# Seminole Middle School



**2023-24**

**Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)**

## Table of Contents

# Seminole Middle School

## 8701 131ST ST, Seminole, FL 33776

### http://www.seminole-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 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 |
|---|---|---|
| Ovalle, Robert | Principal | Oversees all functions and responsibilities of the school. |
| Hoag, Jessica | Assistant Principal | Assistant Principal - 6th Grade; Supports all functions and responsibilities of the school. |
| Nation, Desrine | Assistant Principal | Assistant Principal - 8th Grade; Supports all functions and responsibilities of the school. |
| Johnson, LaWanda | Assistant Principal | Assistant Principal - 7th Grade and Curriculum; Supports all functions and responsibilities of the school. |
| Guth, Lori | School Counselor | Department Chair Guidance |
| Silkie-Rees, Marissa | Teacher, K-12 | Department Chair Science |
| Smith, Erin | Teacher, K-12 | Department Chair Science |
| Coon, Doug | Teacher, K-12 | Department Chair Math |
| Higgins, Valeria | Teacher, K-12 | Department Chair Social Studies |
| Walsky, Riley | Teacher, K-12 | Department Chair Reading |
| Moore, Cidney | Behavior Specialist | Behavior Specialist - ESE Team Leader |

### Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Development

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

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

The School Advisory Committee will meet to give input and discuss the approval of the SIP at their monthly meeting according to the bylaws.

**SIP Monitoring**
Describe how the SIP will be regularly monitored for effective implementation and impact on increasing the achievement of students in meeting the State's academic standards, particularly for those students with the greatest achievement gap. Describe how the school will revise the plan, as necessary, to ensure continuous improvement. (ESSA 1114(b)(3))

The SIP will be monitored monthly at our curriculum meetings to ensure we are on target to meet our goals. Adjustments and revisions will be made accordingly.

## Demographic Data
Only ESSA identification and school grade history updated 3/11/2024

| | |
|---|---|
| **2023-24 Status**<br>(per MSID File) | Active |
| **School Type and Grades Served**<br>(per MSID File) | Middle School<br>6-8 |
| **Primary Service Type**<br>(per MSID File) | K-12 General Education |
| **2022-23 Title I School Status** | No |
| **2022-23 Minority Rate** | 35% |
| **2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** | 51% |
| **Charter School** | No |
| **RAISE School** | No |
| **ESSA Identification**<br>*updated as of 3/11/2024 | TSI |
| **Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)** | No |
| **2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented**<br>(subgroups with 10 or more students)<br>(subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Students With Disabilities (SWD)*<br>English Language Learners (ELL)<br>Asian Students (ASN)<br>Black/African American Students (BLK)*<br>Hispanic Students (HSP)<br>Multiracial Students (MUL)<br>White Students (WHT)<br>Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)* |
| **School Grades History**<br>*2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline. | 2021-22: C<br><br>2019-20: B<br><br>2018-19: B<br><br>2017-18: B |
| **School Improvement Rating History** | |
| **DJJ Accountability Rating History** | |

## Early Warning Systems

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

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | |
| Absent 10% or more days | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 98 | 76 | 80 | 254 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 44 | 32 | 41 | 117 |
| Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 1 | 6 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 15 | 0 | 1 | 16 |
| Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 89 | 71 | 102 | 262 |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 50 | 38 | 57 | 145 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C. | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 142 | 118 | 154 | 414 |

**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 | 2 | 2 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 |

**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 | 76 | 57 | 67 | 200 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 26 | 36 | 69 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 29 | 23 | 20 | 72 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 53 | 39 | 9 | 101 |
| Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 25 | 30 | 25 | 80 |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 24 | 28 | 49 | 101 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C. | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 25 | 30 | 25 | 80 |

**The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:**

| Indicator | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | Total |
|-----------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|-------|
| | | | | Grade Level | | | | | | |
| Students with two or more indicators | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 23 | 37 | 37 | 97 |

**The number of students identified retained:**

| Indicator | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | Total |
|-----------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|-------|
| | | | | Grade Level | | | | | | |
| Retained Students: Current Year | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14 | 6 | 15 | 35 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 |

**Prior Year (2022-23) Updated (pre-populated)**
Section 3 includes data tables that are pre-populated based off information submitted in prior year's SIP.

