Clifford Meigs Middle School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Clifford Meigs Middle School

150 RICHBOURG AVE, Shalimar, FL 32579

[no web address on file]

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Okaloosa County School Board on 8/28/2023.

SIP Authority

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

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

Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)

A school not identified for CSI or TSI, but has one or more subgroups with a Federal Index below 41%.

Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)

A school not identified as CSI that has at least one consistently underperforming subgroup with a Federal Index below 32% for three consecutive years.

Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)

A school can be identified as CSI in any of the following four ways:

1. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%;
2. Have a graduation rate at or below 67%;
3. Have a school grade of D or F; or
4. Have a Federal Index below 41% in the same subgroup(s) for 6 consecutive years.

ESEA sections 1111(d) requires that each school identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI develop a support and improvement plan created in partnership with stakeholders (including principals and other school leaders, teachers and parent), is informed by all indicators in the State's accountability system, includes evidence-based interventions, is based on a school-level needs assessment, and identifies resource inequities to be

addressed through implementation of the plan. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as TSI, ATSI and non-Title I CSI must be approved and monitored by the school district. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as Title I, CSI must be approved by the school district and Department. The Department must monitor and periodically review implementation of each CSI plan after approval.

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

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

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

I. School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

We improve the lives of our students and community by teaching students how to be safe, respectful, and responsible by owning their actions.

Provide the school's vision statement.

We inspire the next generation of student leaders.

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
Bowell, Melissa	Principal	I am the instructional leader of the school.
Yoder, Nathan	Teacher, ESE	Teaches self-contained ESE students ESE Case Manager Plan of Care Tutor
Jones, Rachel	Assistant Principal	Curriculum and Instruction Tutoring Plan Plan of Care Plan Oversees all student services
Little, Christy	Teacher, ESE	ELA ESE Teacher Case Manager ESE Department Chair

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.

ESE and Gen. Ed Teacher leaders, along with admin, reviewed 2 years' of data to determine the school's greatest needs for improvement in ELA and math. Each teacher's input was used to develop the plan as laid out here.

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))

Admin and SIP team will routinely look at lesson plans and do walk throughs of ELA, math, social studies, and science classes, particularly the General Ed. classes with high numbers of ESE students. Case Managers will routinely be in contact with gen ed teachers to ascertain ESE students' progress via progress reports.

All ESE students not in Learning Strategies, Intensive Reading, or Foundational Math will be pulled out of electives by a Title I Paraprofessional where they will work on ALEKS for math and Lexia for ELA.

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

2023-24 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Middle School 6-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	37%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	60%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	ATSI
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD)* English Language Learners (ELL) Asian Students (ASN) Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: C 2019-20: A 2018-19: A 2017-18: A
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	37	21	30	88
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	20	17	48
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5	4	17
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	2	8	16
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	29	54	34	117
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	42	45	25	112
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	29	54	34	117

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	45	62	44	151

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	4	0	2	6
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	27	36	33	96
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	15	21	40
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	6	0	18
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	2	2	17
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	46	40	52	138
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	55	40	41	136
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	46	40	52	138

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	60	49	57	166

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	4	2	2	8
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	0	4

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	27	36	33	96
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	15	21	40
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	6	0	18
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	2	2	17
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	46	40	52	138
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	55	40	41	136
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	46	40	52	138

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	60	49	57	166

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	4	2	2	8
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	0	4

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*	56	58	49	49	55	50	57		
ELA Learning Gains				37			54		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				24			44		
Math Achievement*	55	71	56	53	36	36	50		
Math Learning Gains				56			34		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				46			30		
Science Achievement*	55	61	49	61	63	53	57		
Social Studies Achievement*	59	70	68	71	66	58	74		
Middle School Acceleration	56	66	73	57	54	49	57		
Graduation Rate					61	49			
College and Career Acceleration					73	70			
ELP Progress	71	31	40	42	66	76	71		

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

See [Florida School Grades, School Improvement Ratings and DJJ Accountability Ratings](https://www.floridacims.org).

