

Polk County Public Schools

Mulberry Middle School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	11
III. Planning for Improvement	16
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	22
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	22
VI. Title I Requirements	24
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	26

Mulberry Middle School

500 DR MLK JR AVE SE, Mulberry, FL 33860

<http://schools.polk-fl.net/mms>

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.

Mulberry Middle School is dedicated to providing an environment wherein all students acquire the knowledge, skills, and attitudes to work cooperatively and succeed in a changing society.

Provide the school's vision statement.

“Every Mulberry Middle School student will transition to high school ready to succeed as a proficient learner.”

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
Cangelose, Cynthia	Principal	Instructional leader that provides leadership for and management of programs and processes related to instruction, school operations, personnel management, business management, student support services, student activities and community involvement.
Mitchell, Kathryn	Reading Coach	Deliver appropriate teacher-to-teacher professional learning and coaching support, resulting in improved effectiveness of classroom instructional practices and enhanced student achievement. The coach is responsible for teacher-to-teacher coaching, modeling, mentoring, and collaborating to promote a better articulated instructional curriculum for students. The coach will also be responsible for coaching teachers about: data collection, analysis, interpretation, and usage; research-based instructional strategies and programs; school improvement, and for building a shared knowledge base for teaching and learning throughout schools. Being a Title I school, this position may also be responsible for documenting the implementation of the Title I Plan
west, tamika	Assistant Principal	Instructional leader that assists the school principal by providing leadership for and management of programs and processes related to instruction, school operations, personnel management, business management, student support services, student activities and community involvement.
Donnelly, Kara	Other	Perform intervention services in literacy for students who are underperforming and at risk of not meeting state standards. Professional duties will include identifying students who are at-risk in not meeting grade level proficiency by analyzing data from identified state and district formative and summative assessments, classroom assignments, and other identified curricula-based learning tasks; collaborating with teachers to plan, implement, and evaluate interventions for identified students; identifying appropriate supplemental resources to meet students' individual needs; working with administration to implement and document activities related to the Title I Plan; monitoring students' response and communicating with administration, teachers, and parents regarding students' progress in tutoring activities
Beagan, Misty	Teacher, K-12	Responsible for supervising, educating, and supporting students to help them accomplish learning benchmarks. Develops plans, and implement curriculum, lesson plans, and education programs. Plans and implements a program of instruction that adheres to the district's philosophy, goals and objectives as outlined in the adopted courses of study. Keeps current in subject matter knowledge and learning theory and is willing to share this knowledge for the continual improvement of the school's curriculum. Develops, in accordance with district and building guidelines, reasonable rules of classroom behavior and appropriate discipline techniques which are consistently applied. Evaluates accomplishments of students on a regular basis using multiple assessment methods such as teacher-made test, sample of students work.

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
	Assistant Principal	Instructional leader that assists the school principal by providing leadership for and management of programs and processes related to instruction, school operations, personnel management, business management, student support services, student activities and community involvement.

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.

Mulberry Middle surveyed the School Advisory Council to involve stakeholders. The stakeholders included community members, students, parents, and school staff. The survey asked stakeholders to provide feedback on new benchmarks, parent involvement in their child's education, how the school disseminated information to parents, and how the school communicated student achievement. The School Advisory Council was also asked to provide concerns, ideas, and solutions regarding the 2022-2023 school year at the meeting in May, to provide feedback for the upcoming 2023-2024 school year. Additionally, Mulberry Middle surveyed for feedback on community events, which allowed Mulberry Middle to continuously adapt the school improvement plan.

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 Mulberry Middle School leadership team will meet monthly to analyze student data trends (focusing on ELL, SWD, and FRL students) and communicate findings to modify instructional practices based on student needs. A consistent tracking form will be implemented in these meetings to interpret data trends and address deficiencies. The school will use the standards walkthrough tool to monitor the alignment of classroom instruction with benchmarks to ensure that students are receiving an equitable experience. Administration and instructional coaches will attend quarterly learning arc sessions to collaborate and plan learning arcs, which include questioning strategies, checkpoints throughout the lessons, and common assessments that are grade-level appropriate. At the end of each quarter, the leadership team will meet to review our data including student progress monitoring, discipline, grades, trends from the Qualtrics standards walkthrough tool data, and staff and student attendance. Leadership team will discuss in further detail the data surrounding our ELL, SWD, and FRL students. Additional actions steps may be made based on the results from the data during the SIP review process at the end of each quarter. Professional development and additional support will be provided in areas deemed necessary for continuous improvement.