**The number of students by grade level that exhibited each early warning indicator:**

| Indicator | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | Total |
|-----------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|-------|
| | | | | Grade Level | | | | | | |
| Absent 10% or more days | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 76 | 57 | 67 | 200 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 26 | 36 | 69 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 29 | 23 | 20 | 72 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 53 | 39 | 9 | 101 |
| Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 25 | 30 | 25 | 80 |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 24 | 28 | 49 | 101 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C. | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 25 | 30 | 25 | 80 |

**The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:**

| Indicator | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | Total |
|-----------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|-------|
| | | | | Grade Level | | | | | | |
| Students with two or more indicators | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 23 | 37 | 37 | 97 |

**The number of students identified retained:**

| Indicator | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | Total |
|-----------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|-------|
| | | | | Grade Level | | | | | | |
| Retained Students: Current Year | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14 | 6 | 15 | 35 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 |

## II. Needs Assessment/Data Review

**ESSA School, District and State Comparison (pre-populated)**
Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school or combination schools). Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school.

**On April 9, 2021, FDOE Emergency Order No. 2021-EO-02 made 2020-21 school grades optional. They have been removed from this publication.**

| Accountability Component | 2023 | | | 2022 | | | 2021 | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | School | District | State | School | District | State | School | District | State |
| ELA Achievement* | 50 | 49 | 49 | 51 | 46 | 50 | 53 | | |
| ELA Learning Gains | | | | 43 | | | 46 | | |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | 29 | | | 29 | | |
| Math Achievement* | 60 | 58 | 56 | 55 | 30 | 36 | 55 | | |
| Math Learning Gains | | | | 51 | | | 34 | | |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | 47 | | | 34 | | |
| Science Achievement* | 47 | 48 | 49 | 53 | 52 | 53 | 53 | | |
| Social Studies Achievement* | 68 | 69 | 68 | 64 | 52 | 58 | 69 | | |
| Middle School Acceleration | 73 | 77 | 73 | 74 | 44 | 49 | 67 | | |
| Graduation Rate | | | | | 45 | 49 | | | |
| College and Career Acceleration | | | | | 66 | 70 | | | |
| ELP Progress | 80 | 38 | 40 | 50 | 72 | 76 | 67 | | |

*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) | TSI |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students | 63 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students | No |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 3 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 378 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 6 |

| 2021-22 ESSA Federal Index | |
|---|---|
| Percent Tested | 98 |
| Graduation Rate | |

| 2021-22 ESSA Federal Index | |
|---|---|
| ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI) | TSI |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students | 52 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students | No |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 3 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 517 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 10 |
| Percent Tested | 96 |
| 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 | 20 | Yes | 4 | 4 |
| ELL | 40 | Yes | 1 | |
| AMI | | | | |
| ASN | 75 | | | |
| BLK | 19 | Yes | 3 | 3 |
| HSP | 58 | | | |
| MUL | 73 | | | |
| PAC | | | | |
| WHT | 66 | | | |
| FRL | 52 | | | |

| ESSA Subgroup | Federal Percent of Points Index | Subgroup Below 41% | Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41% | Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32% |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| SWD | 24 | Yes | 3 | 3 |
| ELL | 48 | | | |
| AMI | | | | |
| ASN | 62 | | | |
| BLK | 26 | Yes | 2 | 2 |
| HSP | 49 | | | |
| MUL | 42 | | | |
| PAC | | | | |
| WHT | 59 | | | |
| FRL | 39 | Yes | 1 | |

*2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY*

### Accountability Components by Subgroup

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

**2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS**

| Subgroups | ELA Ach. | ELA LG | ELA LG L25% | Math Ach. | Math LG | Math LG L25% | Sci Ach. | SS Ach. | MS Accel. | Grad Rate 2021-22 | C & C Accel 2021-22 | ELP Progress |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| All Students | 50 | | | 60 | | | 47 | 68 | 73 | | | 80 |
| SWD | 11 | | | 32 | | | 8 | 29 | | | 4 | |
| ELL | 17 | | | 35 | | | | 29 | | | 4 | 80 |
| AMI | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ASN | 71 | | | 79 | | | | | | | 2 | |
| BLK | 14 | | | 24 | | | 13 | 25 | | | 4 | |
| HSP | 47 | | | 52 | | | 39 | 45 | 74 | | 6 | 90 |
| MUL | 54 | | | 62 | | | 73 | 92 | 86 | | 5 | |
| PAC | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 57 | | | 69 | | | 54 | 77 | 73 | | 5 | |
| FRL | 34 | | | 47 | | | 35 | 49 | 73 | | 6 | 73 |

