East Lake Middle School Academy Of Engineering

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

East Lake Middle School Academy Of Engineering

1200 SILVER EAGLE DR, Tarpon Springs, FL 34688

https://www.pcsb.org/eastlake-ms

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.

East Lake Middle School Academy of Engineering will prepare students to be college and career ready and have the skills to compete in a global society.

Provide the school's vision statement.

100% student success

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
Huzar, Karen	Principal	Instructional leader, oversee operations, monitors student progress, support and monitor teachers, etc.
Wheaton, Jaclyn	Teacher, K-12	ELA & Reading Department Head
David, Karin	Teacher, K-12	Math Department Head
Lee, Karen	Teacher, K-12	Science Department Head
Stewart, Gregory	Teacher, K-12	Engineering Department Head
Wisdom, Samantha	School Counselor	Meet with teachers, parents and students. Give guidance and resources when needed.
Reid, David	Instructional Technology	Technology and Curriculum Specialist & Media Library specialist - helps teachers pull data, takes care of library, assists teachers, and takes care of technology needs
Schlierer, Oren	Teacher, K-12	SS Department Head

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.

All stakeholders are involved in the process for development and overseeing SIP goals
1. All departments meet and review current data and look at past year's goal. Questions asked are, "How did we do? Where do we want to go now? How will we get there?" Departments work on induvial subject goals. Then all meet together to ensure strategies and action steps are school wide and align will whole school goals.
2. Proposed SIP goals and action steps are presented to School Advisory Council. SAC will vote to approve or amend goals presented.
3. Once SIP goals are approved with a vote. It is recorded and shared with district personnel and finalized in the CIMS website.

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 goals and action steps are monitored throughout the school year. All testing data is shared with the school community including teachers, students, parents, and SAC. Remediation plans are developed through each subject and are depended on what is needed for individual students and classes. All students are part of the process and know their data. Revised plans are shared with entire school community.

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	16%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	16%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	N/A
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) 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	0	3	8	6	17
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	3	6	20
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	1	1	6
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	2	0	0	2

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	
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	7	13	10	30
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	3
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	3	7
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	2
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	2

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	0	0	0	

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	
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	0	7	13	10	30
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	3
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	3	7
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	2
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	2

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	0	0	0	

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	
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*	81	49	49	87	46	50	82		
ELA Learning Gains				73			64		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				74			59		
Math Achievement*	91	58	56	90	30	36	89		
Math Learning Gains				75			73		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				69			68		
Science Achievement*	83	48	49	83	52	53	80		
Social Studies Achievement*	96	69	68	96	52	58	94		
Middle School Acceleration	92	77	73	92	44	49	92		
Graduation Rate					45	49			
College and Career Acceleration					66	70			
ELP Progress		38	40		72	76			

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

See [Florida School Grades, School Improvement Ratings and DJJ Accountability Ratings](#).

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	89
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	443
Total Components for the Federal Index	5
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	82
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	739
Total Components for the Federal Index	9
Percent Tested	100
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	41			
ELL	70			
AMI				
ASN	93			
BLK				
HSP	93			
MUL	100			
PAC				
WHT	88			

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%
FRL	79			

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	52			
ELL	65			
AMI				
ASN	77			
BLK				
HSP	82			
MUL	77			
PAC				
WHT	83			
FRL	90			

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	81			91			83	96	92			
SWD	36			45							2	
ELL	53			87							2	
AMI												
ASN	93			93							2	
BLK												
HSP	83			97				100	90		4	
MUL	100			100							2	

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
PAC												
WHT	80			90			84	95	92		5	
FRL	66			82			72	86	90		5	

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS

Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21	ELP Progress
All Students	87	73	74	90	75	69	83	96	92			
SWD	38	62	67	48	48	50						
ELL	67	75		50	67							
AMI												
ASN	69	69		92	77							
BLK												
HSP	89	79		86	75							
MUL	69	55		92	91							
PAC												
WHT	88	73	77	90	75	69	83	96	92			
FRL	90	90	80	94	80		95	95	94			

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	82	64	59	89	73	68	80	94	92			
SWD	27	35	27	50	60	64						
ELL	69	82	70	75	71							
AMI												
ASN	82	59		100	69							
BLK												
HSP	71	57		79	64	73	58		70			
MUL	70	60		82	82							
PAC												
WHT	83	65	60	89	73	68	82	94	95			
FRL	75	64	64	84	63	62	42	95	86			

