

Okaloosa County School District

Davidson 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	9
III. Planning for Improvement	14
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	18
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	0
VI. Title I Requirements	0
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

Davidson Middle School

6261 OLD BETHEL RD, Crestview, FL 32536

[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.

Davidson Middle School is committed to providing a safe, inviting, and challenging environment in which students can acquire the cognitive, physical, social, and creative skills they need to achieve academic and personal goals.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Davidson Middle School will equip students for a lifetime of learning.

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
Tew, Holly	Principal	
King, Laura	Assistant Principal	
Gouthro, Lauren	Teacher, K-12	
Hritz, Angela	Teacher, K-12	
Hatcher, Ashley	Teacher, K-12	

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.

Late Spring: Departments were given a list of the school focus targets from last year's SPP to reflect on their implementation throughout the year. Reflections were collected by grade level and department chairs to examine areas to include in the 23-24 SPP. A list of initiatives was then provided to each department to discuss and identify what they would like to focus on during this upcoming school year.

Summer: The SPP team met multiple times to develop and collaborate on the SPP. The team discussed test results and adjusted the SPP based on needs reflected in the standardized test results.

Preplanning: The administration will meet with department and grade level chairs to review the SPP with the expectation to review the classroom implementation plan initiatives for the 23-24 school year. The administration will share with the entire staff the expectation during weekly department meetings to discuss various initiatives and the implementation process in classrooms.

August: The administration team met with the district office to review and revise before presenting to the SAC.

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))

Progress monitoring will occur through student grade checks, strategically planned IEP meeting days, small group lesson plans for push-in support, Lexia, and Lexia reports. These will be monitored through the FOCUS grade book, outlook calendar, lesson plans, department discussions, walkthroughs, and real-time student data reports.

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	28%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	55%
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) Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: B 2019-20: A 2018-19: A 2017-18: 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	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	68	64	53	185
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	34	25	77
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	35	10	63
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	25	33	28	86
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	58	77	66	201
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	65	29	26	120
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	58	77	66	201

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	75	101	77	253

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	7	1	4	12
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	6	1	11

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	54	43	39	136
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	15	12	41
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	28	19	8	55
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	42	20	21	83
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	79	60	82	221
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	113	37	67	217
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	79	60	82	221

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	108	82	91	281

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	12	2	3	17
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	4	2	17

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								54	43	39	136
One or more suspensions								14	15	12	41
Course failure in ELA								28	19	8	55
Course failure in Math								42	20	21	83
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment								79	60	82	221
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment								113	37	67	217
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.								79	60	82	221

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	108	82	91	281

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	12	2	3	17
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	4	2	17

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*	55	58	49	52	55	50	57		
ELA Learning Gains				48			54		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				42			46		
Math Achievement*	73	71	56	61	36	36	59		
Math Learning Gains				66			40		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				64			42		
Science Achievement*	57	61	49	54	63	53	62		
Social Studies Achievement*	66	70	68	68	66	58	68		
Middle School Acceleration	60	66	73	62	54	49	55		
Graduation Rate					61	49			
College and Career Acceleration					73	70			
ELP Progress		31	40		66	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)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	62
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	311
Total Components for the Federal Index	5

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index

Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index

ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	57
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	517
Total Components for the Federal Index	9
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	34	Yes	2	
ELL	49			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	46			
HSP	69			
MUL	62			
PAC	55			
WHT	64			
FRL	53			

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	36	Yes	1	
ELL	62			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	51			
HSP	58			
MUL	59			
PAC				
WHT	58			
FRL	54			

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	55			73			57	66	60			
SWD	27			48			31	38	25		5	
ELL	47			63			36				3	
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	41			63			36	46	46		5	
HSP	61			72			74	62	77		5	
MUL	55			73			41	79	64		5	
PAC	20			90							2	
WHT	57			74			61	67	59		5	
FRL	47			66			49	58	47		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	52	48	42	61	66	64	54	68	62			
SWD	27	40	38	33	46	48	37	44	13			
ELL	42	62	64	58	74	82		55				
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	41	49	41	46	63	67	38	63	53			
HSP	49	53	54	56	71	64	42	63	67			
MUL	56	49	53	59	64	71	62	63	52			
PAC												
WHT	53	47	38	65	65	62	58	71	63			
FRL	44	46	44	55	63	67	54	60	51			

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	46	59	40	42	62	68	55			
SWD	35	48	48	39	47	50	42	47	15			
ELL	47	56	45	42	50							
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	44	48	46	35	28	30	38	53	25			
HSP	55	61	47	65	47	42	70	71	61			
MUL	56	50	50	57	35	26	63	63	53			
PAC												
WHT	59	55	46	62	41	47	64	71	56			
FRL	47	46	46	47	34	35	48	60	44			

Grade Level Data Review– State Assessments (pre-populated)

The data are raw data and include ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data. The percentages shown here represent ALL students who received a score of 3 or higher on the statewide assessments.