| 2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Subgroups | ELA Ach. | ELA LG | ELA LG L25% | Math Ach. | Math LG | Math LG L25% | Sci Ach. | SS Ach. | MS Accel. | Grad Rate 2020-21 | C & C Accel 2020-21 | ELP Progress |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| All Students | 51 | 43 | 29 | 55 | 51 | 47 | 53 | 64 | 74 | | | 50 |
| SWD | 11 | 22 | 22 | 17 | 38 | 37 | 15 | 30 | | | | |
| ELL | 35 | 45 | 33 | 34 | 67 | 69 | | | | | | 50 |
| AMI | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ASN | 57 | 58 | | 64 | 69 | | | | | | | |
| BLK | 15 | 24 | 24 | 16 | 37 | 39 | 12 | 29 | 40 | | | |
| HSP | 43 | 43 | 34 | 45 | 57 | 67 | 41 | 63 | 62 | | | 36 |
| MUL | 55 | 45 | 8 | 59 | 45 | | 21 | 62 | | | | |
| PAC | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 60 | 46 | 33 | 67 | 54 | 51 | 69 | 77 | 78 | | | |
| FRL | 33 | 35 | 27 | 32 | 43 | 48 | 31 | 52 | 44 | | | 44 |

| 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 | 53 | 46 | 29 | 55 | 34 | 34 | 53 | 69 | 67 | | | 67 |
| SWD | 14 | 30 | 27 | 19 | 30 | 32 | 7 | 24 | | | | |
| ELL | 19 | 47 | 46 | 36 | 31 | 24 | 36 | 46 | | | | 67 |
| AMI | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ASN | 61 | 65 | | 58 | 28 | | | | | | | |
| BLK | 20 | 29 | 23 | 20 | 30 | 30 | 11 | 44 | 50 | | | |
| HSP | 46 | 49 | 39 | 45 | 32 | 32 | 37 | 51 | 46 | | | 67 |
| MUL | 51 | 49 | | 45 | 25 | | 50 | 67 | | | | |
| PAC | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 62 | 49 | 27 | 65 | 36 | 38 | 62 | 76 | 69 | | | |
| FRL | 39 | 36 | 23 | 35 | 29 | 28 | 38 | 52 | 49 | | | 69 |

**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 | 54% | 48% | 6% | 47% | 7% |
| 08 | 2023 - Spring | 42% | 47% | -5% | 47% | -5% |
| 06 | 2023 - Spring | 46% | 47% | -1% | 47% | -1% |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 06 | 2023 - Spring | 59% | 58% | 1% | 54% | 5% |
| 07 | 2023 - Spring | 36% | 36% | 0% | 48% | -12% |
| 08 | 2023 - Spring | 65% | 61% | 4% | 55% | 10% |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 08 | 2023 - Spring | 44% | 47% | -3% | 44% | 0% |

| 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 | * | 46% | * | 48% | * |

| CIVICS | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| N/A | 2023 - Spring | 65% | 68% | -3% | 66% | -1% |

# 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.**

Science data was our lowest area of performance at 47% and ELA was at 49%. Factors contributing to these scores would include learning gaps from previous years and inconsistencies in instructional practices. In addition, our civics data correlates to ELA with lower than expected proficiency. A factor contributing to this may include inconsistency in instruction.

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

Science data showed a decline in proficiency levels. Factors contributing to this decline include inconsistencies in instructional delivery and learning gaps from previous years.

**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.**

Seminole Middle School met or exceeded all state averages in assessed content areas.

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

Math showed the greatest improvement. New actions included consistency across the department. We hired new teachers, improved best practices and was more data driven.

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

Areas of concern are student failures in core classes and lack of consistency in grading practices such as standard based grading.

