
Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	11
III. Planning for Improvement	16
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	23
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	0
VI. Title I Requirements	0
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

Osceola Creek Middle School

6775 180TH AVE N, Loxahatchee, FL 33470

<https://ocms.palmbeachschools.org>

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Palm Beach County School Board on 10/18/2023.

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.

The staff and families of Osceola Creek Middle School strive to educate students and to assist them in realizing their full potential as responsible, productive, contributing members of society by providing an educational environment in which students are challenged, excellence is expected and differences are valued.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The vision of Osceola Creek Middle School parents and staff is fostering of a positive school climate where a sense of ownership, support, trust, and involvement is created. We all share the responsibility for the success of our students. The dignity of each student is essential in the way we educate. We encourage all students to use their own initiative and respect their opinions and ideas. Each student has a right to learn, to feel safe, to ask questions, to make learning choices, and to have a chance to share ideas. Our staff is committed to positive change and innovative approaches to the way we promote the intellectual, academic, creative and social development of our students. The success of an integrated, multi-functional school depends upon excellent teamwork. Osceola Creek Middle School parents and staff are committed to providing that teamwork. Through Professional Learning Communities and collaboration with the community, we will meet our mission.

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
McClellan, Brian	Principal	Mr. McClellan provides strategic direction for the campus and staff. Oversees the delivery of instructions to students, evaluates teaching methods, monitors student and teaching data, hires instructional and non-instructional staff, liaison with all stakeholders. He also manages the school budget and determines the implementation of policies and procedures for the school.
Forte, Christopher	Assistant Principal	Mr. Forte oversees the math, science and ESE departments. He analyzes student and teacher data, observes teachers and their teaching methods. He assists the Principal in monitoring student achievement and supports the implementation of new policies and procedures. Additionally, he schedules all students and teachers in the master board. He also oversees the credit recovery program, new teacher development, and the Focus team. Mr. Forte monitors the data of his department in adherence to their goals and to the goals of the SIP and overall students growth and improvement.
Mccoy, Michelle	Assistant Principal	Ms. McCoy assists in monitoring teacher and student data and achievement, particularly in the English Language Arts and Reading departments. She oversees testing for the school and leads the crisis team. Ms. McCoy works with all new teachers and provides support to them to ensure their success. She also assists in monitoring teaching methods and planning Ms. McCoy also oversees SAC and the SIP. This involves scheduling SAC meetings, Sending out all community notices and invitations and running the meetings. Ms. McCoy monitors ELA and Reading data as it relates to the SIP, school goals and students growth and improvement.
Clemons, Lyndon	Assistant Principal	Mr. Clemons provides leadership and direction to the social studies and electives teams. He monitors student and teacher data and student achievement. He also oversees the AVID program and School Wide Positive Behavior Support. Additionally, he oversees textbooks, transportations, the custodial team and facilities. He also assists in observing teaching methods and provides classroom support. Mr. Clemons monitors data related to Civics and students achievement. He provides guidance to the teachers and helps set and monitor goals for student achievement with the teachers.

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.

Administration met with the school leadership team prior to school starting to review data and discuss out ATS&I status. I reviewed last year's data with them and discussed our areas of overall concern. I also discussed what earned us the ATS&I status. Each member of the leadership team was provided with a folder of data and questions to answer for the SIP.

After the leadership team meeting, everyone was in consensus on the two areas of focus for the SIP. Based on the feedback provided, the data and focus points was shared with the entire faculty on August 4, 2023 during the faculty meeting.

On August 17, 2023, the SIP will be shared with our School Advisory Council for a vote of approval.

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))

Once approved, our goals will be revisited throughout the school year, particularly at the mid-year reflection and with our SAC to monitor our progress toward meeting the goals. Adjustments will be made based on our progress toward reaching our goals or lack thereof.

We strategically plan for a variety of monitoring techniques:

- Review of Lesson Plans,
- Data Analysis,
- Classroom walks,
- Student attendance,
- Data Chats,
- Formal Observations,
- Professional Learning Communities' attendance/participation,
- Formative/Summative Assessments and Technology.

