Howard Middle School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Howard Middle School

1655 NW 10TH ST, Ocala, FL 34475

[no web address on file]

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes (F.S.), requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a new, amended, or continuation SIP for each school in the district which has a school grade of D or F; has a significant gap in achievement on statewide, standardized assessments administered pursuant to s. 1008.22 by one or more student subgroups, as defined in the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), 20 U.S.C. s. 6311(b)(2)(C)(v)(II); has not significantly increased the percentage of students passing statewide, standardized assessments; has not significantly increased the percentage of students demonstrating Learning Gains, as defined in s. 1008.34, and as calculated under s. 1008.34(3)(b), who passed statewide, standardized assessments; has been identified as requiring instructional supports under the Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE) program established in s. 1008.365; or has significantly lower graduation rates for a subgroup when compared to the state's graduation rate. Rule 6A-1.098813, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.), requires district school boards to approve a SIP for each Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) school in the district rated as Unsatisfactory.

Below are the criteria for identification of traditional public and public charter schools pursuant to the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) State plan:

Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)
A school not identified for CSI or TSI, but has one or more subgroups with a Federal Index below 41%.

Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)
A school not identified as CSI that has at least one consistently underperforming subgroup with a Federal Index below 32% for three consecutive years.

Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)
A school can be identified as CSI in any of the following four ways: 1. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%; 2. Have a graduation rate at or below 67%; 3. Have a school grade of D or F; or 4. Have a Federal Index below 41% in the same subgroup(s) for 6 consecutive years.

ESEA sections 1111(d) requires that each school identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI develop a support and improvement plan created in partnership with stakeholders (including principals and other school leaders, teachers and parent), is informed by all indicators in the State's accountability system, includes evidence-based interventions, is based on a school-level needs assessment, and identifies resource inequities to be addressed through implementation of the plan. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as TSI, ATSI and non-Title I CSI must be approved and monitored by the school district. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as Title I, CSI must be approved by the school district and

Department. The Department must monitor and periodically review implementation of each CSI plan after approval.

The Department's SIP template in the Florida Continuous Improvement Management System (CIMS), https://www.floridacims.org, meets all state and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all ESSA components for a support and improvement plan required for traditional public and public charter schools identified as CSI, TSI and ATSI, and eligible schools applying for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) funds.

Districts may allow schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions to develop a SIP using the template in CIMS.

The responses to the corresponding sections in the Department's SIP template may address the requirements for: 1) Title I schools operating a schoolwide program (SWD), pursuant to ESSA, as amended, Section 1114(b); and 2) charter schools that receive a school grade of D or F or three consecutive grades below C, pursuant to Rule 6A-1.099827, F.A.C. The chart below lists the applicable requirements.

SIP Sections	Title I Schoolwide Program	Charter Schools
I-A: School Mission/Vision		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(1)
I-B-C: School Leadership, Stakeholder Involvement & SIP Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(2-3)	
I-E: Early Warning System	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-A-C: Data Review		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-F: Progress Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(3)	
III-A: Data Analysis/Reflection	ESSA 1114(b)(6)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(4)
III-B: Area(s) of Focus	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(i-iii)	
III-C: Other SI Priorities		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(5-9)
VI: Title I Requirements	ESSA 1114(b)(2, 4-5), (7)(A)(iii)(I-V)-(B) ESSA 1116(b-g)	

Note: Charter schools that are also Title I must comply with the requirements in both columns.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Department encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

I. School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

Howard Middle School is committed to developing all students in partnership with our community to become knowledgeable, compassionate global citizens, and we believe that every student should be provided opportunity to achieve their personal best.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The faculty and staff of Howard Middle School are committed to providing our students with quality educational experiences, integrating curriculum content with real world experiences. All students are provided opportunities to achieve and reach their full potential through rigorous instruction, relevant curriculum, and relationships with staff.

