social Studies teachers implemented progress monitoring with fidelity and used the data during their collaborative planning sessions to make changes to their instruction in order to guarantee that students were receiving quality instruction that meets the FL Standards.

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

Two potential areas of concern based on our Early Warning Systems are the number of students who scored level 1 on ELA and students who missed 10% or more of school. Level 1 students are being addressed with increased data chats and support from our reading coach and department. Attendance is being addressed with our school attendance team and increasing parental contact.

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

Students with disabilities demonstrating an increase in their English Language Arts Skills.

Students with disabilities demonstrating an increase in their Math skills.

All of our students showing an increase in their English Language Arts skills and comprehension.

All of our students showing an increase in their Math skills and comprehension.

All of our students showing an increase in their Science skills and comprehension.

Area of Focus

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

#1. 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.

Maintaining teachers is beneficial for the school, keeping consistent teachers allows for relationships between teachers, students, staff, and parents. It also allows the teachers to grow as a team and strengthen cross-curricular teaching.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Maintain 75% of our 23-24 teaching staff for the 24-25 school year.

Monitoring:

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

Teacher climate surveys, and open door meetings with the administration to share concerns.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Rusty Edwards (edwardsr@leonschools.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.)

Quarterly feedback sessions with identified teacher leaders on campus.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

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.

1. Teacher leaders will receive feedback from teachers.
2. Teacher leaders will share that feedback with administration
3. Administration will review the feedback as a collective group
4. Action steps will be taken based on the feedback.

Person Responsible: Rusty Edwards (edwardsr@leonschools.net)

By When:

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

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

Our students with disabilities has been performing below 32% proficiency for the last 3 school years.

Measurable Outcome:

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

32% of our students with disabilities will show proficiency in English Language Arts, scoring a level 3 or above on the FAST PM3 Math Assessment for the 23-24 school year.

Monitoring:

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

FAST Data from PM 1, PM2, and PM3 will be used in conjunction with classroom and district assessments and progress monitoring. This data will be reviewed monthly by the leadership team and Language Arts department.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

LaToya Montgomery (montgomeryla@leonschools.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.)

Support Facilitation will be used this year for some of our students who are identified as those with disabilities. Many of our students with disabilities are enrolled in intensive reading course designed to increase their reading comprehension skills. We have ESE teachers conducting push ins and pull outs of ESE students in English Language Arts to foster growth. ESE teachers and support facilitation teachers are being given professional development on how to best support our students in the classroom. Additionally, we have invited our students with disabilities to before and after school tutoring, as well as Saturday school which is focused on increasing student success in English Language Arts.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Before and After School tutoring along with Saturday School allow our students more targeted instruction in key areas of English Language Arts. This allows them additional time to interact and gain strength in this area. ESE Teacher pull outs and push ins allow for more support and smaller groups for these students in the classroom

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.

- 1) Monitor IEP goal progress
- 2) When Progress Monitoring scores come out we will analyze our individual student scores.
- 3) We will look at our grade level scores and needs as a department.

- 4) New strategies may need to be implemented by the 2nd Progress Monitoring.
- 5) Compare the year-long growth of each Progress Monitoring Test and the Study Sync Assessments

Person Responsible: LaToya Montgomery (montgomeryla@leonschools.net)

By When:

#3. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

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

Our students with disabilities has been performing below 32% proficiency for the last 3 school years in the area of Mathematics.

Measurable Outcome:

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

32% of our students with disabilities will show proficiency in Math, scoring a level 3 or above on the FAST PM3 Math Assessment for the 23-24 school year.

Monitoring:

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

FAST Data from PM 1, PM2, and PM3 will be used in conjunction with classroom and district assessments and progress monitoring. This data will be reviewed monthly by the leadership team and Math department.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

LaToya Montgomery (montgomeryla@leonschools.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.)

Support Facilitation will be used this year for some of our students who are identified as those with disabilities. . We have ESE teachers conducting push ins and pull outs of ESE students in Math to foster growth along with support from our Math Coach. ESE teachers and support facilitation teachers are being given professional development on how to best support our students in the classroom. Additionally, we have invited our students with disabilities to before and after school tutoring, as well as Saturday school which is focused on increasing student success in Math Fluency and skills.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Before and After School tutoring along with Saturday School allow our students more targeted instruction in key areas of Math and Math fluency. This allows them additional time to interact and gain strength in this area. ESE Teacher pull outs and push ins allow for more support and smaller groups for these students in the classroom

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.

- 1) Monitor IEP goal progress
- 2) When Progress Monitoring scores come out we will analyze our individual student scores.
- 3) We will look at our grade level scores and needs as a department.