The School Improvement Plan (SIP) is a living document that memorializes the continuous improvement work we do at our school. The SIP is updated throughout the year to ensure proper documentation of what we do. Continuous improvement at the forefront of what we do. We work collaboratively to review and analyze data. We make decisions based on the data to ensure all students receive the necessary support and accommodations during instruction. Our team works towards the following student achievement goals:

- Strategic visioning and planning
- Problem identification and root cause analysis
- Developing action steps towards improvement
- Creating and maintaining a culture of collaboration towards shared decision-making
- Supporting professional learning and improvement

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	56%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	69%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification	ATSI

*updated as of 3/11/2024	
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: B 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	68	47	47	162
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	44	46	96
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	31	47
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21	18	39
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

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	48	56	61	165

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students identified retained:

--	--

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Students retained two or more times	0	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	0	55	63	62	180
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	34	39	74	147
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5	5	17
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	29	23	24	76
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	37	73	77	187
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	44	63	51	158
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	45	70	77	192

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	45	70	77	192

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	11	27	50
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2

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	55	63	62	180
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	34	39	74	147
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5	5	17
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	29	23	24	76
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	37	73	77	187
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	44	63	51	158
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	45	70	77	192

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	45	70	77	192

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	11	27	50
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2

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*	57	51	49	51	53	50	54		
ELA Learning Gains				43			42		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				30			24		
Math Achievement*	67	59	56	63	35	36	54		
Math Learning Gains				64			31		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				53			21		

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
Science Achievement*	57	50	49	54	56	53	58		
Social Studies Achievement*	82	68	68	86	64	58	76		
Middle School Acceleration	78	76	73	84	52	49	80		
Graduation Rate					50	49			
College and Career Acceleration					70	70			
ELP Progress	29	37	40	69	85	76	64		

* 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	370
Total Components for the Federal Index	6
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	60
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	597
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	40	Yes	2	
ELL	44			
AMI				
ASN	90			
BLK	61			
HSP	60			
MUL	71			
PAC				
WHT	70			
FRL	57			

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	46			
AMI				
ASN	88			
BLK	56			
HSP	59			
MUL	79			
PAC				
WHT	59			
FRL	53			

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	57			67			57	82	78			29
SWD	25			41			18	60	54		5	
ELL	34			52			37	71	42		6	29
AMI												
ASN	86			93							2	
BLK	47			66			38	84	72		5	
HSP	54			65			56	77	81		6	24
MUL	62			79							2	
PAC												
WHT	60			67			62	84	76		5	
FRL	49			61			56	75	73		6	29

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	51	43	30	63	64	53	54	86	84			69
SWD	22	27	21	34	44	32	32	59	67			50
ELL	32	37	24	44	58	46	23	82				69
AMI												
ASN	91			92	80							
BLK	48	45	20	54	63	55	44	86	90			
HSP	45	40	32	63	67	52	48	83	84			72
MUL	83	76		82	75							
PAC												
WHT	54	43	30	64	62	52	59	87	84			
FRL	43	38	26	54	59	46	40	82	78			67

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	54	42	24	54	31	21	58	76	80			64
SWD	20	24	21	23	17	17	22	66	40			60
ELL	38	40	33	40	23	13	20	61				64

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20	ELP Progress
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	46	40	19	38	29	27	55	62	77			
HSP	50	42	25	55	30	10	60	71	82			62
MUL	85	55		69	27							
PAC												
WHT	58	43	25	56	33	25	58	81	79			
FRL	47	38	21	42	28	20	48	66	77			63

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%	48%	3%	47%	4%
08	2023 - Spring	51%	47%	4%	47%	4%
06	2023 - Spring	58%	45%	13%	47%	11%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	71%	54%	17%	54%	17%
07	2023 - Spring	35%	36%	-1%	48%	-13%
08	2023 - Spring	71%	65%	6%	55%	16%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	56%	46%	10%	44%	12%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	88%	48%	40%	50%	38%

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

CIVICS						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	81%	65%	16%	66%	15%

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.