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	59
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	352
Total Components for the Federal Index	6

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
Percent Tested	96
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	50
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	496
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	27	Yes	2	1
ELL	45			
AMI				
ASN	75			
BLK	41			
HSP	57			
MUL	56			
PAC				
WHT	59			
FRL	52			

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	34	Yes	1	
ELL	43			
AMI				
ASN	73			
BLK	41			
HSP	46			
MUL	49			
PAC				
WHT	52			
FRL	43			

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	56			55			55	59	56			71
SWD	22			26			22	39	26		5	
ELL	41			37			50	25			5	71
AMI												
ASN	90			60							2	
BLK	45			45			38	36			4	
HSP	53			60			56	50	47		6	73
MUL	60			48			42	77	53		5	
PAC												
WHT	58			57			60	64	55		5	
FRL	49			47			47	49	47		6	71

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	49	37	24	53	56	46	61	71	57			42
SWD	22	31	23	26	38	36	40	56	31			
ELL	23	35	35	40	48	50	40	72				42
AMI												
ASN	80			80	60							
BLK	35	38	31	32	55	43	38	54				
HSP	30	30	30	49	56	48	43	79	48			42
MUL	50	40	21	49	56	38	86	53	52			
PAC												
WHT	54	38	21	57	56	48	61	73	58			
FRL	37	33	21	41	54	46	46	65	41			

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	57	54	44	50	34	30	57	74	57			71
SWD	19	35	33	24	32	25	22	55	27			
ELL	34	55	53	30	41	42		54				71
AMI												
ASN				80	80							
BLK	63	74	64	29	14	17	41	47	60			
HSP	54	51	30	41	29	26	41	72	50			69
MUL	45	42	25	44	28	29	71	65	50			
PAC												
WHT	59	54	49	55	36	32	61	79	59			
FRL	46	48	40	37	31	29	50	62	52			60

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	51%	54%	-3%	47%	4%
08	2023 - Spring	54%	57%	-3%	47%	7%
06	2023 - Spring	52%	57%	-5%	47%	5%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	41%	65%	-24%	54%	-13%
07	2023 - Spring	65%	75%	-10%	48%	17%
08	2023 - Spring	50%	69%	-19%	55%	-5%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	54%	61%	-7%	44%	10%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	84%	59%	25%	50%	34%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	91%	61%	30%	48%	43%

CIVICS						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	59%	70%	-11%	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.

7th Grade ELA at Meigs Middle School was only 50% Proficient. These students increased from the year before but were still the lowest group at Meigs. This is the group that we are targeting with pull out remediation with a Title Paraprofessional or certified teacher.

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

Civics scores dropped from 71 to 59% from the last year. This was anticipated as we had a teacher leave mid-year and had no replacement. We made some good hires of teachers who are capable and veteran and should see an improvement this year.

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 greatest gap was with our Level 2 students. The factors that contributed to this was that our students were not effective on grade level standards. Each ELA teacher has disaggregated their data and had individual data chats with students at the end of last year and will combine last year's PM3 data with this year's PM1 data to give parents and students a clearer indication of their overall strengths and weaknesses. This will help hone in on the standards that teachers need to continue to teach and reteach.

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

All grades of ELA, especially with our ESE self-contained students, saw tremendous growth from FAST 1 to FAST 3. We implemented a pull-out remediation plan that included all bubble and ESE students 2 days a week from their elective class. Students worked with a teacher and used Lexia to remediate foundational skills that were sufficient.

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

Our current 7th graders are a definite concern in terms of EWS data. 60 of them have 2 or more EWS indicators. The most concerning being that there were 12 students who failed ELA, 13 who failed math, 46% of them scored a level 1 on the grade 6 ELA FAST, and 55 of them scored a level 1 on the grade 6 Math FAST. We know we are going to have to support and remediate this grade level, especially as they are now also going to be required to take Civics, which is difficult reading for students.

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

1. Increase overall school ELA proficiency to 60% from 52%
2. Increase ESE ELA proficiency to 44% from 34%
3. Increase Math proficiency in 6th grade to 64% from 44%
4. Increase ESE math proficiency to 65%
5. Decrease chronic absenteeism by 5% each semester.

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

#1. 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.

Students with disabilities were at 24% compared to the overall ELA achievement of 49% (2022).

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

The percentage of Students with Disabilities will increase proficiency on their respective grade level BEST ELA standards from 24% to 44% by May 2024 as measured by the FAST/PM 3.

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

This area of focus will be monitored monthly by Lexia reports, teacher data and student data chats, walkthroughs and PM1 and PM2.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Melissa Bowell (bowellm@okaloosaschools.com)

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.)

The evidence-based intervention is to continue to utilize small group remediation in pull-out with Lexia. Lexia is an adaptive computer program that meets students where they are in reading comprehension, vocabulary development, and phonics. The teacher is there to remediate the student on a 1:1 basis.

