Thurgood Marshall Fundamental School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Thurgood Marshall Fundamental

3901 22ND AVE S, St Petersburg, FL 33711

http://www.marshall-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.

All members of the Thurgood Marshall Fundademental Middle School community are committed to providing a safe, challenging, and fully inclusive learning environment that promotes college and career readiness.

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
Schottler, Kevin	Principal	The Principal is the instructional and operational leader within the school community and is critical to improving student outcomes, through the hiring, development, support, supervision and retention of high-quality instructional and support staff. As the school leader, the Principal creates a culture of rigorous learning, belonging and engagement for staff, students and families through collaboration and distributive leadership. In alignment with the Florida Principal Standards, the Principal leads the school team to increased school and student outcomes by prioritizing instruction while effectively balancing the operational, safety, and policy responsibilities of a school building leader.
Gore, Valencia	Assistant Principal	The Assistant Principal is an instructional and operational leader within the school community and is critical to improving student outcomes through staff development and effectiveness. In collaboration with and aligned to the direction of the Principal, the Assistant Principal supports the creation of the culture of rigorous learning, belonging and engagement for staff, students and families throughout the school community. In alignment with the Florida Assistant Principal Standards, the Assistant Principal supports and leads assigned school teams to increased school and student outcomes through ongoing training, coaching, feedback and support by prioritizing instruction while effectively balancing operational, safety and policy responsibilities, as assigned.
Grogan, Ashley	Assistant Principal	The Assistant Principal is an instructional and operational leader within the school community and is critical to improving student outcomes through staff development and effectiveness. In collaboration with and aligned to the direction of the Principal, the Assistant Principal supports the creation of the culture of rigorous learning, belonging and engagement for staff, students and families throughout the school community. In alignment with the Florida Assistant Principal Standards, the Assistant Principal supports and leads assigned school teams to increased school and student outcomes through ongoing training, coaching, feedback and support by prioritizing instruction while effectively balancing operational, safety and policy responsibilities, as assigned.
Vines, Shannon	Teacher, K-12	Social Studies Department Chair
Bracken-Tripp , Phillip	Teacher, K-12	Performing Arts Elective Department Chair
Harding, Jacqueline	Teacher, K-12	Math Department Chair
Pendergrass, Amy	Teacher, K-12	Science Department Chair
Reed, Natasha	Teacher, K-12	Avid and Elective Department Chair

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Reitz, Matthew	Teacher, ESE	ESE Department Chair

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.

Preschool meetings were conducted with Parent Teacher Association (PTA), School Advisory Council (SAC), and student leadership representative to discuss the School Improvement Plan (SIP) goals for the 2023-2024 school year. Administrative team has worked with department chairs and all teachers to review the goals and modify by departmental need.

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))

SIP will be actively monitored by a variety of methods. During PLC and Data chats, our goals will be reviewed and compared to the current data of the school. If data suggest that there is a need to shift practices, a shift in instructional interventions will occur. If action steps are not being followed with fidelity, a review of the SIP will take place at faculty and staff meetings. Action steps will need to be followed in planning, PLCs, and classrooms and will be evidenced by walkthroughs and monitored by administration. Feedback will be issued both formally and informally to ensure growth toward the Action Steps. Adjustments will be added as needed through quarterly review to ensure the school is making progress towards all learning goals.

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	59%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	54%
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) Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: B 2019-20: A 2018-19: A 2017-18: A
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	58	44	66	168
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	21	35	76
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	45	57	48	150
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	63	41	27	131
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	103	87	93	283

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	0	0	0	

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	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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*	65	49	49	63	46	50	67		
ELA Learning Gains				51			50		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				31			32		
Math Achievement*	64	58	56	69	30	36	66		
Math Learning Gains				60			40		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				44			38		

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
Science Achievement*	57	48	49	59	52	53	65		
Social Studies Achievement*	80	69	68	78	52	58	74		
Middle School Acceleration	75	77	73	81	44	49	74		
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	68
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	341
Total Components for the Federal Index	5
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	60
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	536
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	43			
ELL	70			
AMI				
ASN	89			
BLK	51			
HSP	68			
MUL	80			
PAC				
WHT	79			
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	44			
ELL	70			
AMI				
ASN	79			
BLK	46			
HSP	68			
MUL	63			
PAC				
WHT	69			
FRL	50			

Accountability Components by Subgroup
Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school. (pre-populated)