- 4) New strategies may need to be implemented by the 2nd Progress Monitoring.
- 5) Compare the year-long growth of each Progress Monitoring Test and the Reveal/ ALEKS Assessments

Person Responsible: LaToya Montgomery (montgomeryla@leonschools.net)

By When:

#4. 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.

Our science data declined this year from 49% percent in the 21-22 school year to 37% proficiency for the 23-23 school year. This percentage is not only a decline from years previous, but also 7% lower than the state average of 44% and the district average of 38%.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Our Science data will show 42% proficiency.

Monitoring:

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

Collaborative planning and progress monitoring data analysis will allow our teachers to identify the strengths and weaknesses of the students throughout the year. This will allow teachers to see what students know, how they are progressing in their knowledge, as well as what skills still need to be mastered.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Lyndsey Bell (belll1@leonschools.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.)

Students who are identified based on their data, will be invited to Science Boot Camp which will focus on comprehension and mastery of Science benchmarks. Science Rewind will also be used to allow our students to access previously taught materials in 6th & 7th grade bridging the gap that is being assessed.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Science Boot Camp will be offered to students who indicate a need for additional time with the Science content in a small group. This intervention allows the students to receive more intensive and individualized instruction during Boot Camp.

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.

1. Students will take the PM1 Math, Reading, district baseline assessments, and district science assessments.
2. The team will review the data and make adjustments to curriculum as needed.

Person Responsible: Lyndsey Bell (belll1@leonschools.net)

By When:

#5. 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.

Our Math proficiency for the 22-23 School year is projected to be 50% proficiency for grades 6-8. This means that half of our students were not proficient in math.

Measurable Outcome:

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

52% Of our students will be proficient, scoring a level 3 or above on the FAST PM3 Math Assessment for the 23-24 school year.

Monitoring:

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

FAST Data from PM 1, PM2, and PM3 will be used in conjunction with classroom and district assessments and progress monitoring. This data will be reviewed monthly by the leadership team and Math department. Data chats with students and teachers will be used to ensure that all stakeholders are aware of their progress.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Petra Burns (burnsp@leonschools.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.)

Math Coach Push in support, ALEKS program through the textbook, the Acaletics Program will be used with those students who are in the bottom 25% for math based on FAST PM1

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Math Coach push-ins will target those students who are struggling with mastery of the skills, which allows for more targeted support, Moby Max interventions allows for support on prerequisite skills.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

1. Students will take the FAST PM1 Math Assessment
2. Data will be reviewed by the Math Department, Math Coach, Teacher, Administration.
3. A Data chat with the student will occur
4. New strategies may need to be implemented.

Person Responsible: Petra Burns (burnsp@leonschools.net)

By When:

#6. 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.

Our students proficiency for the 22-23 school year in ELA was 44%, which shows that the majority of our students were not proficient.

Measurable Outcome:

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

This year 47% of our students will be proficient, scoring a level 3 or above on the FAST PM3 Math Assessment for the 23-24 school year.

Monitoring:

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

FAST Data from PM 1, PM2, and PM3 will be used in conjunction with classroom and district assessments and progress monitoring. This data will be reviewed monthly by the leadership team and ELA department. Data chats with students and teachers will be used to ensure that all stakeholders are aware of their progress.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Tiffanie Timmons (timmonst@leonschools.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.)

Students who scored at or below the 10th percentile are taking Intensive reading courses to aid in their comprehension skills. Our reading coach is providing push in and pull out group supports. Moby Max is being used to help students close gaps from previous years.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Reading Coach push-ins will target those students who are struggling with mastery of the skills, which allows for more targeted support, Intensive reading uses the Language! Live program with targeted student lessons and small group teacher instruction.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

1. Students will take the FAST PM1 ELA Assessment
2. Data will be reviewed by the ELA Department, Reading Coach, teacher, Administration.
3. A Data chat with the student will occur
4. New strategies may need to be implemented in the classroom and through the Study Sync Curriculum

Person Responsible: Tiffanie Timmons (timmonst@leonschools.net)

By When:**CSI, TSI and ATSI Resource Review**

Describe the process to review school improvement funding allocations and ensure resources are allocated based on needs. This section must be completed if the school is identified as ATSI, TSI or CSI in addition to completing an Area(s) of Focus identifying interventions and activities within the SIP (ESSA 1111(d)(1)(B)(4) and (d)(2)(C)).

School Improvement funding allocations this year will be directed to supplies to support our Science Boot camp, as well as ELA and Math Boot Camps. These supplies will allow our teachers to provide additional interventions in the area of Science, ELA and Math. Boot camp will focus on our students who are identified by progress monitoring data as not meeting or exceeding the standard in order to assist in their growth in these areas.

Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE)**Area of Focus Description and Rationale**

Include a description of your Area of Focus (Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA) for each grade below, how it affects student learning in literacy, and a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed. Data that should be used to determine the critical need should include, at a minimum:

- The percentage of students below Level 3 on the 2022 statewide, standardized ELA assessment. Identification criteria must include each grade that has 50 percent or more students scoring below level 3 in grades 3-5 on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.
- The percentage of students in kindergarten through grade 3, based on 2021-2022 end of year screening and progress monitoring data, who are not on track to score Level 3 or above on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.
- Other forms of data that should be considered: formative, progress monitoring and diagnostic assessment data.

Grades K-2: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA**Grades 3-5: Instructional Practice specifically related to Reading/ELA****Measurable Outcomes**

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each grade below. This should be a data-based, objective outcome. Include prior year data and a measurable outcome for each of the following:

- Each grade K -3, using the coordinated screening and progress monitoring system, where 50 percent or more of the students are not on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment;
- Each grade 3-5 where 50 percent or more of its students scored below a Level 3 on the most recent statewide, standardized ELA assessment; and
- Grade 6 measurable outcomes may be included, as applicable.

Grades K-2 Measurable Outcomes**Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes****Monitoring****Monitoring**

Describe how the school's Area(s) of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcomes. Include a description of how ongoing monitoring will impact student achievement outcomes.

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Evidence-based Practices/Programs**Description:**

Describe the evidence-based practices/programs being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each grade and describe how the identified practices/programs will be monitored. The term "evidence-based" means demonstrating a statistically significant effect on improving student outcomes or other relevant outcomes as provided in 20 U.S.C. §7801(21)(A)(i). Florida's definition limits evidence-based practices/programs to only those with strong, moderate or promising levels of evidence.

- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs meet Florida's definition of evidence-based (strong, moderate or promising)?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align with the district's K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align to the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards?

Rationale:

Explain the rationale for selecting practices/programs. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting the practices/programs.

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs address the identified need?
- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken to address the school's Area(s) of Focus. To address the area of focus, identify 2 to 3 action steps and explain in detail for each of the categories below:

- Literacy Leadership
- Literacy Coaching
- Assessment
- Professional Learning

Action Step**Person Responsible for Monitoring**

Title I Requirements

Schoolwide Program Plan (SWP) Requirements

This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A SWP and opts to use the SIP to satisfy the requirements of the SWP plan, as outlined in the ESSA, Public Law No. 114-95, § 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

Provide the methods for dissemination of this SIP, UniSIG budget and SWP to stakeholders (e.g., students, families, school staff and leadership and local businesses and organizations). Please articulate a plan or protocol for how this SIP and progress will be shared and disseminated and to the extent practicable, provided in a language a parent can understand. (ESSA 1114(b)(4))

List the school's webpage* where the SIP is made publicly available.

Public Hearing, SAC, School Website, Share with our community and stakeholders via Listserv,
<https://www.leonschools.net/fairview>

Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission, support the needs of students and keep parents informed of their child's progress.

List the school's webpage* where the school's Family Engagement Plan is made publicly available. (ESSA 1116(b-g))

Fairview plans to build increased positive relationships with parents, families, and stakeholders by gearing our parent and family engagement events toward topics and events that will benefit our community. Some of these events include information about grades and testing, STEAM, as well as high school credit options and graduation goals. We are also working to build our community partnerships by getting more local community members and businesses connected to our school community.

Describe how the school plans to strengthen the academic program in the school, increase the amount and quality of learning time and help provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum. Include the Area of Focus if addressed in Part III of the SIP. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)ii)

Fairview plans to strengthen our academic programs through several avenues. Using support facilitation to increase the amount of support our students with disabilities receive will allow them to strengthen their academic skills. Saturday enrichment and recovery programs afford our students the opportunity to recover or strengthen their academic skills by allowing them additional time and smaller groups of students. Fairview will also be utilizing an academic response team made up of various school faculty and staff with the goal of intervening with our students earlier and throughout the year to improve their mastery of standards, grades, and progress monitoring data.

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

N/A

Optional Component(s) of the Schoolwide Program Plan

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

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

N/A

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

N/A

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

N/A

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

N/A

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

N/A

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: Positive Culture and Environment: Teacher Retention and Recruitment	\$0.00
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities	\$0.00
3	III.B.	Area of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities	\$0.00
4	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Science	\$0.00
5	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math	\$0.00
6	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	\$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