Tarpon Springs Middle School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Tarpon Springs Middle School

501 N FLORIDA AVE, Tarpon Springs, FL 34689

http://www.tarpon-ms.pinellas.k12.fl.us

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.

Mission : To provide challenging learning experiences in a safe learning environment so that all students are prepared for college, career and life.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Vision: Learning gains for every student, every day.

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
Mason, Ronald	Principal	
Valsamis, Evangelos	Assistant Principal	
Thomas, Giovanna	Assistant Principal	
Schmittdiel, Amber	Assistant Principal	

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.

Consulted with SAC, PTA, and school leadership to present current school data trends.

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))

The SIP will be monitored bi-weekly during the Instructional Leadership Team Meetings.

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	40%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	82%
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: B 2019-20: C 2018-19: C 2017-18: B
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

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

Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Total
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	35	34	31	100
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	22	12	52
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	39	23	20	82
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	29	25	70
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	

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	98	121	109	328

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	2	2	1	5
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	0	69	71	52	192
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	1	6
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	11	12	34
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	35	5	5	45
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	26	34	12	72
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	27	38	19	84
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	26	34	12	72

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	14	25	12	51

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	4	1	6
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1

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	69	71	52	192
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	1	6
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	11	12	34
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	35	5	5	45
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	26	34	12	72
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	27	38	19	84
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	26	34	12	72

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	14	25	12	51

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	4	1	6
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1

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*	60	49	49	59	46	50	59		
ELA Learning Gains				47			59		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				30			48		
Math Achievement*	57	58	56	64	30	36	58		
Math Learning Gains				59			50		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				54			44		

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
Science Achievement*	69	48	49	62	52	53	58		
Social Studies Achievement*	85	69	68	84	52	58	68		
Middle School Acceleration	78	77	73	76	44	49	80		
Graduation Rate					45	49			
College and Career Acceleration					66	70			
ELP Progress	27	38	40	38	72	76	25		

* 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	63
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	376
Total Components for the Federal Index	6
Percent Tested	97
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	573
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	97
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	24	Yes	4	1
ELL	47			
AMI				
ASN	96			
BLK	41			
HSP	57			
MUL	58			
PAC				
WHT	76			
FRL	54			

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	**Federal Percent of Points Index**	**Subgroup Below 41%**	**Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%**	**Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%**
SWD	34	Yes	3	
ELL	41			
AMI				
ASN	79			
BLK	42			
HSP	54			
MUL	58			
PAC				
WHT	62			
FRL	49			

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	60			57			69	85	78			27
SWD	15			15			19	36	40		6	18
ELL	31			27			43	73	80		6	27
AMI												
ASN	100			91							2	
BLK	34			30			38	61			4	
HSP	51			49			59	81	81		6	23
MUL	61			39			64	80	44		5	
PAC												
WHT	67			66			74	91	81		5	
FRL	47			44			58	75	71		6	26

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	59	47	30	64	59	54	62	84	76			38
SWD	19	25	24	30	50	49	39	39				
ELL	33	30	16	45	54	56	22	71				38
AMI												
ASN	86	62		86	83							
BLK	33	34	29	38	56	59	30	56				
HSP	57	45	23	58	57	48	52	85	70			41
MUL	39	38		71	57		45	100				
PAC												
WHT	65	51	32	70	59	53	70	85	77			
FRL	45	36	25	54	56	55	47	77	62			37

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	59	59	48	58	50	44	58	68	80			25
SWD	26	38	32	23	31	33	29	48				
ELL	42	58	50	39	35	33	30	47	55			25

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	92	70		91								
BLK	20	36	36	18	30	34	18	39				
HSP	59	63	59	50	47	35	46	60	76			25
MUL	47	56		55	55		53	73				
PAC												
WHT	67	61	49	68	55	51	68	77	82			
FRL	50	55	42	50	51	45	54	55	80			32

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	58%	48%	10%	47%	11%
08	2023 - Spring	59%	47%	12%	47%	12%
06	2023 - Spring	59%	47%	12%	47%	12%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	55%	58%	-3%	54%	1%
07	2023 - Spring	35%	36%	-1%	48%	-13%
08	2023 - Spring	61%	61%	0%	55%	6%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	68%	47%	21%	44%	24%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	85%	53%	32%	50%	35%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	100%	46%	54%	48%	52%

CIVICS						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	87%	68%	19%	66%	21%

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 data component that showed the lowest performance was Language Arts. Some contributing factors to last year's low performance are inconsistent effective instruction/intervention in the Reading course. Transition with administrative leadership led to unclear and inconsistent expectations for ELA instruction and progress monitoring of student performance with BEST standards.