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

1. Continue to boost the staff's ability to identify critical content from the Standards in alignment with district resources through collaboration with colleagues and engage students in research-based strategies that will promote equity and extensive inquiry-based learning opportunities at a high level of rigor. 2. Continue to develop the staff's ability to implement research-based PBIS strategies to promote a culture of student success. 3.Continue to enhance the staff's ability to utilize student data to provide for differentiated instruction/remediation/enrichment. 4.Continue to create opportunities for students to engage in advanced/accelerated coursework.

**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.

Our current level of performance is 47% Mathematics Achievement, as evidenced in the 22-23 School Grades Report. We expect our performance level to be 57% by May 2024. The problem/gap is occurring because more than 50% of students, excluding Algebra and Geometry, are not meeting grade-level expectations. If instruction is aligned to level 3, 4, & 5 of the Achievement Level Descriptors, student achievement will increase.

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

By May 2024 math proficiency rate will be increased from 47% to 57%, using FAST PM3 Data.

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

Monitoring will occur from frequent instructional walkthroughs, PLC discussions, data.
review of assessments: FAST PM1 and PM2 data, IXL, cycle assessment data for Algebra and Geometry, and student work, and feedback/ideas shared by teachers,
administrator and district staff developer.

### Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Desrine Nation (nationd@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. Continue to support the staff with aligning the learning targets and tasks to the course standards.
2. Continue to support the staff with engaging students in complex tasks that increase the level of instructional rigor.
3. Enhance the staff's ability to utilize student data to organize students to interact with content in a manner which differentiates/scaffolds instruction and learning.
4. Enhance student's ability to self-monitor and track their progress and reflect to make changes towards proficiency.

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

Aligning learning targets and tasks to the standards, improving differentiated instruction, and increasing the level of instructional rigor through complex tasks will increase student achievement. These are all research-based strategies and best practices advocated by the National Council of Teachers of Mathematics (NCTM).

### Tier of Evidence-based Intervention
(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

### Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

**Action Steps to Implement**
List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Conduct regular, monthly, Professional Learning Communities (PLCs) inclusive of 'data chats' to review student data to identify and plan for differentiation opportunities based on the students' readiness, interest, and/or learning profile. Data can come from the FAST assessments, IXL, Instructional Materials assessments, and/or teacher and district formal and informal assessments.

**Person Responsible:** Desrine Nation (nationd@pcsb.org)

**By When:** Ongoing/Monthly

Teachers will receive ongoing professional development supporting the alignment of learning targets and tasks to B.E.S.T Standards, The Big M, the Mathematical Thinking and Reasoning Standards, and Differentiation in the Math Classroom.
Math PD based on the professional development calendar will be created for the school year.

**Person Responsible:** Desrine Nation (nationd@pcsb.org)

**By When:** This will occur during Facilitated- Planning Sessions, Biweekly PLCs, Ongoing

Teachers utilize IXL to have students practice on a benchmark aligned skill to achieve proficiency or mastery. Additionally, students can use their Personalized Action Plans as a result of the Diagnostics Snapshot to address mathematical skills gaps with an emphasis on utilizing the program outside of the school day to extend learning beyond the classroom.
learning beyond the classroom.

**Person Responsible:** Desrine Nation (nationd@pcsb.org)

**By When:** Ongoing/ Progress checks weekly

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:** Desrine Nation (nationd@pcsb.org)

**By When:** Ongoing

**#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.

The area of focus centers around increasing the level of rigor of the learning targets and learning tasks to ensure the ELA standards are mastered. There will be a focus on bubble students to move as many level 2 students to level 3 and to maintain level 3 and higher students. There will be a focus on vocabulary and writing strategies that can be used school wide. Teacher will incorporate CLRT strategies in their classroom to ensure a positive learning environment. This area of focus was determined through data analysis, observations from administrative walkthroughs, and from PCS ISM feedback.

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

The percentage of students achieving ELA proficiency will increase from 49% to 59% as measured by the 2023-2024 Florida ProgressMonitoring Assessment (PM3 FAST). We will have a 5-7 point increase in final exams for the history course.

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

Monitoring will consist of daily instructional walkthroughs (iObservation, ELA Gold doc and Look-Fors tools), data reviews, feedback from both school-based administrators and district staff developers, and from discussions during PLCs.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

LaWanda Johnson (johnsonlawa@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.)