While the area of lowest performance in acceleration, we are more concerned about SWD and 7th grade as a whole. Our acceleration component dropped from 84% to 75%. Our overall Students With Disabilities continue to score below the Federal Index of 41%. While we have increased in overall SWD proficiency, we have yet to cross that threshold. Our overall 7th grade, has not had over 49% proficient in ELA or Math in many years. ELA is at 49% proficient and math at 35% proficiencies. There are several factors to contribute to the low performance. The primary contributor to low performance is the lack of both, teacher and student attendance. We had several teachers that missed just under half of the school year last year and 181 students that missed over 10% of the school year. In addition, 206 students have two of or more Early Warning Sign indicators.

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

Acceleration was the component with the greatest decline this year. We went from 84% to 75%. The predominant factor for the decline was student schedule changes. Students scoring level 3 or higher were initially placed in Algebra I classes. However, many struggled with the content and changed their schedule to pre-algebra.

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 6th grade math had the greatest gap compared to the state average. Our 6th grade average was 17 points higher than the state average. We had a new teacher join our 6th grade team this year and she had a very positive impact on her students.

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

The component showing the greatest improvement over the previous year was in 6th grade math. Sixth grade math had an 18 point improvement over the previous year, and a 17 point improvement over, both, the school district and state.

Aside from the new teacher that joined our team, we also conducted quarterly data chats with our students.

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

Upon reflection of the Early Warning Signs, we have two areas of concern. First the number of students absent 10% or more of the school year and second, the number of students with a substantial reading deficiency. We currently have 181 students absent 10% or more days, which is equivalent to 18 days or more of school. In addition, we have 190 students with a substantial reading deficiency, which is equivalent to 22% of our overall school population.

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

This year our highest priorities are our overall Students With Disabilities proficiency and our 7th grade as a whole. In addition, our students with substantial reading deficiencies rounds out the top three areas of greatest concerns on our campus.

Our school will infuse the content required by Florida Statute 1003.42(2) and S.B. Policy 2.09 (8)(b)(ii), as applicable to appropriate grade levels, including but not limited to:

- (g) History of the Holocaust
- (h) History of Africans and African Americans
- (i) History of Asian Americans & Pacific Islanders
- (o) Health Education, Life Skills & Social Media
- (q) Hispanic Contributions
- (r) Women's Contributions
- (t) Civic & Character Education
- (u) Sacrifices of Veterans, and the value of Medal of Honor recipients

2. Character-development program (required K-12) with curriculum to address: patriotism; responsibility; citizenship; kindness; respect for authority, life, liberty, and personal property; honesty; charity; self-control; racial, ethnic, and religious tolerance; and cooperation.
3. Our school highlights multicultural diversity within the curriculum and the arts.

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.

Our Students With Disabilities were identified as being below the federal index of 41%. We scored a 39% overall with this subgroup.

If we focus on standards-based instruction to increase learning gains in school-wide ELA and Math, then we will increase student achievement and ensure alignment to the District's Strategic Plan; This area of focus aligns directly with our District Strategic Plan, Theme A-Goal 3, Academic Excellence & growth. Our first instructional priority is to deliver, content, concept, or skill that is aligned to the benchmark and intended learning.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Our SWD subgroup will increase by 3% overall, through data tracking, identified technology interventions, small group instruction and differentiated instruction across all content areas.

Monitoring:

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

Teachers will track data for all of their students on all standards based assessments in all content areas. This data will drive their instruction and determine remediation or enrichment. In addition, students will have quarterly data chats with the administrative team to discuss their overall performance and set academic goals.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Christopher Forte (christopher.forte@palmbeachschools.org)

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.)

Reading Plus, No Red Ink, Newsela, Professional Learning Communities, Formative Assessments, Palm Beach County USA's

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

All of the above mentioned interventions are supported and approved by the district. They also have detailed reports that track student progress and mastery of standards.