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	84%	48%	36%	47%	37%
08	2023 - Spring	80%	47%	33%	47%	33%
06	2023 - Spring	76%	47%	29%	47%	29%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	87%	58%	29%	54%	33%
07	2023 - Spring	38%	36%	2%	48%	-10%
08	2023 - Spring	97%	61%	36%	55%	42%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	83%	47%	36%	44%	39%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	95%	53%	42%	50%	45%

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	96%	68%	28%	66%	30%

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.

ELA went down overall. Science remained the same and some math areas went down. Contributing factors could have been new teachers and new structure of test. We have overall high proficiency but can improve.

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

Reading showed the biggest decline from 87 overall proficiency to 80 percent overall proficiency. Some factors that could contribute is the new test and students having to take the assessment 3 times.

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.

I think we just need to continue to be deliberate with our planning and teachers need to continue to pull small groups when needed. This is the only way to ensure that all of our students are getting what they need when they need it. We do have 1 new ELA teacher joining our faculty this year so making sure she knows how to pull data from our system and ensuring they have the tools needed to have data chats, pull small groups etc. is essential to continuing to improve.

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

Area that showed the most improvement overall was math. We went from a 90 percent overall proficiency to a 92 percent proficiency. We utilized small groups for all math subjects.

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

Students that continue to miss school and then fall behind in their content area. This is what happens, and it is hard for them to catch up academically.

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

Critical reading strategies will be used in all content areas.
Continue to utilize small groups for ELA and math classes.
Continue the mentor program so every student has a trusted adult on campus.

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 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.

Based upon current scores, our goal for the upcoming school year is to ensure students' successes by increasing math proficiency as measured by F.A.S.T. testing and EOC examinations. We will support students by individualizing goal setting, differentiating instruction, and identifying critical content. AVID structures and critical reading strategies will be incorporated into mathematics instruction to increase student achievement.

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

Our current level of overall math performance as measured by F.A.S.T. testing and EOC examinations is 92%. The percentage of all students achieving math proficiency will increase by three percentage points from current levels, as measured by end-of-year F.A.S.T. assessments, Algebra EOC, or Geometry EOC examinations, exclusive of courses that already exceed 98% proficiency.

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

Student data from IXL diagnostics and cycle assessments will be analyzed by teachers and department. Teachers will engage in data chats with students throughout the year, at minimum, once per semester.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

[no one identified]

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.)

1. Staff will utilize data to assist in restructuring small groups and organizing students to interact with content in manners which differentiate and scaffold instruction to meet the needs of each student.
2. By strengthening staff practices and utilizing higher-order questioning, the math department will help students elaborate on content and think critically. This will include a focus on critical reading strategies and math vocabulary to increase foundational fluency. AVID structures will be included in daily instruction.
3. Staff will support students by communicating their specific data (data chats) and utilizing this information to establish and monitor individual goals.

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

The strategies listed have been identified by our math department as priorities. Resources include incorporating AVID strategies such as collaborative study structures and focused note taking for students within the classroom to aid in individualized growth. As an AVID demonstration school, strategies are applied schoolwide providing consistency throughout various subject areas.

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.

Data chats will be held with all students twice yearly (semester I/semester II). Teachers will meet with students and students will set goals. Throughout the year, use of unit assessments, IXL Diagnostics, and Cycle Assessments will be used to track student progress relating to understanding standard benchmarks.

Person Responsible: Karin David (davidka@pcsb.org)

By When: This is continuous throughout the school year but specifically it will happen after unit assessments, IXL Diagnostic testing, and cycle assessments/FAST PM testing.

AVID strategies to include critical reading and collaborative structures will be infused in daily classes. Collaborative study groups will be used throughout the year before assessments. Interactive notebooks will be implemented. Differentiation and small groups will be incorporated as needed.

Person Responsible: Karin David (davidka@pcsb.org)

By When: Daily in all classes.

Mathematics teachers will attend ongoing training involving critical reading and AVID instruction and monthly PLCs to support spiraling of content with efficacy.