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2021-22	C & C Accel 2021-22	ELP Progress
All Students	65			64			57	80	75			
SWD	46			47			48	36	38		5	
ELL	70			70							2	
AMI												
ASN	81			91					96		3	
BLK	46			45			36	68	59		5	
HSP	71			67			47	81	76		5	
MUL	72			81			82	82	84		5	
PAC												
WHT	78			77			71	87	80		5	
FRL	51			48			39	68	66		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	63	51	31	69	60	44	59	78	81			
SWD	46	39	25	47	51	38	40	67				
ELL	80	53		80	67							
AMI												
ASN	79	71		85	71		82		86			
BLK	40	37	25	48	53	41	33	63	77			
HSP	72	55	42	75	70	69	65	81	81			
MUL	63	50	40	72	57		64	100	60			
PAC												
WHT	79	61	40	83	63	46	76	88	84			
FRL	47	42	28	53	53	40	49	71	71			

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20	ELP Progress
All Students	67	50	32	66	40	38	65	74	74			
SWD	45	27	19	43	29	25	33	24				
ELL	71	67		79	50							

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	89	84		84	64		87	89	86			
BLK	45	38	27	44	33	29	39	48	52			
HSP	73	53	41	69	40	48	63	75	86			
MUL	66	54		73	47			78				
PAC												
WHT	80	55	37	79	43	54	79	91	79			
FRL	52	43	32	51	35	32	48	59	56			

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	65%	48%	17%	47%	18%
08	2023 - Spring	64%	47%	17%	47%	17%
06	2023 - Spring	60%	47%	13%	47%	13%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	54%	58%	-4%	54%	0%
07	2023 - Spring	23%	36%	-13%	48%	-25%
08	2023 - Spring	73%	61%	12%	55%	18%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	80%	53%	27%	50%	30%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	98%	46%	52%	48%	50%

CIVICS						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	80%	68%	12%	66%	14%

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 data is showing the lowest proficiency at 63% of TMFMS, which is a 4% decline in proficiency from the 2021-2022 School Year which was 67%.

Contributing factor to the year's low performance is a misunderstanding with new BEST Standards and a curriculum that was not clearly developed for teachers. Additionally, staff vacancies in ELA presented a barrier to providing students with consistent rigorous and standards-based instruction.

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

7th grade Math data showed the greatest decline from 70% to 23%. Majority of our accelerated 7th grade scholars took the 8th grade assessment in Math, this increased the 8th grade assessment scores but created a decrease for 7th grade as a whole.

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.

7th grade Math data has the greatest gap of 25% when compared to the state. As stated previously, Majority of our accelerated 7th grade scholars took the 8th grade assessment in Math, this increased the 8th grade assessment scores but created a decrease for 7th grade as a whole.

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

8th grade math showed the greatest improvement with a 52% increase. This is because of adjustments to testing and math schedule to ensure appropriate course work for scholars.

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

The main area of concern is with for students "Absnet 10% or more days" of school as reflected in Focus. The 168 students who have been absent 10% or more of the school days is contributing to major

deficiencies in Reading and Math. Additionally, there were 91 days of OSS issued to students during the 22-23 School Year resulting in missed instructional time.

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

Increasing ELA proficiency, Learning Gains and L25 is our top priority for the upcoming school year.

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 Benchmark-aligned Instruction

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

Our current level of performance is 63% proficiency as evidenced by FSA ELA Achievement data and Civics is 80% proficiency as evidenced by the EOC exam. The problem is occurring due to lack of continual task complexity within classroom instruction. Benchmarks need to be studied more in depth to help teachers to determine appropriate target and task alignment that is student centered with rigor. This is identified as a critical need due to the stagnate proficiency from the previous year to this year. Additionally, there has been a steady decline in ELA data since the implementation of the B.E.S.T. Standards due to a lack of unpacking the benchmarks.

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

The percent of all students achieving ELA proficiency will increase from 63% to 70% as measured by ELA FAST assessment 2023-2024 data. The percent of all students achieving Civics proficiency will increase from 80% to 85% as measured by the 2023-2024 EOC exam.

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

Teachers collaboratively plan learning targets and learning tasks to align to the B.E.S.T. Benchmarks for ELA by using the District developed Golden Document to fully meet the depth of each benchmark.
Teachers will participate in ongoing professional development and benchmark studies with a focus on unpacking B.E.S.T. Standards to increase teacher knowledge and scholar achievement.
Within PLC and/or common planning, teachers utilize student data (PM 1-3 data, module data, class assessments, scholar data) to collaboratively plan differentiated instruction using the Golden Document to ensure high level of complexity for each scaffolded/enriched group.
Administration will conduct walk throughs with department heads to monitor teaching and learning in the classroom for a variety of "look fors", such as target/task alignment to the benchmark, teaching environment is student centered with rigor, differentiated instruction is planned with fluid groups, etc

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Ashley Grogan (grogana@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.)

Planning: Teachers will use Teacher Clarity (What, Why, and How scholars are learning) to plan lessons, which will include doing the work of the scholar in order to ensure alignment from the teacher model to the scholar task. While planning for the Teacher Clarity, the teachers will use the district created resource, the Golden Document to ensure that the lesson is hitting the depth and the breadth of the benchmark. A review of previous scholar work (state and district assessments, teacher created exit tickets) will be used to determine fluid groups for differentiated instruction, to appropriately scaffold and enrich.