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

This adaptive program meets students exactly where they are, and the teacher is able to re-teach and assess if the program is working.

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

#2. 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.

Since our data shows that students who struggle with attendance are also predominantly ESE students, we will focus on a positive culture, making students want to attend.

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

Meigs will reduce chronic absenteeism by 5% in the first semester of the 2023-2024 school year using PBIS strategies to positively influence attendance.

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

Weekly attendance reports will be pulled and monitored by the SIP team and admin. PBIS incentives for classes and grades with the best attendance will be used.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Rachel Jones (rachel.jones@okaloosaschools.com)

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.)

Early intervention and reducing barriers to attendance. Teachers will take accurate and daily attendance, which will be monitored by the attendance office and the SIP team weekly. Upon any student's 3rd unexcused absence, phone calls will be made to the house from the front office. Any barrier to attendance will be addresses then, as well.

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

Early intervention and positive communication with a problem solving mentality will help the parent better get the student to school. Like any partnership, these interventions will help focus on the positive and team aspect of a 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.

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

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

Everything begins with the data. Upon analysis of the data, teacher recommendations, programs, and other personnel decisions are made. For example, Meigs is now a Title I school, so we hired an additional Title Math teacher to improve scores and 2 additional Title paraprofessionals who will push into ELA, science, socials studies, and math classes to help provide small group remediation. Additionally, these paraprofessionals will pull students out to provide remediation. Finally, we used Title funds to purchase ALEKS and Lexia seats to further drill down to individual student needs.

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.

This SIP will be shared with SAC during SAC meetings. Additionally, a portion of the SIP will be a focus of each monthly faculty meeting. Finally, a copy of the SIP will be placed on the school webpage.

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 principal has a weekly email distribution that includes 54% of the overall parent population. The Sunday evening email serves to explain to parents what is going on instructionally and extracurricular activities for that week. Additionally, we invite parents to all school functions, such as pep rallies, multiple open houses, and a "Becoming a Middle Schooler" night.

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))

Particularly with the SWD group, the school plans to continue to focus on areas for improvement via professional development. All ELA teachers attend 3 district -led professional development trainings with their peer teachers. School-based PD will include instructional rounds at Meigs and at other schools in the district. Finally, common planning at least 1 time weekly to coordinate, plan, and discuss standards and best practices.

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))

This plan in addition to our district School Performance Plan, which is our school's road map to improvement, are the ways we will improve student achievement.

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))

The school has a 5 day a week Mental Health Counselor, who focuses on in need students. Students who are placed on behavioral contracts are immediately placed with the MHC. She also sees students of concern based on parent, student, or teacher observations. We also have an ESE Social Worker who focuses on teaching social skills to students who need it and have it written into their IEP. Finally, we have a school counselor who also focuses on small groups and mentoring with students who are in need based on attendance, discipline, etc.

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))

Meigs has several postsecondary and CTE courses/tracks available. First, we offer the coding CTE course track, which culminates with the 8th grade course for high school credit. Second, we have the Artificial Intelligence CTE course track, which culminates with the 5.0 AI course and certification. Finally, we offer the Building Trades CTE track of courses, which culminates with the high school credit course. Each of these tracks have an 8th grade course which matriculates to the high school. Additionally, we offer all advanced courses in math, with Algebra I Honors and Geometry I Honors. This enables students to earn high school credit earlier so they can advance further while in high school.

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).

We have a weekly behavioral MTSS where our school counselor, ESE Social Worker, Behavior Interventionist, Assistant Principal and grade level teachers meet to discuss and implement behavioral supports. Monthly grade level meetings also help identify students in need. Discipline reports add another layer for behavioral MTSS where student referrals are looked at and plans are made to help improve student behaviors and outcomes.

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))

There are 3 real tracks of professional development activities for all teachers at Meigs Middle School. First, all teachers in content areas and ESE (high need) attend 3 district created professional development trainings with their grade level cohort. This allows for streamlined PD and collaboration with

grade level teachers. Additionally, we have school-based PD where we complete instructional rounds both on our campus and at other schools where there are expert teachers. This is all done with the expertise of an instructional coach or an administrator. Finally, we offer monthly mini-PDs on campus in lieu of a faculty meeting. These "Tuesday Tips" trainings are chosen by teachers based on their needs and wants. These mini-PDs are led by on campus expert teachers and range from technology needs to research based strategies in best practices groups.

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