Person Responsible: Karin David (davidka@pcsb.org)

By When: Pre-School will be whole school training on critical reading strategies. Monthly for continual training and PLC's

#2. 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.

Based upon current proficiency scores, our goal for the 2023-2024 school year is to ensure students' successes by increasing ELA proficiency as measured by F.A.S.T. testing. We will support students by individualizing goal setting, differentiating instruction, and identifying critical content. AVID structures including collaborative study groups, routine use of graphic organizers including one pagers, cultivating student understanding and use of academic vocabulary through intentional vocab development that supports students' organization of thoughts through the systematic use of language functions, and coach students consistently and intentionally as they are learning new skills will be incorporated into the ELA instruction to increase student achievement. Critical reading strategies including scaffolding in complexity, text-dependent questions, Socratic seminars, and philosophical chairs will be incorporated into the ELA instruction to increase student achievement.

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

Our current level of performance as measured by F.A.S.T. is 80% . The percentage of all students achieving ELA proficiency will increase by three percentage points from current levels, as measured by end-of-year F.A.S.T. assessments.

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

Student data from PM1 and PM2 of reading and writing testing will be analyzed.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jaclyn Wheaton (wheatonj@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.)

1. Support staff to utilize data to organize students to interact with content in manners which differentiate/ scaffolds instruction to meet the needs of each student.
2. Strengthen staff practice to utilize questions to help elaborate on content. Also strengthen staff to align best practices throughout all grade levels.
3. Enhance staff capacity to identify critical content from the standards in alignment with district resources.

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

If targeted questioning based on standards- aligned critical content and student data is utilized, proficiency will increase. As teachers leverage targeted data, they will use specific questioning based on the critical standards- aligned content to strengthen in the students the capacity to interpret and elaborate on rigorous content. Resources include incorporating AVID strategies such as collaborative study structures and focused note taking for students withing the classroom to aid in individualized growth.

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.

Meet monthly as a department Professional Learning Community to review student data and written work. Teachers will evaluate trends, strengths and weaknesses.

Person Responsible: Jaclyn Wheaton (wheatonj@pcsb.org)

By When: Monthly starting in Aug - May

Teachers will use and plan text-dependent questions, AVID strategies, close reading, and skill/strategy based groups to implement with students to support success with complex text. Teachers will meet monthly to collaborate and plan between grade levels.

Person Responsible: Jaclyn Wheaton (wheatonj@pcsb.org)

By When: Pre-School training in August. Strategies are to be used daily Aug - May. Teachers will meet monthly starting Aug.

ELA department will align procedures, grading rubrics and writing strategies while using district guides to best support all students at ELMS

Person Responsible: Karen Huzar (huzark@pcsb.org)

By When: Starting in August.

#3. 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.

Our 2023 level of performance was 83% proficiency (level 3 and above), as measured by the SSA 8th grade test in May 2023. We will continue to strengthen content knowledge, reinforce student learning, and move science process skills forward using AVID strategies. Instructional differentiation throughout the year will address common areas of deficiency.

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

The proficiency level of our 8th grade students will increase by 2%, as measured by the SSA test in May 2024.
The proficiency level of our 6th and 7th grade students performing at, or above, grade level (C or better) will be 90% or higher, as measured by the district level exam in May 2024.

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

Student data will be gathered from classroom-level assessments, GAP testing, district cycle testing, and SSA testing. The science team will monitor throughout the year and collaborate in monthly PLC's to address common areas of deficiency. Data chats with students will occur throughout the year.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Karen Lee (leek@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.)

1. Identify critical content from the standards in alignment with district resources and provide opportunities for learning through inquiry-based learning activities/strategies.
2. Use assessment data to identify areas of strength and deficiency to allow for differentiated instruction, enrichment, and remediation.
3. Use common instructional practices, formatting & documentation when addressing Nature of Science standards.

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

The cumulative nature of the SSA presents a unique set of challenges. The 8th grade students are tested on standards spanning three years of instruction. Addressing strengths and deficiencies continuously and intentionally from the beginning of 6th grade through the end of 8th grade will provide multiple opportunities for improvement. Given that the Nature of Science standards scaffold through the coursework in grades 6 – 8, we will focus on consistency of instruction and student outcome/product expectations.

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.