PLC's/Common Planning will be utilized to enhance student-centered, targeted standards-based instruction with the appropriate level of rigor and data-driven differentiated instruction to help address the needs of all students.

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

PLCs/Common Planning will promote a collaborative data driven culture to help support the needs of all students. This strategy is research based and promoted by PCS as a best practice to implement.

**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.

The master schedule is created to allow for weekly planning to allow teachers to utilize systemic documents (adopted curriculum, pacing guides, etc.) to effectively plan for ELA units that incorporate the

Standards for ELA Practice and align targets to tasks and create rigorous/complex learning opportunities for students.

**Person Responsible:** LaWanda Johnson (johnsonlawa@pcsb.org)

**By When:** August 2023

To help address the diverse learning needs of students when planning for increased levels of instructional rigor, CLRT-based activities will be utilized.

**Person Responsible:** LaWanda Johnson (johnsonlawa@pcsb.org)

**By When:** Ongoing/PLC

To ensure the effectiveness of PLCs/Collaborative Planning, administration will work with the team to analyze data, to help plan for appropriately increasing the levels of instructional rigor to master the standards.

**Person Responsible:** LaWanda Johnson (johnsonlawa@pcsb.org)

**By When:** Ongoing/Monthly PLC

Students will engage in frequent data chats to monitor and own their data with protocols utilized.

**Person Responsible:** LaWanda Johnson (johnsonlawa@pcsb.org)

**By When:** Ongoing/Progress Checks

Teachers will be encouraged to attend the SS dept. DBQ PD, will engage in student work analysis protocols in PLCs and track student's growth in writing across the three administrations of the DBQs.

**Person Responsible:** Lawanda Johnson (johnsonlaw@pcsb.org)

**By When:** Ongoing

## #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.

1. Our current level of performance is 47%, as evidenced in SSA Assessment results from the 2022-23 school year.
2. We expect our performance level to be 57% by the end of the 2023-24 school year as measured by the SSA.
3. The problem/gap is occurring because differentiated standard based instruction with the appropriate level of rigor needs to be implemented consistently at every grade level.
4. There is a need to implement standard based instruction at the appropriate level of rigor and utilize research-based strategies that promote CLRT in the classroom. We believe that if this occurs then we will see an increase on the SSA by 10%.

### 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 science proficiency will increase from 47% (2022-23) to 57% (2022-23), as measured by the SSA.

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

Daily administrative walkthroughs, data reviews, PLC discussions, and feedback from district staff developers.

### Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jessica Hoag (hoagj@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. Teachers will effectively implement data driven instruction at every grade level to differentiate and scaffold instruction to meet the needs of all students and provide appropriate opportunities for remediation.
2. Teachers will identify critical content from the Standards in alignment with district resources through collaboration with colleagues and engage students in research based strategies that will promote CLRT and extensive inquiry based learning opportunities at a high level of rigor.

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

The above strategies are well embedded in the research and are aligned to the district's strategic plan. They have shown to be proven to increase the school's district and SSA scores. Additionally, by incorporating more equitable strategies, it will not only increase district and SSA scores, but also help close the science educational gap

### 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 will utilize reading and writing, UDL and PBIS strategies within all science classes to provide extensive inquiry-based instruction including research, scientific thinking, and writing opportunities (claims and evidence.) This ties into strategy #2

Examples:

•Teachers will release ownership of learning to students

•Science teachers utilize the parallel teaching approach teaching Nature of Science in context with Content.

•Using Project Based Learning during the elaborate phase of the 5E instructional model, teachers will help students make real world content connections to make content meaningful.