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
Parker, Suzette	Principal	The school principal serves as the instructional leader by providing professional learning opportunities for teachers aligned to standards-basic instruction. The principal also facilitates the school's collaborative planning and builds opportunities for teachers to participate in instructional to foster professional growth and development. The principal provides feedback to teachers to improve standards-based instruction and tracks formative assessment data weekly. She also tracks data from district and school progress monitoring assessments and assists teachers in understanding how to use that data to plan instruction. The principal also oversees the leadership team and delegates tasks such as coaching, data collection, and specified collaborative planning processes, and other duties as assigned.
Leach-Cotton, Jennifer	Assistant Principal	The assistant principal works with the leadership team to support teachers in both planning and implementing instruction aligned to the standards. The assistant principal also facilitates the school's collaborative planning sessions and supports opportunities for teachers to participate in instructional rounds to foster professional growth and development. The assistant principal assists the principal in providing a common vision for the use of data-based decision-making, assists in the development of a strong infrastructure of resources for the implementation of high yield instructional strategies, further assists the principal in the assessment of school staff, assists with the monitoring of the implementation of the intervention and necessary documentation, assists with the delivery of professional development for effective instructional delivery. The assistant principal carefully monitors the additional academic support schedule to ensure all personnel is serving in their specified areas.
Hinson, Bashannon	Assistant Principal	The assistant principal works with the leadership team to support teachers inb oth planning and implementing instruction aligned to the standards. The assistant principal also facilitates the school's collaborative planning sessions and supports opportunities for teachers to participate in instructional rounds to foster professional growth and development. The assistant principal assists the principal in providing a common vision for the use of data-based decision-making, assists in the development of a strong infrastructure of resources for the implementation of high yield instructional strategies, further assists the principal in the assessment of school staff, assists with the monitoring of the implementation of the intervention and necessary documentation, assists with the delivery of professional development for effective instructional delivery. The assistant principal carefully monitors the additional academic support schedule to ensure all personnel is serving in their specified areas.
Howard, Heather	School Counselor	The guidance counselor participates in the collection, interpretation, and analysis of data; facilitates the development of intervention plans; provides support for intervention fidelity and documentation; assists with professional development for behavior concerns; assists in facilitation of

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		data-based decision-making activities. She also provides quality services and expertise on issues ranging from IEP development to intervention with individual students. She communicates with child-serving community agencies to support the students' academic, emotional, behavioral, and social success.
Sapp, Kiticha	School Counselor	The guidance counselor participates in the collection, interpretation, and analysis of data; facilitates the development of intervention plans; provides support for intervention fidelity and documentation; assists with professional development for behavior concerns; assists in facilitation of data-based decision-making activities. She also provides quality services and expertise on issues ranging from IEP development to intervention with individual students. She communicates with child-serving community agencies to support the students' academic, emotional, behavioral, and social success.
Daubenmire, Matthew	Dean	The student services manager provides teachers with classroom support and feedback to ensure a safe, cooperative environment for learning to take place. Resources, such as behavior contracts, for at-risk students are carefully considered and shared by the SSM. He coordinates efforts to use positive reinforcements to encourage more positive behavior choices by students. He also monitors and shares disciplinary/attendance data, and serves on the PBIS/Safety committee. In addition, the SSM may act as a liaison with outside agencies that offer support to students and families
Dortch, Essie	Dean	The student services manager provides teachers with classroom support and feedback to ensure a safe, cooperative environment for learning to take place. Resources, such as behavior contracts, for at-risk students are carefully considered and shared by the SSM. She coordinates efforts to use positive reinforcements to encourage more positive behavior choices by students. She also monitors and shares disciplinary/attendance data, and serves on the PBIS/Safety committee. In addition, the SSM may act as a liaison with outside agencies that offer support to students and families.
Hamel, Helen	Magnet Coordinator	The Magnet Coordinator participates in the collection, interpretation, and analysis of data dealing with the Magnet program. She recruits and retains magnet students. She guides and supports them as they work towards fulfilling the expectations of the IB learner profiles. She works closely with teachers and assists them in generating rigorous and aligned IB unit plans. She also assists in new teacher retention &related support programs.
Macias, Lisa	Instructional Coach	The Content Area Specialist assists teachers with the interpretation and implementation of the Florida Standards for Language Arts, Writing and Math. She provides instructional support, including preparation of lesson plans, content alignment, content delivery methods, and instructional

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		modeling. She also assists in the design and implementation of progress monitoring, data collection, and data analysis and participates in the design and delivery of professional development.. She works closely with teachers and assists them in generating rigorous and aligned IB unit plans. She also assists in new teacher retention &related support programs.

