Destin Middle School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Destin Middle School

4608 LEGENDARY MARINA DR, Destin, FL 32541

[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.

Placing students on a pathway to success by providing high quality instruction, a wide array of marketable experiences, and unparalleled extracurricular opportunities while developing relationships that meet both their academic and emotional needs.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Preparing today's students for success within and beyond the classroom.

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
Small, Belinda	Principal	To lead the school students and school community in all aspects of advancing the education of all students grade 5-8.

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

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

The data analysis was conducted by the Principal and the school leadership team who also serves as the literacy team was involved in the initial revision of the draft presented by the principal. Students will be involved in the selection of the meaningful recognition and reward for progress towards goal achievement. The plan will be presented at the first SAC meeting made up of parents, teachers, and community members to revise and integrate their ideas to the plan.

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))

After each progress monitoring session, release time will be used to compile the Excel spreadsheet data for the lowest 25% ELA students who are also identified as SWD as well as absenteeism records. This spreadsheet will be presented in visual format to inform stakeholders of the efforts outlined in this document. At the end of the semester, the leadership/literacy team will make recommendations to continue or amend the plan and document this revision in the SPP reflection piece of our SPP.

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 5-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	25%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	37%
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: A 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	32	21	22	21	96
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	4	3	4	9	20
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	3	2	12
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	5	8	7	12	32
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	32	34	35	36	137
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	36	37	20	15	108
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	32	34	35	36	137

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	37	40	38	40	155

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	1	0	0	1
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	26	18	26	29	99
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	6	5	15
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	2	0	6
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	3	7	7	5	22
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	28	28	16	21	93
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	17	36	14	12	79
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	28	28	16	21	93

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	30	34	27	26	117

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

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	26	18	26	29	99
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	6	5	15
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	2	0	6
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	3	7	7	5	22
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	28	28	16	21	93
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	17	36	14	12	79
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	28	28	16	21	93

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	30	34	27	26	117

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

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*	65	58	49	70	55	50	67		
ELA Learning Gains				60			58		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				41			48		
Math Achievement*	80	71	56	76	36	36	71		
Math Learning Gains				69			55		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				58			42		
Science Achievement*	64	61	49	61	63	53	63		
Social Studies Achievement*	84	70	68	88	66	58	80		
Middle School Acceleration	66	66	73	68	54	49	70		
Graduation Rate					61	49			
College and Career Acceleration					73	70			
ELP Progress	58	31	40	84	66	76	59		

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	70
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	417
Total Components for the Federal Index	6
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	68

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	675
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	49			
ELL	48			
AMI				
ASN	87			
BLK	48			
HSP	62			
MUL	66			
PAC				
WHT	72			
FRL	61			

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	39	Yes	1	
ELL	51			
AMI				
ASN	72			
BLK	41			
HSP	59			

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%
MUL	61			
PAC				
WHT	70			
FRL	62			

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY

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	65			80			64	84	66			58
SWD	31			58			35	71			4	
ELL	29			52			38	62			5	58
AMI												
ASN	79			95							2	
BLK	32			58			36	65			4	
HSP	52			60			55	87	62		6	57
MUL	68			70			55	69			4	
PAC												
WHT	68			84			67	87	69		6	56
FRL	53			71			50	79	53		6	58

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	70	60	41	76	69	58	61	88	68			84
SWD	31	35	18	47	51	43	33	62	30			
ELL	46	46	33	56	60	45	37	58	41			84
AMI												
ASN	86	71		86	62		57					

					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
BLK	52	50	42	38	45	18						
HSP	58	56	30	62	66	47	33	78	75			84
MUL	59	47		73	66		58					
PAC												
WHT	72	61	45	79	71	64	67	89	67			83
FRL	61	57	43	68	67	55	50	85	51			78

					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	67	58	48	71	55	42	63	80	70			59
SWD	29	51	49	49	46	27	29	65				
ELL	38	52	59	49	46	31	15	73				59
AMI												
ASN	60	43		84	69		60					
BLK	46	30	20	59	41	45	60					
HSP	60	67	53	55	49	26	41	71	38			57
MUL	51	43	18	65	57	29	42	69				
PAC												
WHT	70	60	53	73	56	45	67	82	72			65
FRL	57	54	46	70	57	58	57	77	55			

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
05	2023 - Spring	64%	61%	3%	54%	10%
07	2023 - Spring	59%	54%	5%	47%	12%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	64%	57%	7%	47%	17%
06	2023 - Spring	66%	57%	9%	47%	19%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	75%	65%	10%	54%	21%
07	2023 - Spring	82%	75%	7%	48%	34%
08	2023 - Spring	82%	69%	13%	55%	27%
05	2023 - Spring	63%	63%	0%	55%	8%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	68%	61%	7%	44%	24%
05	2023 - Spring	51%	57%	-6%	51%	0%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	100%	59%	41%	50%	50%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	100%	61%	39%	48%	52%

CIVICS						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	82%	70%	12%	66%	16%

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.

SWD Lowest 25% The trend continues to be that about a third of SWD students are proficient in reading and about a third make learning gains. One contributing factor is that while our population exceeds 10, we still have a small number so when one student's performance score fluctuates, the impact on percentages can dramatically impact numeric results. Some contributing factor may be lack of knowledge on how to differentiate instruction and/or intensely scaffold and/or make effective use of small group instruction that is more personalized.