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

Using Teacher Clarity yields a 0.75 on the Hattie scale, which is over a year's worth of growth (one year is 0.4 on the Hattie scale). While planning it is important to have the district developed "Golden Document" because it is a guide to help teachers understand the depth and breadth of the benchmark. Also, it provides an explicit teacher model, an explanation and questions to use while teaching, and a sample of FAST style questions that will help teachers in planning.

Differentiated instruction will help to meet the needs of all scholars in the room by providing scaffolded support. Groups need to be fluid based on available assessment and teacher data to ensure scholars are not receiving over scaffolded supports.

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 participate in professional learning opportunities around the B.E.S.T. Standards, district and state resources, Differentiation and Culturally Relevant lessons in the classroom. Facilitated- Planning Sessions, Biweekly PLCs, Ongoing ELA PD Offerings

Person Responsible: Ashley Grogan (grogana@pcsb.org)

By When: Ongiong for the 2023-2024

Teachers provide students with effective differentiated instruction for each lesson (based on state, district, and classroom data) through a three-tiered support system, heavy scaffold with prompting, light scaffold with prompting, and an extension of learning activity.

Person Responsible: Ashley Grogan (grogana@pcsb.org)

By When: daily/ ongoing

Teachers hold individual data chats with scholars based on state, district, and classroom assessments. Then, create SMART goals scholars will be able to work on in the classroom with support from the teacher and guidance counselors.

Person Responsible: Ashley Grogan (grogana@pcsb.org)

By When: Monthly/ ongoing

Administrators and teachers engage in subject-focused learning walks/discussions with a focus on target/ task alignment to benchmark/standard and differentiated learning opportunities for students.

Person Responsible: Ashley Grogan (grogana@pcsb.org)

By When: ongoing

#2. 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.

Our current level of proficiency is 67% Mathematics Achievement, as evidenced in 2022-2023 FAST assessment. We expect our performance level to increase by 8% proficiency to 75% Mathematics Achievement by 2023-2024 FAST assessment. The problem/gap is occurring because learning targets and learning tasks are not always differentiated to address student readiness, interest, and learning profile of the students with relation to mathematics. Intentional planning using the five key elements of differentiation to increase proficiency; learning environment, curriculum, assessment, instruction, classroom leadership and management. This can be achieved by incorporating the three types of differentiation – philosophy, principles, and practices.

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

The percent of all students' achievement in mathematics will increase from 67% to 75%, as measured by the 2023-2024 FAST Mathematics Assessment.

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

Teachers collaboratively plan learning targets and learning tasks to align to the B.E.S.T. Benchmarks for Mathematics (all math department). Within PLC and/or common planning, teachers utilize student data to collaboratively plan differentiated learning opportunities that address student readiness, interest, and/or learning profile (all math department). Teachers participate in ongoing professional development focused on Differentiation in Mathematics (all math department)

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Valencia Gore (gorev@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.)

Planning: task to target alignment protocols Focused planning protocol for target task alignment from "Thinking through a Lesson Protocol" (TTLP): A key for Successfully Implementing High-Level Tasks; Smith, Margaret, Victoria Bill, and Elizabeth Hughes.
Student Data: Data disaggregation protocols from Harvard "data wise" Mid Sept to early Oct teachers will use Performance Matters to disaggregate student data from the first F.A.S.T assessment. End of Jan teachers will use Performance Matters to disaggregate student data from the second F.A.S.T assessment. Throughout the year teachers will utilize IXL data reports and unit assessments to have data conversations with our scholars and track growth as a team.
Differentiation: The practice of UDL Teachers will intentionally put into practice the practice of differentiated grouping based on current data from unit assessments and classroom exit tickets, classwork, assessments.

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

Teachers will use a dialogue protocols within the classroom to promote meaningful communication and learning through social interactions.
To identify benchmark clarifications that adhere to the target and task alignment using structured planning protocols.
To promote student advocacy of performance data by tracking standard proficiency through on going data

chats and data tracking models.
To promote teacher identification of students' standard performance by structured data disaggregation protocols and professional conversation protocols.

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.

Mathematics teachers participate in professional learning opportunities around the B.E.S.T. Standards, the Mathematical Thinking & Reasoning Standards, and Differentiation in the Math Classroom.

Person Responsible: Valencia Gore (gorev@pcsb.org)

By When: Facilitated- Planning Sessions, Biweekly PLCs, Ongoing Math PD Offerings

Teachers utilize IXL's Diagnostic Arena to have students address mathematical skills gaps from their individualized Action Plans with an emphasis on utilizing the program outside of the school day to extend learning beyond the classroom.