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.

Stakeholders are invited to be involved through the variety of Parent and Family Engagement events that are structured to support our identified ESSA subgroups which include students in the following subgroups: ESE, black (AA), ELL and economically disadvantaged (ED). Our School Advisory Committee, SAC, also provides input for both school improvement goals and ways to involve more families in the school. The principal also works with a Community Subcommittee to review school goals and craft next steps to more actively engage families in participation in raising student achievement in Reading and Math with a focus on the needs of our families who are ED, AA, ELL or who have students with special needs (ESE).

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))

SIP goal monitoring will be conducted through weekly classroom walkthroughs using a classroom walkthrough tool aligned to SIP goals. Data from these walkthroughs will be discussed at weekly administrative team meetings, and action steps will be planned for teachers and students that may need additional support. District support teams will also walk classrooms quarterly to lend additional insight and to discuss possible revisions to the supportive plan. Data from walkthroughs will be shared with teachers. Data from FAST progressing monitoring and District Progress Monitoring Assessments will also be used to tweak SIP goals and the supportive plan for teachers and students as needed.

Demographic Data	
Only ESSA identification and school grade history updated 3/11/2024	
2023-24 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Middle School 6-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	Yes
2022-23 Minority Rate	70%

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: B
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	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Total
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	134	65	108	307
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	37	87	102	226
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	34	44
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	37	13	52
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	54	83	95	232
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	60	69	110	239
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	50	62	58	170
	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	11	11	13	35

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	3	1	19	23
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	112	98	93	303
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	90	85	86	261
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	31	104	79	214
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	93	130	90	313
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	107	108	83	298
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	128	113	92	333
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	
	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	87	125	115	327

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	1	5	14	20
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	7	10

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	112	98	93	303
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	90	85	86	261
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	31	104	79	214
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	93	130	90	313
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	107	108	83	298
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	128	113	92	333
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	
	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	87	125	115	327

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	1	5	14	20
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	7	10

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*	48	40	49	48	42	50	50		
ELA Learning Gains				42			45		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				25			31		
Math Achievement*	52	48	56	47	30	36	47		

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
Math Learning Gains				46			35		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				33			30		
Science Achievement*	44	40	49	46	45	53	47		
Social Studies Achievement*	60	61	68	62	49	58	65		
Middle School Acceleration	77	71	73	69	41	49	79		
Graduation Rate					40	49			
College and Career Acceleration					64	70			
ELP Progress	18	36	40	33	69	76	62		

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	50
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	299
Total Components for the Federal Index	6
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	TSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	45
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	4
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	451
Total Components for the Federal Index	10

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
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	18	Yes	4	4
ELL	25	Yes	2	2
AMI				
ASN	92			
BLK	33	Yes	2	
HSP	45			
MUL	64			
PAC				
WHT	70			
FRL	43			

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	21	Yes	3	3
ELL	28	Yes	1	1
AMI				
ASN	83			
BLK	34	Yes	1	
HSP	44			
MUL	53			
PAC				
WHT	58			
FRL	36	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)

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
2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
All Students	48			52			44	60	77			18
SWD	17			19			22	13			4	
ELL	26			26			17	38			5	18
AMI												
ASN	87			88			93	100	91		5	
BLK	29			33			19	41	45		5	
HSP	43			47			41	49	69		6	18
MUL	59			69			33	68	89		5	
PAC												
WHT	62			65			64	74	84		5	
FRL	32			37			31	45	68		5	

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
2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
All Students	48	42	25	47	46	33	46	62	69			33
SWD	14	26	21	11	26	25	14	28				
ELL	24	34	25	23	35	32	17	27				33
AMI												
ASN	94	67		94	83		75	93	78			
BLK	26	34	27	24	32	30	30	39	62			
HSP	47	42	22	45	46	33	42	66	63			31
MUL	55	40		64	45		46	80	42			
PAC												
WHT	64	47	27	65	57	45	62	81	75			
FRL	32	33	23	31	38	30	33	49	61			26