Teachers utilize systemic documents (NGSSS standards, district roadmaps & unit cards, etc.) and data (district and classroom-level assessments) to effectively plan lessons that incorporate rigorous performance tasks, inquiry-based learning, and AVID strategies.

Person Responsible: Karen Lee (leek@pcsb.org)

By When: Starts during Pre-school during pre-planning and will continue throughout the school year.

Conduct data chats with students (minimum of 1x/semester; increase as indicated by individual data from assessments) to monitor progress, set goals and plan for improvement.

Person Responsible: Karen Lee (leek@pcsb.org)

By When: After cycle assessments at least 1X per semester

Use AVID strategies (including AVID Critical Reading Strategies, Collaborative Structures and Focused Note Taking) to increase the connection between content acquisition and processing/application. Consistently use AVID EGO (experimental design graphic organizer) and LENSES (graph analysis) across grades 6 – 8 to establish consistency in student learning for Nature of Science standards.

Person Responsible: Karen Lee (leek@pcsb.org)

By When: AVID Critical Reading training will be during Pre-School (August) and continual training will continue throughout the school year. Department mtgs will continue throughout the school year.

Collaborate monthly at department PLC meeting to review student data and plan for implementation of remediation and enrichment opportunities.

Person Responsible: Karen Lee (leek@pcsb.org)

By When: Monthly starting in August during Pre-School

#4. 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.

In 2023, 96 % of our students achieved proficiency (3.0 or higher) on the Civics EOC. Infuse higher order questioning and complex tasks into daily lessons of all SS classes. All SS classes will increase student literacy by using content novels, articles, or complex texts.

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

-100% of students achieve proficiency (3.0) as measured on the Civics EOC in Spring 2024.

-6th and 8th grade SS goal is that 100% of students will pass the end of year exam

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

Analyze student cycle and unit assessment data. Teachers will collaborate with Principal after each cycle testing.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Oren Schlierer (schlierero@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.)

Support staff to utilize data to organize students to interact with content in manners which differentiate/ scaffolds instruction to meet the needs of each student.

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

Data is reviewed to see if any skills need reteaching. Individualized student data is shared and remediation is given to individual students as needed. Data (both summative and formative) can also be used to help differentiate content to students to help meet the needs of each student.

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.

Utilize Cycle Assessments data, unit assessment data and informal data to see if any skills need reteaching. Individualized student data is shared through data chats. Individualized remediation is given when needed.

Person Responsible: Oren Schlierer (schlierero@pcsb.org)

By When: After all unit assessments

Utilize and infuse AVID strategies into daily lessons. Examples are writing inquiry, collaborative study groups, one pagers, interactive notebooks, organization and reading strategies.

Person Responsible: Oren Schlierer (schlierero@pcsb.org)

By When: Daily in all classes

Use complex Social Studies texts read by students in multiple class settings to support curriculum and expose students to understand bias with different points of views.

Person Responsible: Oren Schlierer (schlierero@pcsb.org)

By When: Throughout the school year in all SS classes

Hold individualized data chats with students. Through these data chats student specific classroom data will be shared and offer support for student achievement, bridging the gap, and individualize goal setting.

Person Responsible: Oren Schlierer (schlierero@pcsb.org)

By When: After all cycle tests

Use complex age-appropriate videos to challenge students to make connections between benchmarks.

Person Responsible: Oren Schlierer (schlierero@pcsb.org)

By When: Throughout the school year in all SS classes

#5. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Career & Technical Education

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.

6th and 7th grade students should master the Engineering Design Process to enhance their problem-solving skills, as it will have positive impacts across all subject areas. Our previous (2022-2023) level of performance was 99% and 95% mastery for 7th and 6th grade respectively, as evidenced in the results of the Design Process Certification Test. 8th grade students should master the concepts covered in the Introduction to Engineering Design (IED) course to further build their problem-solving skills and provide the prerequisites for a high-school engineering program. This was assessed through a comprehensive Automaton capstone project, and 100% of students successfully demonstrated mastery of all IED concepts.

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

The percent of 8th grade students who pass the Introduction to Engineering Design (IED) final capstone project will remain at 100%. The percent of 7th grade students who pass the Design Process Certification Test (C or greater) will increase from 99% to 100%, as measured by the Design Process Certification Test. The percent of 6th grade students who pass the Design Process Certification Test (C or greater) will remain at 80% or greater, as measured by the Design Process Certification Test.