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

The data component that showed the greatest decline from the prior year was Math. The factor that contributed to this decline was inconsistent effective instruction due to inconsistent expectations for instruction and vacancies.

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

The data component with the greatest gap was ELA. Some contributing factors to last year's low performance are inconsistent effective instruction/intervention in the Reading course. Transition with administrative leadership led to unclear and inconsistent expectations for ELA instruction and progress monitoring of student performance with BEST standards.

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

The area that showed the most improvement was Science. This can be attributed to an increase in hands-on learning opportunities, labs, and connections to real-world experiences.

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

Rising 8th grade students have the highest number of students with one or more referral and higher absences than other grade-levels.

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

o Connections to critical content
o Clear learning objectives
o Consistent opportunities for academic conversation
o Consistent bell to bell instruction

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 ELA

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.

It is essential for students to show growth and proficiency in the area of Language Arts to demonstrate appropriate grade-level mastery.

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

Increase Language Arts achievement from 59% to 65% as measured by the FAST PM 3.

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

This Area of Focus will be continually monitored through unit assessments, cycle assessments, and common assessment remediation tracking through PLCs, in collaboration with teachers and administrators. Additionally, administrators will monitor through walkthroughs and observations.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Giovanna Thomas (thomasgio@pcsb.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.)

Enhance staff capacity to identify critical content from the standards in alignment with district resources and engage students in rigorous content, and clear learning objectives. Enhance staff capacity to support students through purposeful activation, transfer, and academic conversation.

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

When students can identify critical content and learning objectives, they have an opportunity to make meaningful connections and improve their proficiency. Through academic conversation, students can challenge and negotiate their thinking, leading to fluency.

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.

Conduct weekly PLCs inclusive of data chats to review student responses to tasks and formative assessments and plan for instructional lessons that include text-dependent questions, close and critical reading, academic conversation, and skill/strategy-based groups to implement during core instruction to support success with complex tasks.

Person Responsible: Giovanna Thomas (thomasgio@pcsb.org)

By When: Weekly

Regularly assess (formally and informally) and utilize common assessment data to modify and adjust instruction. Teachers utilize ongoing formative assessment and use the information gained to adjust instruction, enrich and reteach, and provide research-based interventions. Collaborate with students in creating in-the-moment remediation to address misconceptions and engage in ownership of their own progress/data.

Person Responsible: Giovanna Thomas (thomasgio@pcsb.org)

By When: Regularly (weekly/instructional units/quarterly)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science

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.

It is essential for students to show growth and proficiency in the area of Science to demonstrate appropriate grade-level mastery.

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

Increase Science achievement from 68% to 75% as measured by the SSA.

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

This Area of Focus will be continually monitored through unit assessments, cycle assessments, and common assessment remediation tracking through PLCs, in collaboration with teachers and administrators. Additionally, administrators will monitor through walkthroughs and observations.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Amber Schmittdiel (schmittdiela@pcsb.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.)

Enhance staff capacity to identify critical content from the standards in alignment with district resources and engage students in rigorous content, and clear learning objectives. Enhance staff capacity to support students through purposeful activation, transfer, and academic conversation.

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

When students can identify critical content and learning objectives, they have an opportunity to make meaningful connections and improve their proficiency. Through academic conversation, students can challenge and negotiate their thinking, leading to fluency.

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.

Conduct weekly PLCs inclusive of data chats to review student responses to tasks and formative assessments and plan for instructional lessons that include text-dependent questions, close and critical reading, academic conversation, and skill/strategy-based groups to implement during core instruction to support success with complex tasks.

Person Responsible: Amber Schmittdiel (schmittdiela@pcsb.org)

By When: Weekly

Regularly assess (formally and informally) and utilize common assessment data to modify and adjust instruction. Teachers utilize ongoing formative assessment and use the information gained to adjust instruction, enrich and reteach, and provide research-based interventions. Collaborate with students in creating in-the-moment remediation to address misconceptions and engage in ownership of their own progress/data.