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	50	45	31	47	35	30	47	65	79			62
SWD	14	24	19	13	26	30	26	24				
ELL	23	41	45	24	31	46	42	41	55			62
AMI												
ASN	93	72		86	51		75	100	83			
BLK	31	32	27	26	26	26	17	55	57			
HSP	47	46	36	45	36	41	55	60	74			61
MUL	51	44		54	45		50	73	82			
PAC												
WHT	66	55	35	65	41	33	63	72	89			
FRL	36	37	31	33	31	30	29	51	66			64

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	41%	37%	4%	47%	-6%
08	2023 - Spring	47%	38%	9%	47%	0%
06	2023 - Spring	47%	36%	11%	47%	0%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	52%	44%	8%	54%	-2%
07	2023 - Spring	20%	41%	-21%	48%	-28%
08	2023 - Spring	43%	45%	-2%	55%	-12%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	43%	37%	6%	44%	-1%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	92%	44%	48%	50%	42%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	93%	43%	50%	48%	45%

CIVICS						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	59%	58%	1%	66%	-7%

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.

Math proficiency in grades 7 & 8 fell below both the district and state averages for PM3; there were new teachers in both of these grade levels who did not begin until after the school year started; additionally the school has had vacancies in math in both school years 2021-22 and 2020-21.

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

Seventh grade math showed the greatest decline in student proficiency from 2021-22. There were new teachers in this grade levels who did not begin until after the school year started; additionally the school has had vacancies in math in both school years 2021-22 and 2020-21. These prior math vacancies have caused an ongoing deficits in student mastery of math standards.

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.

Seventh grade math showed the greatest decline in student proficiency from 2021-22. There was also a 28 percent difference in math proficiency scores between the state and Howard Middle School. There were new teachers in this grade levels who did not begin until after the school year started; additionally the school has had vacancies in math in both school years 2021-22 and 2020-21. These prior math vacancies have caused an ongoing deficits in student mastery of math standards.

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

Grade 6 math showed the greatest increase in student proficiency (10%). Howard students still achieved 2% below the state average, however they surpassed the district average by 8%. The master schedule was adjusted prior to the start of the school year to place strong teachers in 6th grade math.

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

The greatest area of concern is the large number of students scoring a Level 1 on the state assessments in both ELA and Math. For example, 52% of 7th grade students scored a Level 1 in math and over 30% of the student body scored a Level 1 in ELA.

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

1) Quality of Tier 1 instruction in ELA and MA; 2) Strength of interventions for ESE students; 3) Culture and classroom environment and impact on AA, ED, & ELL students; 4) Engaging strategies for ESE, ELL, AA, and ED students; 5) Chronic Absenteeism of students

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

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Benchmark-aligned Instruction

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

Analysis of state assessment data indicates a need to build lessons that are more closely aligned to the rigor of the standards in the core content areas of ELA and math.The percentage of non-proficient students in grades 6-8 in ELA was 54%, and the percentage of non-proficient students in math for grades 6-8 was 58%. Teacher survey data indicates the need for assistance in understanding the new BEST standards, strategies for engagement, and use of collaborative structures to increase student achievement.

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

If lessons more closely and consistently aligned to the rigor of the standards in the core content areas of ELA and math, then Howard Middle School will raise student proficiency in ELA (47) and Math (55) by 4% as measured by the third FAST Progress Monitoring Assessment (PMA) administered by the State of Florida in the Spring of 2024 and the 3rd District Progress Monitoring Assessment administered (DPMA) by Marion County Public Schools in the Spring of 2024.

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

FAST state PMA and local DPMA data from assessments administered in the fall and winter will be checkpoints utilized to monitor student performance. Leadership team walkthroughs will foster continuous monitoring of classroom instruction, and feedback will be provided to teachers on an ongoing basis. Collaborative planning
lessons facilitated by members of the leadership team and grade level instructional leads focused on student data, task alignment, and standard focused instruction will occur bi-monthly in a formal setting and weekly in an informal setting in the classrooms. Data chats with students and all teachers on intervention data/progress for Reading and Math will occur at regular intervals as dictated by the individual program. These reports will be sent home for parents as well.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jennifer Leach-Cotton (jennifer.leach-cotton@marion.k12.fl.us)

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.)