**Person Responsible:** Jessica Hoag (hoagj@pcsb.org)

**By When:** Ongoing

Teachers meet in PLC's at least twice per month to review student data (including responses to tasks, formative assessment data, gap assessment data, and quarterly district assessment data) and use standards as well as learning goals to develop lesson plans at the appropriate level of rigor. This ties to strategy #1 & #2

**Person Responsible:** Jessica Hoag (hoagj@pcsb.org)

**By When:** Monthly PLC

Utilize data to differentiate and scaffold instruction and remediate at every grade level to maximize student performance. This ties to strategy #1

Teach students protocols to establish goals, monitor their data and self-reflection to support continuous improvement. This ties to strategy #1

Teachers collaborate with the PBIS Team, Equity Team, and AVID Site Team to discuss and incorporate strategies that will promote equity and extensive inquiry. This ties to strategy #2

**Person Responsible:** Jessica Hoag (hoagj@pcsb.org)

**By When:** Ongoing/Progress Checks

**#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.

1. Our current level of performance is 68% proficiency on the 2022-2023 Civics EOC
2. We expect our performance level to be 70% proficiency on the 2023-2024 Civics EOC.
3. We will focus on providing targeted standards-based instruction with the appropriate level of rigor. Literacy strategies will be utilized along with data driven differentiated instruction to address the learning needs of all students.
4. By providing targeted professional development to support the strategies
noted in #3, student achievement will increase to the goals noted in #1.

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

The percentage of students achieving proficiency on the Civics EOC will increase from 66% (2022-23) to 70% in (2023-24)

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

Frequent instructional walkthroughs by administrators providing actionable feedback; data reviews by teachers and administrators; PLC discussions between teachers and administrators; and feedback provided from district staff developers. The data used to chart progress will consist of unit assessments, cycle assessments, midterms, teacher made assessments, and year-end assessments.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Robert Ovalle (ovaller@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.)

Utilize PLCs and collaborative planning to engage teachers in data driven discussions to design targeted aligned standards-based instruction that organizes students to interact with content in manners which differentiates/scaffolds instruction to meet the needs of each student; identifies critical content; provides the appropriate level of rigor; and that incorporates literacy strategies such as vocabulary and writing daily.

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

The above strategies are research-based and aligned to the district's strategic
plan.

**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 regularly engage in PLCs to deconstruct upcoming benchmarks and utilize systemic documents (adopted curriculum, pacing guides, etc.) to effectively plan for units that incorporate rigorous performance tasks aligned to standards.

**Person Responsible:** Robert Ovalle (ovaller@pcsb.org)

**By When:** Ongoing/Monthly Department PLC

Regularly assess students (formally and informally) and utilize data during PLCs to adjust instruction, enrich and reteach, and provide research-based intervention.

**Person Responsible:** Robert Ovalle (ovaller@pcsb.org)

**By When:** Ongoing/Progress checks

Teachers will implement vocabulary and writing strategies in civics to engage in reading, analyzing text, and engaging students with text depended questions and tasks aligned to standards. Develop cross curricular opportunities, ex: ELA and reading teachers to utilize civics text and vocabulary in lessons.

**Person Responsible:** Robert Ovalle (ovaller@pcsb.org)

**By When:** Ongoing during PLC

Teachers collaborate with the PBIS Team, Equity Team, AVID Team, and reading team to discuss and incorporate strategies to improve instruction and class culture.

**Person Responsible:** Robert Ovalle (ovaller@pcsb.org)

**By When:** Ongoing/PLC

**#5. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Black/African-American**

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

The area of focus is to improve our overall school practice in the use of data to enhance the staff's effectiveness to provide differentiated learning through UDL, remediation, and enrichment. This strategy were developed by the SBLT, Equity Team, and is research-based.

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

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

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome. Administrators will conduct daily instructional walkthroughs with feedback provided, monitor assessment data, and engage in discussions during PLCs/Collaborative Planning.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Robert Ovalle (ovaller@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.)

Teachers will engage in data-driven professional learning communities to disaggregate data of African-American students as a tool to support differentiated learning (UDL practices, remediation, enrichment) to increase student achievement.

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

The above mentioned strategy is research-based, aligned to the PCS Strategic and Bridging the Gap Plans, and discussed by the SBLT.

**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.

Professional Learning Communities meet twice a month reviewing student data - protocols will be utilized to support the disaggregation of students data to identify gaps for remediation and to support differentiated learning. A special emphasis will be placed on discussing which best practices are having the greatest impact to promote student achievement. (Aug - May)

**Person Responsible:** Robert Ovalle (ovaller@pcsb.org)

**By When:** Ongoing

All staff will participate in professional learning led by the Seminole Middle School Equity Team (Aug - April) with monthly instructional technique shared during staff meetings.