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

SWD lowest 25% learning gains in ELA showed a decline from prior year. Two possible factors may be lack of human resources to tutor or pull small groups of students, or teachers overwhelming need to close the gap in reading due to pandemic times that instructors did not have the extra time or knowledge to differentiate the instruction to sufficiently reach the lowest 25% of SWD. An additional factor may have been late timing of intervention due to lack of resources.

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.

Data forthcoming as sited in Data Review section.

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

Math and Social Studies both showed great improvement. We moved to 1-1 technology in classrooms. Math used the technology for daily skills practice and additional resource practice that mirrored taking assessments online. Social Studies used FJCC resources and bootcamps to challenge students.

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

Absences. 99 students were absent more than 10 percent of the year.

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

1. ELA SWD
2. ELA SWD Lowest 25%

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

#1. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to 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.

The breakdown of the data from the Early Warning System (students having two or more indicators for At-Risk) has two strikingly similar numbers. Specifically the number of students out of the 800+ student population who were absent more than 10 percent of the school year was 97. The number of students in the same sample size who scored a level one in proficiency was 93. Additionally only 6 were recorded as failing. Therefore, an area of focus that may prove positive correlation would be to address the need to reduce absences over 10 percent of the school year to decrease the number of students scoring Level 1 because it is widely researched that improvement in attendance in school improves performance.

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

The number of students who are absent more than 10% of the year will be reduced from 99 to less than 75 by the end of the year. The hypothesis is that then number of students scoring Level 1 will mirror the reduction of absences, creating a healthier school climate where low performers are celebrated for coming to school more often.

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

First a list of last year's 99 most absentee students will be identified and placed in an Excel document. Using Focus, a report will be generated on a quarterly basis to compare the 2023-24 SY absentee records of the same students. Data will be entered on the Excel Spreadsheet and graphs will illustrate progress. Homeroom teachers of the students will use the shared data sheet to enter number of absences per quarter. Once a student hits 9 absences in a semester, the homeroom teacher will submit name to grade level meeting for intervention assistance.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Denise Tucker (denise.tucker@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.)

At the end of the first, second, and third quarter, of the 99 students who have reduce their rate of absences from previous year, will be recognized by the principal with a reward system that engages their family in celebration.

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

It is widely known and researched that students and adults alike crave positive recognition and calls home as indicated on our parent satisfaction survey over time. If struggling students make it to our educational environment (participate in school) then they will receive more information and gain skills through more frequent exposure and practice. Thus, performing higher on state tests at the end of the school year.

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. 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.

Using the Data Analysis/Reflection, the SWD group within the lowest 25% achievement on the ELA test was identified as being 18% proficient as opposed to 49% proficient the previous year. This decrease is the rationale for addressing this subgroup.

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

By the end of the 23-24 school year, the SWD population within the lowest 25% will increase to 50% or higher as measured by the F.A.S.T.

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

First, we will identify all SWD's that are also in the lowest 25% of ELA students according to the FAST. Two progress monitoring assessments will occur at equal intervals before the FAST at the end of the school year. The results of the identified SWD within the lowest 25% will be tracked on an Excel spreadsheet. Additionally, literacy walk-throughs will occur weekly with 1-1 teacher-admin conversations following literacy walk through for monitoring progress.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Margaret Markey (markeym@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.)

A suite of evidenced based interventions that are aligned with OCSD recommended resources and training will be implemented. First, decisions to place the many of the lowest 25% of students in ELA into a daily Foundations of Reading class will occur. The students will receive daily instruction using the 3 pillars of reading instruction in the Read 180. At DMS the lowest 25% of ELA students who are SWD will receive daily reading strategies in Learning Strategies class. This instruction will also embed the Lexia program approximately 45 minutes per week in middle school. For the same population in grades 5, the instructor will use Orton-Willingham methods to teach the science of reading. In some cases, identified students may attend both Foundations in Reading and Learning Strategies. Plan of Care students who are the lowest 25% of ELA students will use the district purchased IXL for scaffolding reading skills and deficiencies.

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

My staff has attending district led workshops with the above mentioned resources whose companies tout results if applied by trained instructors. These purchases are readily accessible through student Classlink and can also be used by tutors should we be able to recruit the human resources to expand our reach to all of the 25% of lowest performers in ELA.

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 a training and timeline from the Curriculum and Instruction Department to complete the School Improvement Plan (SIP). District offers collaborative opportunities for schools to meet:
• Facilitate sharing and presentation of district-level data.
• Support the inclusion of a variety of data sources; assist data collection efforts with district resources and connections.
• Bring schools together to focus on related priorities in order to pool expertise and resources.
Schools then conduct a needs assessment to stakeholders and prioritize needs to be included in SIP. District reviews school SIP and during review process ensures 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 school's identified focus areas, the District will engage 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 necessary resources that are not currently available to ensure the strategy is implemented as intended.
• Determine what training is necessary for teachers to ensure the strategy is implemented 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 status of SIP focus areas.

Budget to Support Areas of Focus

Part VII: Budget to Support Areas of Focus

The approved budget does not reflect any amendments submitted for this project.

1	III.B.	Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Early Warning System	$0.00
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities	$0.00
		Total:	$0.00

Budget Approval

Check if this school is eligible and opting out of UniSIG funds for the 2023-24 school year.

Yes