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 4 - Demonstrates a Rationale

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.

Teachers will track standards based assessment data for their classes and students. Through PLC's, teachers will analyze the data and plan small group rotations for prescribed instruction, remediation or enrichment.

Administration will have quarterly data chats with teachers and students alike to view trends and strategize to address deficiencies.

Person Responsible: Brian McClellan (brian.mcclellan@palmbeachschools.org)

By When: Each cycle or unit of study.

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

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

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

Overall our 7th grade is performing at less than 50% proficient. This has been occurring for several years now. While the Civics EOC scores are at 81%, the ELA and Math scores are at 49% and 35% respectively.

If we focus on standards-based instruction to increase learning gains in school-wide ELA and Math, then we will increase student achievement and ensure alignment to the District's Strategic Plan; This area of focus aligns directly with our District Strategic Plan, Theme A-Goal 3, Academic Excellence & growth. Our instructional priority is to deliver, content, concept, or skill that is aligned to the benchmark and intended learning.

Measurable Outcome:

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

This year all 7th grade assessments will increase by 2%. Civics will increase from 81% to 83%, ELA from 49% to 51% and Math from 35% to 37%.

Monitoring:

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

Intensive Reading teachers will administer the ELA FSQ's to track the data and utilize it to differentiate their instruction and facilitate small group instruction. ELA, Math, Science and Civics teachers will administer all USA's to track student data for mastery, remediation or enrichment. Teachers will have quarterly data chats with their respective administrators, as well as students.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Brian McClellan (brian.mcclellan@palmbeachschools.org)

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.)

Reading Plus, No Red Ink, Newsela, Professional Learning Communities, Formative Assessments, Palm Beach County FSQ's and USA's, Florida Assessment of Student Thinking, Scaffolding, Differentiated Instruction via small groups, Positive Behavior Interventions and Support

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

All of the above mentioned interventions are supported and approved by the district. They also have detailed reports that track student progress and mastery of standards.

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 4 - Demonstrates a Rationale

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.

Teachers will track standards based assessment data for their classes and students. Through PLC's, teachers will analyze the data and plan small group rotations for prescribed instruction, remediation or enrichment.

Administration will have quarterly data chats with teachers and students alike to view trends and strategize to address deficiencies.

Person Responsible: Brian McClellan (brian.mcclellan@palmbeachschools.org)

By When: Each cycle or unit of study.

#3. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Teacher Attendance

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.

Last year we had several teachers miss 80 or more days of school, which is nearly half of the school year. In total, our teachers missed 452 days of work last school year.

In alignment with the District's Strategic Plan, we enhance a sense of belonging, safety, and acceptance for all students and staff. Our instructional priority is to use trends in student and teacher data to identify needs in order to support positive behaviors.

Measurable Outcome:

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

We will improve our teacher attendance by 10% this year.

Monitoring:

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

This area of focus will be monitored by active faculty involvement in both SWPBS and the House System. In addition, it will be monitored by the number of absences we have this year amongst our teachers.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Christopher Forte (christopher.forte@palmbeachschools.org)

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.)

SWPBS and the Ron Clark House System

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Our SWPBS is very active and does a lot to promote a positive culture for our students. This year SWPBS will make it a focus to provide a positive culture for teachers and staff alike.

In addition, we implemented the Ron Clark House System last year, four houses one family. It provided a sense of belonging for our students. Over the course of last school year and this summer, we were able to have more teachers trained in the House System, creating more buy-in. This is changing our systems and culture on campus and uniting the faculty and staff.

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 3 - Promising 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.

Get more faculty involved in our School Wide Positive Behavior Support team and implementation. Have more faculty trained in the House System and utilize them as leaders on our campus.

Person Responsible: Christopher Forte (christopher.forte@palmbeachschools.org)

By When: On Going.

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).

At this time we are not allocating funding. As requests for funding arise, it will be requested from the School Advisory Council with the data to support the request. Additionally, quarterly updates will be provided to SAC with monitoring conducted on the impact of the funds (programs) requested.