Person Responsible: Amber Schmittdiel (schmittdiela@pcsb.org)

By When: Regularly (weekly/instructional units/quarterly)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Social Studies

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.

It is essential for students to show growth and proficiency in the area of Civics to demonstrate appropriate grade-level mastery.

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

Increase Social Studies achievement from 87% to 90% as measured by the Civics EOC. Increase student achievement in US History from 56% to 70% as measured by the US History Final Exam.

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

This Area of Focus will be continually monitored through unit assessments, cycle assessments, and common assessment remediation tracking through PLCs, in collaboration with teachers and administrators. Additionally, administrators will monitor through walkthroughs and observations.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Amber Schmittdiel (schmittdiela@pcsb.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.)

Enhance staff capacity to identify critical content from the standards in alignment with district resources and engage students in rigorous content, and clear learning objectives. Enhance staff capacity to support students through purposeful activation, transfer, and academic conversation.

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

When students can identify critical content and learning objectives, they have an opportunity to make meaningful connections and improve their proficiency. Through academic conversation, students can challenge and negotiate their thinking, leading to fluency.

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.

Conduct weekly PLCs inclusive of data chats to review student responses to tasks and formative assessments and plan for instructional lessons that include text-dependent questions, close and critical reading, academic conversation, and skill/strategy-based groups to implement during core instruction to support success with complex tasks. Teachers intentionally and explicitly help students identify critical content.

Person Responsible: Amber Schmittdiel (schmittdiela@pcsb.org)

By When: Weekly

Regularly assess (formally and informally) and utilize common assessment data to modify and adjust instruction. Teachers utilize ongoing formative assessment and use the information gained to adjust instruction, enrich and reteach, and provide research-based interventions. Collaborate with students in creating in-the-moment remediation to address misconceptions and engage in ownership of their own progress/data.

Person Responsible: Amber Schmittdiel (schmittdiela@pcsb.org)

By When: Regularly (weekly, units, quarterly)

#4. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

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.

It is essential for students to show growth and proficiency in the area of Math to demonstrate appropriate grade-level mastery.

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

Increase Mathematics achievement from 63% to 73% as measured by the FAST PM 3.

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

This Area of Focus will be continually monitored through unit assessments, cycle assessments, and common assessment remediation tracking through PLCs, in collaboration with teachers and administrators. Additionally, administrators will monitor through walkthroughs and observations.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Evangelos Valsamis (valsamise@pcsb.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.)

Enhance staff capacity to identify critical content from the standards in alignment with district resources and engage students in rigorous content, and clear learning objectives. Enhance staff capacity to support students through purposeful activation, transfer, and academic conversation.

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

When students can identify critical content and learning objectives, they have an opportunity to make meaningful connections and improve their proficiency. Through academic conversation, students can challenge and negotiate their thinking, leading to fluency.

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.

Conduct weekly PLCs inclusive of data chats to review student responses to tasks and formative assessments and plan for instructional lessons that include text-dependent questions, close and critical reading, academic conversation, and skill/strategy-based groups to implement during core instruction to support success with complex tasks.

Person Responsible: Evangelos Valsamis (valsamise@pcsb.org)

By When: Weekly

Regularly assess (formally and informally) and utilize common assessment data to modify and adjust instruction. Teachers utilize ongoing formative assessment and use the information gained to adjust instruction, enrich and reteach, and provide research-based interventions. Collaborate with students in creating in-the-moment remediation to address misconceptions and engage in ownership of their own progress/data.

Person Responsible: Evangelos Valsamis (valsamise@pcsb.org)

By When: Regularly (weekly, units, quarterly)

#5. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Other

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.

Based on teacher surveys and staff input, it was identified that the school-wide focus should surround connections, clarity, and consistency that will be implemented through a PBIS system.

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

This area of focus will be measured through the number of discipline referrals, PBIS Spartan Bucks given to students, and teacher feedback.

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

Student discipline data will be monitored by administrative team during weekly meetings.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Giovanna Thomas (thomasgio@pcsb.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.)