Direct instruction as defined by John Hattie will be the evidence based strategy used for ELA and Math. The focus on guided and independent practice that is aligned with the rigor of the standard and that are provided by state adopted resources. The communication of expectations by the teachers verbally and with the use of the standard focused board will provide the purpose for the learning in the classrooms. Teachers will collaboratively plan using BEST standard-based resources to develop BEST standards aligned formative assessments. Teachers will plan these formative assessments and task aligned lessons during collaborative planning

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

Direct instruction has a .59 positive effect on student achievement according to John Hattie's research. Setting the purpose for the lesson and providing students with rigorous and relevant tasks will positively impact student achievement. Additionally, research indicates that both formative assessment and collaborative planning are high impact processes that result in student learning. Teachers will utilize

research-based strategies from the school provided professional development to craft standards-aligned formative assessments. Research also shows that planned, explicit, and rigorous tier 1 instruction, along with task alignment, increases student learning 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.

Review of gradual release model practices and share implementation best practices. Explicit training regarding the role of technology to actively engage students in the content during all phases of the gradual release model.

Person Responsible: Jennifer Leach-Cotton (jennifer.leach-cotton@marion.k12.fl.us)

By When: Quarter 1 2023 (August - October)

Student conferencing and feedback practices to allow students to track and celebrate their own mastery of the standards. Teachers conference with students to draft next steps in their learning path. Teacher professional learning focus is crafting aligned, rigorous, formative assessment.

Person Responsible: Bashannon Hinson (bashannon.hinson@marion.k12.fl.us)

By When: Quarter 2 & 3 (October 2023- March 2024)

Student conferencing and feedback practices to allow students to track and celebrate their own mastery of the standards. Teachers conference with students to draft next steps in their learning path. Teacher professional learning focus is crafting aligned, rigorous, formative assessment.

Person Responsible: Bashannon Hinson (bashannon.hinson@marion.k12.fl.us)

By When: Quarter 2 & 3 (October 2023- March 2024)

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups

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 (SWD), African American (AA) students, students who are English Language Learners (ELL), and students who are Economically Disadvantaged (ED) are performing below the Federal Index of 41%. To better serve these students, the school will provide appropriate services, implement universal
design for learning strategies, and provided targeted reading interventions based on student needs.

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

If we provide our SWD, ED, ELL, and AA populations with appropriate services, appropriate reading and math interventions based on student learning needs, and engaging classroom lessons, then we will raise the proficiency of these subgroups to above the 41% ESSA threshold.

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

The area of focus will be closely monitored through classroom walk-throughs, lesson plans, student work, and intervention-based progress monitoring/assessments.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Suzette Parker (suzette.parker@marion.k12.fl.us)

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.)

Through re-examining IEPs, re-evaluating reading and math intervention steps and incorporating universal design for learning (UDL), students will receive appropriate services in their instructional setting.

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

Research shows that students are best served when their services are aligned to their specific needs. Additionally, research has proven that all student engagement and incorporation of UDL are strongly correlated. By working with our ESE Specialist to determine appropriate levels of service, and working with our Assistant Principal for Curriculum to appropriately schedule students into proper ESE supported classrooms and/ or intensive interventions in ELA and math, we will be able to raise proficiency for this sub-group.

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.

Re-examining Individualized Education Plans (IEPs) and make sure that they are being implemented to meet the needs of students.

Person Responsible: Jennifer Leach-Cotton (jennifer.leach-cotton@marion.k12.fl.us)

By When: End of Quarter 1 (October 2023)

Re-evaluating reading intervention and math services to SWD, AA, ED, and ELL to insure data indicates that they are receiving the appropriate remediation.

Person Responsible: Lisa Macias (lisa.macias@marion.k12.fl.us)

By When: Beginning prior to start of school year and then ongoing as student data is updated.

#3. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Early Warning System

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

Howard Middle School will continue to improve and adjust the implementation of PBIS as a school wide initiative. Howard will continue to implement the "I See IB" incentive system for students who are meeting school wide expectations. Howard is also providing professional development on culture and relationships through the lens of PBIS. Culturally Responsive PBIS systems are designed to fit the cultural backgrounds of the individuals they serve- with specific focus on AA, ELL, ED and ESE students . It may require educators to change the way they think about support, and or address student behavior. Effective integration of culturally responsive techniques, and reinforcing positive student interactions will improve overall school culture.