An asterisk (*) in any cell indicates the data has been suppressed due to fewer than 10 students tested, or all tested students scoring the same.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
07	2023 - Spring	53%	54%	-1%	47%	6%
08	2023 - Spring	54%	57%	-3%	47%	7%
06	2023 - Spring	54%	57%	-3%	47%	7%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	69%	65%	4%	54%	15%
07	2023 - Spring	75%	75%	0%	48%	27%
08	2023 - Spring	78%	69%	9%	55%	23%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	57%	61%	-4%	44%	13%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	86%	59%	27%	50%	36%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	97%	61%	36%	48%	49%

CIVICS						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	66%	70%	-4%	66%	0%

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.

The lowest performance at Davidson Middle School is our SWD (Students with Disabilities) subgroup. The 21-22 for our SWD was 27, which is below the threshold of 41%. This is consistent with prior year data (35%) in 20-21. Thus it is a 2-year trend. Overall we did improve our ELA proficiency from 52% to 54%.

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

ELA's lowest quartile gains showed the most significant decline from 48% in 20-21 to 38% in 21-22. This could be partly due to being a center school for students with autism.

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

Our most significant gap is ELA proficiency which is 51.9% versus the state average of 53.2%. We believe changing to a new textbook had an impact, and this was the first full year of implementation. We also had several veteran teachers leave and could not hire a certified teacher. We noticed we have more level 2s proficiency and less level 1s than the state. This is encouraging because level 2s are almost 3s. They are just not there yet.

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

We had a 14% gain in Math achievement going from 61% in 21-22 to a 75% in 22-23. We adopted a new textbook and followed the pacing guide provided by the district.

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

In reflecting on the EWS data, our number of students with two or more EWS indicators is an area of concern. For 2022-2023 we had 281 students with two or more indicators.

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

1. Differentiation/small group instruction
2. ESE students in learning strategies (Lexia) or intensive reading (Read18)
3. Increasing attendance

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 Differentiation**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.

Differentiation, including small group instruction, can positively impact our learning gains and sub-group data.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Our mid-year goal is 33% of our SWD will be proficient, and our end-of-year goal is 41% proficiency for our SWD.

Monitoring:

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

This area of focus will be monitored through grade book and FAST assessments throughout the school year.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Laura King (kingla@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.)

Read 180

Teacher knowledge of students

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Small group learning has an effect size of .47 on Hatties Visible Learning Research.

Teacher knowledge of students reflects the accuracy of an individual teacher's knowledge of students in his or her classes and how that knowledge determines the kinds of classroom activities and materials as well as the difficulty of the tasks assigned.

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.

Addressing the needs of students and improving attendance will increase their academic achievement. Academic performance should increase when barriers to success, like poor attendance, course failures, and discipline issues, are improved. This is a critical need for students at Davidson Middle School.

Measurable Outcome:

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

At the beginning of the second semester for the 2023-2024 school year, the number of students with two or more EWS indicators will decrease from 281 to 200.

Monitoring:

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

Leadership members will follow MTSS protocols when a student is absent
 Teachers will identify struggling students, implement strategies and interventions, and progress monitor
 Teachers will identify students with two or more EWS indicators
 Teachers will refer these students to the MTSS team

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Laura King (kingla@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.)

Monitoring the progress of all students and proactively intervening when students show early signs of attendance, behavior, or academic problems. Response to Intervention has an effect size of 1.29, according to Hattie's Visible Learning.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

This strategy was selected to monitor the progress and analyze the data for our at-risk students. By implementing interventions, we should see an increase in student achievement when attendance increases.

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).

Schools are provided training and a timeline from the Curriculum and Instruction Department to complete the School Improvement Plan (SIP). The district offers collaborative opportunities for schools to meet the following:

- Facilitate sharing and presentation of district-level data.
- Support the inclusion of various data sources; assist data collection efforts with district resources and connections.
- Bring schools together to focus on related priorities to pool expertise and resources.

Schools then conduct a needs assessment of stakeholders and prioritize needs to be included in SIP. During the review process, the district reviews school SIP and ensures the school identifies allowable funding sources that are not currently being utilized to implement the strategy(s) intended to improve learner outcomes; instructional coaches, tutoring, ESE resources, and professional learning. If funding does not match the school's identified focus areas, the District will engage the school in further conversation with inquiries such as;

- Connect schools with available statewide systems of support, including external facilitators and high-quality professional development (FDLRS and FIN).
- Identify the resources that are not currently available to ensure the strategy is implemented as intended.
- Determine what training teachers need to implement the strategy as intended.

After District provides feedback to schools, the SIP will be refined and submitted. School district leadership will meet quarterly with schools for collaborative discussion, feedback, and progress monitoring updates on the status of SIP focus areas.