**Person Responsible:** Robert Ovalle (ovaller@pcsb.org)

**By When:** On going

Each grade level administrator will maintain a data book monitoring the progress of African-American students for their grade level. Data will be discussed during the monthly SBLT meeting. (Aug - May)

**Person Responsible:** Robert Ovalle (ovaller@pcsb.org)

**By When:** On going.

African-American students will be provided additional opportunities to receive tutoring/remediation/ enrichment through the Extended Learning Program (ELP) and Ridgecrest 360 partnership.

**Person Responsible:** Robert Ovalle (ovaller@pcsb.org)

**By When:** On going

On-going administrative walk-throughs will occur to monitor effectiveness of instruction providing timely and actionable feedback to help promote continuous improvement (Aug - May).

**Person Responsible:** Robert Ovalle (ovaller@pcsb.org)

**By When:** On going

**#6. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities**

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

The area of focus is to improve differentiated standards-based planning and instruction to better meet the needs of our ESE students. This area of focus was determined from the SBLT after reviewing ESE trend data and from feedback provided by district personnel.

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

The percent of ESE Students achieving ELA proficiency will increase from 11% (2021-22) to 30% (2022-23) and in Math from 17% (2021-22) to 30% (2022-23) to _____ (2023-2024)as measured by the Spring 2023 Progress Monitoring Assessment (F.A.S.T.).

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

Monitoring will be achieved through daily instructional walkthroughs, collaborative conversations during PLCs/Planning, data reviews examining gaps in foundational skills, and from feedback provided from district staff developers.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Robert Ovalle (ovaller@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.)

PLCs and collaborative planning will be utilized as forums to discuss data and effective lesson planning to organize ESE students to interact with content in manners which differentiates/scaffolds instruction to meet the needs of each ESE student. Specific attention will be placed on identifying specific foundational skills gaps and deficits.

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

The strategy is research-based for middle school education and well[1]grounded in the education literature as best practices to improve ESE/ SWD student achievement. Additionally, the strategy was recommended
from feedback provided by the ESE Department and determined by the school's SBLT.

**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.

The ESE Team will meet twice a month to review data of ESE students to identify strengths and gaps to address. General education Teachers who provide mainstreaming will participate in the data meetings.

**Person Responsible:** Robert Ovalle (ovaller@pcsb.org)

**By When:** On going

The data discussed during the PLCs will be utilized to support the common/collaborative planning of teachers to design and implement effective differentiation strategies to address the learning needs of ESE students.

**Person Responsible:** Robert Ovalle (ovaller@pcsb.org)

**By When:** On Going

Administrators will conduct daily instructional walkthroughs to provide timely and actionable feedback to promote continuous improvement.

**Person Responsible:** Robert Ovalle (ovaller@pcsb.org)

**By When:** On going

**#7. 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.

We have a disproportionate percentage of disciplinary referrals for our black students. We have a strong Positive Behavior Intervention system designed to reward students for positive behavior expectations. Our community supports PBIS by providing funds and donations for student rewards.

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

We will have a twenty-five percent reduction in behavior referrals for black students.

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

We will analyze the data to determine if there is a correlation between PBIS rewards distribution and a decrease in disciplinary data. This will be monitored monthly by various stakeholders.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Robert Ovalle (ovaller@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 school focus more heavily on positive reinforcement as opposed to disciplinary outcomes. Seminole Middle School is a pilot school with the district Culturally Responsive Climate Team to implement culturally responsive practices campus wide.

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

Our rationale is that our disadvantaged students experience a disproportionate percentage of disciplinary consequences.

**Tier of Evidence-based Intervention**
(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

**Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?**

No

**Action Steps to Implement**
List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

*No action steps were entered for this area of focus*

**#8. 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.

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

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

**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.)

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

**Tier of Evidence-based Intervention**
(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

**Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?**

No

**Action Steps to Implement**
List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

*No action steps were entered for this area of focus*

## CSI, TSI and ATSI Resource Review
Describe the process to review school improvement funding allocations and ensure resources are allocated based on needs. This section must be completed if the school is identified as ATSI, TSI or CSI in addition to completing an Area(s) of Focus identifying interventions and activities within the SIP (ESSA 1111(d)(1)(B)(4) and (d)(2)(C).

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.