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

If stakeholders at Howard Middle School re-dedicate themselves to improving school culture and relationships through the lens of schoolwide PBIS, then there will be an increase in student proficiency on FAST PM3 in areas of ELA and MA by 4%, decrease in number of office discipline referrals (-5%) and decrease in chronic absences (-5%)

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

Classroom walkthroughs, review of types and number of occurrences of Office Discipline referrals (ODR); and disaggregation of student responses from student survey data.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Bashannon Hinson (bashannon.hinson@marion.k12.fl.us)

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.)

Putting focus on creating and maintaining a positive classroom culture helps to lower the rate of discipline referrals and has a significant positive impact on the school climate as a whole. Students are taught life lessons through a curriculum called Habitudes.

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

Research shows that students have a tendency to resist rules and procedures if there is not a trusting relationship between teacher and student (Marzano, 2003). This leads to higher students achievement and overall student success (National Association of Secondary School Principals NASSP, 2020). Habitudes curriculum helps students make better choices not only in school but also in their daily lives. These character lessons help teach students mutual respect and foster a positive learning environment within our school.

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.

PBIS committee meets monthly ot craft student incentives and to monitor student data.

Person Responsible: Bashannon Hinson (bashannon.hinson@marion.k12.fl.us)

By When: Ongoing

Collaboration with community members from the Black and Hispanic community to unify and celebrate the history of Howard and to unite the school behind 1 common goal- "This is Howard"

Person Responsible: Suzette Parker (suzette.parker@marion.k12.fl.us)

By When: August - December: culminating event is January 20- "Howard Homecoming;" planning next steps Feb- May

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).

Collaborative discussions during School Advisory Council Meetings enable the school to allocate resources to meet the needs of our students and staff. Title 1 allocations are budgeted based on the Comprehensive Needs Assessment of the school, and SAC members utilize their internal funds to support teacher grant requests which are written to support Tier 1 instruction or to promote positive culture. School Title 1 fund usage and internal accounts held by the SAC are a standing agenda items at each SAC meeting.

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.

The goals of the School Improvement Plan (SIP) are outlined and discussed at the Annual Title 1 meeting. In addition, the SIP is published to the school's webpage at www.marionshools.net\hms. The SIP can be translated into any language upon request, and bilingual staff are available to assist in translation as needed. The SIP is routinely discussed and tweaked at SAC meetings throughout the school year. The SIP will be made available to parents upon request and printed.

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))

The school builds positive relationships with parents through strong communication using Skylert phone and e-mail, and text messages; Classroom DOJO app; Twitter and Facebook. The SAC is a bridge that also serves to foster positive school relationships. Parents are welcome into the school as volunteers. We also have a standing committee of involved community members and school staff who work to strengthen positive relationships with parents and community members. https://www.marionschools.net/hms

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)

Collaboration practices and planning time will be focused on task alignment and meeting the rigor of the standard. BEST Standards, the BIG-M and benchmark clarifications will be tools used while planning with peers and with the administrative team. Collaboration will focus largely proper understanding and implementation of the BEST standards in ELA and math. Faculty meetings will be professional development opportunities, and will focus on standards alignment and use of formative assessment and UDL to support that alignment. Collaborative planning and IB planning will be opportunities not only to map out the standards but also to enhance teacher understanding of the standard and to discuss "how" the standard will be addressed. These discussions will highlight formative assessment opportunities.

Standards-based, aligned Tier 1 instruction will continue to be the focus of teacher professional development and collaboration alike. Collaborative planning will prepare teachers for classroom instruction through the design of highly effective lessons plans vetted for standards alignment by teachers with support from the administrative team, The administrative team will continue to share observations from informal walkthroughs with one another in order to devise a teacher support schedule for teachers by specific personnel based on the needs shared. Best practices for ESE and ESOL students will be shared and highlighted by coaches during instructional rounds. Targeted feedback will be provided to teachers regarding standards alignment and other best practices as outlined in the FEAPS.

Additionally, tutoring will be available in Math on campus before and after school. STEAM camps will focus on standard based projects and will be provided for students before and after school. Intensive Math instructor will continue to build math skills of lowest performing math students. The use of district provided interventions in reading will continue and will include: Read 180, System 44, and Study Synch.

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))

NA