The evidence-based intervention being implemented is PBIS school-wide.

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

This intervention was chosen because it is research-based and was developed with stakeholder input.

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.

Collaborate to develop clear and consistent PBIS system to be implemented school-wide.

Person Responsible: Giovanna Thomas (thomasgio@pcsb.org)

By When: August 2023

Implement PBIS system school-wide and monitor number of discipline referrals and PBIS tokens given to students.

Person Responsible: Giovanna Thomas (thomasgio@pcsb.org)

By When: Weekly

#6. 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.

It is essential that students with disabilities improve their proficiency levels in both Language Arts and Math.

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

Students with disabilities will increase their Language Arts proficiency from 24% to 34% as measured by the FAST ELA PM 3 and increase their Math proficiency from 32% to 42% as measured by the FAST Math PM 3.

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

This Area of Focus will be continually monitored through unit assessments, cycle assessments, and common assessment remediation tracking through PLCs, in collaboration with teachers and administrators. Additionally, administrators will monitor through walkthroughs and observations.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Evangelos Valsamis (valsamise@pcsb.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.)

Enhance staff capacity to identify critical content from the standards in alignment with district resources and engage students in rigorous content, and clear learning objectives, and SDI. Enhance staff capacity to support students through purposeful activation, transfer, and academic conversation.

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

When students can identify critical content and learning objectives, they have an opportunity to make meaningful connections and improve their proficiency. Through academic conversation, students can challenge and negotiate their thinking, leading to fluency. SDI implementation will ensure that students are receiving instruction at the appropriate level of rigor and are getting strategies that improve their fluency.

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.

Conduct weekly PLCs inclusive of data chats to review student responses to tasks and formative assessments and plan for instructional lessons that include text-dependent questions, close and critical reading, academic conversation, and skill/strategy-based groups to implement during core instruction to support success with complex tasks.

Person Responsible: Evangelos Valsamis (valsamise@pcsb.org)

By When: Weekly

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).

The district allocates SIP funds to each school as prescribed by the legislature. Principals present to the School Advisory Council the amount of their SIP Funds, their SIP, and how the SIP funds will support the plan. The SAC reviews and votes on approval of the SIP and use of SIP funds. The SIP funds are spent in alignment with the SIP, and reviewed by the SAC throughout the year. Expenditures that deviate from the approved SIP are presented to the SAC, which votes to approve or deny the expense.

Title I Requirements

Schoolwide Program Plan (SWP) Requirements
This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A SWP and opts to use the SIP to satisfy the requirements of the SWP plan, as outlined in the ESSA, Public Law No. 114-95, § 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

Provide the methods for dissemination of this SIP, UniSIG budget and SWP to stakeholders (e.g., students, families, school staff and leadership and local businesses and organizations). Please articulate a plan or protocol for how this SIP and progress will be shared and disseminated and to the extent practicable, provided in a language a parent can understand. (ESSA 1114(b)(4))
List the school's webpage* where the SIP is made publicly available.

We will be disseminating the SIP through our SIP one pager at school-wide events, SAC meetings, PTSA meetings, and through our website/social media.

Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission, support the needs of students and keep parents informed of their child's progress.
List the school's webpage* where the school's Family Engagement Plan is made publicly available. (ESSA 1116(b-g))

We will continue to engage our families through family events, advertising through our website/social media, in addition to our SAC and PTSA.

Describe how the school plans to strengthen the academic program in the school, increase the amount and quality of learning time and help provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum. Include the Area of Focus if addressed in Part III of the SIP. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)ii))

We will be moving to a 6 period day, increasing instructional time in all core classes. Additionally, we will be providing students enrichment opportunities through our Spartan Time class.

If appropriate and applicable, describe how this plan is developed in coordination and integration with other Federal, State, and local services, resources and programs, such as programs supported under ESSA, violence prevention programs, nutrition programs, housing programs, Head Start programs, adult education programs, career and technical education programs, and schools implementing CSI or TSI activities under section 1111(d). (ESSA 1114(b)(5))

N/A

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: Instructional Practice: ELA	$0.00
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Science	$0.00
3	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Social Studies	$0.00
4	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math	$0.00
5	III.B.	Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Other	$0.00
6	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