Person Responsible: Valencia Gore (gorev@pcsb.org)

By When: Daily/Weekly student goals

Administrators and teachers engage in mathematics-focused learning walks/discussions with a focus on target/task alignment and differentiated learning opportunities for students.

Person Responsible: Valencia Gore (gorev@pcsb.org)

By When: Ongoing

#3. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Early Warning System

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

During the the 2022-2023 school year there were 291 processed office discipline referrals by the end of the year. This equates to .34 incidence per student. The Black subgroup represented 39.3% of the population but received 75.3% of the referrals. This is evidenced by the data reflected in School Profiles.

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

By the end of the year, reduce the number of Office Discipline Referrals (ODRs) for all students from ~291 to 233 or fewer – a decrease of at least 20%, as evidenced by year-to-date and end-of-year referral data from School Profiles.

Strategies:
Reduce Specific Incidents:
Decrease Fights by 50%, or 17 fewer incidents.
Decrease Classroom and Campus Disruptions by 50%, or 15 fewer incidents.

Implement Positive Behavior Intervention Supports (PBIS):
Achieve 100% schoolwide implementation by all student-facing staff.
Anticipate this will reduce an additional 26 discipline incidents - I need to know more about how you arrived at this number.

Support Classroom Teachers:
Plan for bell-to-bell instruction.
Foster positive and inclusive learning environments.
Ensure the non-negotiable implementation of classroom behavior systems.

Enhance Staff Presence:
Regularly communicate duty roster.
Ensure staff visibility in the halls throughout the school day to deter fights and disruptions.

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

Office Discipline Referral data will be monitored weekly at Leadership team meetings, and monthly at the TMFMS Faculty Meeting. Additionally, school-based leadership and School Climate Specialist will routinely monitor data and support staff as needed with best supporting school in acccomplishing this goal.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Ashley Grogan (grogana@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 for this Area of Focus is PBIS (Positive Behavioral Interventional and Support). We will use PBIS as a framework for creating safe, positive, equitable schools. Training staff routinely to ensure implementation fidelity.

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

The rationale for selecting PBIS as a the evidence-based intervention is because PBIS is a framework that supports students' academic, social, emotional, and behavioral success, engage with families to create locally-meaningful and culturally-relevant outcomes, and uses data to make informed decisions that improve our way of work and overall our school.

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.

Review Schoolwide Expectations with Staff (August 2023)

Person Responsible: Ashley Grogan (grogana@pcsb.org)

By When: Ongoing- dates listed near Description of action needed

Review Schoolwide/Classroom Expectations with Students (August 2023)

Person Responsible: Ashley Grogan (grogana@pcsb.org)

By When: Ongoing- initial date listed near Description of action needed

Develop and utilize a list of interventions that can be used school wide. Additionally, have scholar input on PBIS Rewards and planned quarterly events.

Person Responsible: Ashley Grogan (grogana@pcsb.org)

By When: Ongoing

Review Schoolwide Expectations with Students & Staff at Grade Level Assemblies (8/16/2023)

Review Goal & Progress Toward Goal at Faculty Meeting (September 2023)

Person Responsible: Ashley Grogan (grogana@pcsb.org)

By When: Ongoing

Communicate Expectations & Updates with Families Weekly (Starting- July 2023)

Person Responsible: Ashley Grogan (grogana@pcsb.org)

By When: Ongoing

#4. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Teacher Retention and Recruitment

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.

Focusing on Teacher Retention and Recruitment as an area of crucial need is based on the vacancies at the start of the summer (July 2023). Additionally, the results of the 2022-2023 PCS Climate Survey suggest that more teachers would be retained if the climate was more positive.

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

TMFMS will retain at least 80% (40 or more) of the current staff members currently on staff. Additionally, when surveyed there will be a 10% or more increase in favorable response(s) as it relates to the following PCS Climate Survey questions.
The actions of my direct supervisor are consistent with their words- 59% in 2023
I can count on the support of my direct supervisor when addressing problems or issues- 62% in 2023
My direct supervisor promotes a positive work culture- 59% in 2023

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

This area of focus will be monitored for the desired outcome by consistently reviewing staff absences that may suggest staff in need of additional support. Staff will be routinely surveyed to ensure that they are feeling supported. Staff will be invited to check-in with Administrators and colleagues at monthly meetings to provide feedback of processes and systems on campus.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Kevin Schottler (schottlerk@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.)

Currently reviewing research regarding pipeline for teacher retention and recruitment.

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

See above, as strategies will be identified following research review.

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.

Student and Staff Expectations clearly and explicitly stated.

Person Responsible: Kevin Schottler (schottlerk@pcsb.org)

By When: August 2023, ongoing.

Staff to develop schoolwide expectations to increase buy-in.

Person Responsible: Kevin Schottler (schottlerk@pcsb.org)

By When: August 2023, ongoing.

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.