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

8th grade students will complete unit exams and projects to help prepare them for the final capstone Automaton project, and the teacher will review the results with students in a data chat format. 6th and 7th grade students will complete a practice Design Process Certification Test at the end of the first semester, and teachers will review the results with the students in a data chat format. Teachers will also reflect on the Design Process with students after all Engineering class projects. Finally, teachers will review and discuss in department PLCs monthly.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Gregory Stewart (stewartgr@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.)

Support staff to utilize data to organize students to interact with content in manners which differentiate / scaffolds instruction to meet the needs of each student.

- Strengthen staff ability to engage students in complex tasks using the Engineering Design Process.

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

Regarding the Design Process Certification Test, we have identified that the problem/gap is occurring because of lack of differentiation/scaffolding on Engineering class projects, and limited reflection after project completion. With consistent scaffolding and frequent reflection, the problem will be significantly reduced. We are also confident that improved scaffolding and reflection will improve 8th grade student performance on the Intro to Engineering Design End of Course exam.

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.

Develop scaffolding strategies for all Engineering class projects to include AVID collaboration strategies.

Person Responsible: Gregory Stewart (stewartgr@pcsb.org)

By When: Throughout the school year.

Provide higher-level enrichment activities to challenge students through our Young Inventors Challenge.

Person Responsible: Gregory Stewart (stewartgr@pcsb.org)

By When: Start in Oct/Nov, ending in January.

Reflect on the Design Process after all Engineering class projects. Use AVID Focused Notes, highlight changes, reflect on what they have learned, etc.

Person Responsible: Gregory Stewart (stewartgr@pcsb.org)

By When: Daily in all classes

#6. 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.

During the 2023/24 school year all students will receive rigorous instruction for high level courses. All students will be monitored and supported throughout the year to ensure success of the rigorous course. All teachers will continue to build classes that use high yield AVID structures and strategies.

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

All students will be successful with Adv Accelerated, Honors, Pre-AP and high school credit courses with a D or better. 90% of the students will show success with a C or better.

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

AVID site team will conduct focused walk throughs throughout the year to monitor AVID procedures and strategies. Grades are monitored via the Student Service team on a bi-weekly basis.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Karen Huzar (huzark@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.)

AVID strategies school-wide provide opportunities for all students.

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

AVID is schoolwide when a school is systematically and intentionally using AVID approaches across the entire building to benefit all students and educators, setting the foundational transformation of a school through its Instruction, Systems, Leadership, and Culture to ensure college and career readiness for all students. Teachers representing all curriculum departments are AVID-trained by attending AVID Summer Institute, AVID Path to Schoolwide® events, or in-district AVID professional development. AVID methodologies are incorporated into the content levels and classroom expectations across all curricular departments and grade levels, resulting in a consistent schoolwide college-going culture.

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.

Provide supports to teachers that need additional help with AVID strategies.

Person Responsible: Karen Huzar (huzark@pcsb.org)

By When: Pre-School Training and throughout the year AVID site-base team will provide training.

AVID Strategy walks and on going PD

Person Responsible: Karen Huzar (huzark@pcsb.org)

By When: AVID strategy walks will happen at least once a semester.

Provide supports to students that need extra help and support with their classes. These students will meet one on one with a student service team member until they are back on track.

Person Responsible: Samantha Wisdom (wisdoms@pcsb.org)

By When: Starts after 3 week of school and will continue throughout the year.

All students will have a teacher mentor that they will meet with throughout the year.

Person Responsible: Karen Huzar (huzark@pcsb.org)

By When: Starts September 1st and will continue throughout the school year. Teacher match will be a teacher that the students sees regularly but mentor meetings will happen monthly throughout the school year.

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.

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: Math				$0.00
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA				$0.00
3	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Science				$0.00
4	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Social Studies				$0.00
5	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Career & Technical Education				$0.00
6	III.B.	Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Other				$2,000.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2023-24
			6391 - East Lake Middle School Academy Engineering	School Improvement Funds		$2,000.00
			Notes: Planners for organization and use of AVID Strategies			

	Total:	$2,000.00

Budget Approval

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

No