Demographic Data

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

<p>2023-24 Status (per MSID File)</p>	<p>Active</p>
--	---------------

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	Yes
2022-23 Minority Rate	62%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	100%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	TSI
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)* 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: C 2019-20: C 2018-19: C 2017-18: B
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	116	130	112	358
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	174	175	165	514
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	185	175	186	546
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	144	92	103	339
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	138	121	113	372
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that have two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level										Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	221	195	180	596	

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	10	10
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1

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								86	111	105	302
One or more suspensions								28	93	98	219
Course failure in ELA								33	39	32	104
Course failure in Math								28	7	20	55
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment								104	93	107	304
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment								120	99	123	342
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.								215	206	203	624

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	223	235	201	659	

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	6	1	8	15	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	3	

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	86	111	105	302
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	28	93	98	219
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	33	39	32	104
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	28	7	20	55
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	104	93	107	304
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	120	99	123	342
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	215	206	203	624

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	223	235	201	659

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	6	1	8	15
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	3

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*	34	36	49	39	40	50	40		
ELA Learning Gains				44			41		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				35			37		
Math Achievement*	44	40	56	35	34	36	36		
Math Learning Gains				45			34		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				46			41		

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
Science Achievement*	33	34	49	31	40	53	37		
Social Studies Achievement*	68	66	68	71	49	58	66		
Middle School Acceleration	87	70	73	55	46	49	54		
Graduation Rate					36	49			
College and Career Acceleration					66	70			
ELP Progress	18	31	40	39	68	76	23		

* 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	47
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	284
Total Components for the Federal Index	6
Percent Tested	98
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	44
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	440
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	28	Yes	4	3
ELL	38	Yes	3	
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	41			
HSP	44			
MUL	44			
PAC				
WHT	58			
FRL	44			

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	26	Yes	3	2
ELL	36	Yes	2	
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	41			
HSP	42			
MUL	44			
PAC				
WHT	48			
FRL	38	Yes	1	

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	34			44			33	68	87			18
SWD	11			22			11	37	73		6	15
ELL	17			31			13	60	86		6	18
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	36			35			31	63			4	
HSP	29			40			27	68	82		6	18
MUL	44			44							2	
PAC												
WHT	40			50			41	70	89		5	
FRL	30			39			28	68	83		6	17

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	39	44	35	35	45	46	31	71	55			39
SWD	11	28	24	15	35	39	11	39	21			38
ELL	26	38	35	27	41	43	15	53	44			39
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	37	48	38	23	43	45	32	58				
HSP	35	43	36	32	42	45	24	68	51			40
MUL	55	56		38	32		40					
PAC												
WHT	43	44	32	41	49	50	41	77	59			
FRL	31	41	34	30	42	43	20	66	38			35

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	40	41	37	36	34	41	37	66	54			23
SWD	11	26	34	19	34	37	14	30				
ELL	25	36	35	23	37	46	9	46	45			23

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20	ELP Progress
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	31	39	31	20	25	32	27	59	57			
HSP	36	37	29	32	34	45	26	61	53			23
MUL	59	59		35	39							
PAC												
WHT	46	46	52	45	36	42	53	76	52			
FRL	31	36	31	28	32	38	26	59	43			22

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	29%	36%	-7%	47%	-18%
08	2023 - Spring	34%	39%	-5%	47%	-13%
06	2023 - Spring	29%	35%	-6%	47%	-18%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	37%	38%	-1%	54%	-17%
07	2023 - Spring	40%	35%	5%	48%	-8%
08	2023 - Spring	38%	42%	-4%	55%	-17%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	33%	33%	0%	44%	-11%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	88%	37%	51%	50%	38%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	100%	37%	63%	48%	52%

CIVICS						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	67%	65%	2%	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.

ELA proficiency was the lowest-performing component. Student and teacher attendance impacted student learning and achievement. In addition to attendance, students lacked stamina to effectively read the passages in their entirety. SWD had learning gaps in foundational reading skills which hindered their ability to read grade-level passages and answer corresponding comprehension questions. FRL students also had learning gaps in foundational reading skills which hindered their ability to read grade-level passages and answer corresponding comprehension questions. In addition, FRL students lacked access to reading materials at home and real world experiences. This affected their ability to make connections to the reading passages in class. ELL students also had learning gaps in foundational reading skills which hindered their ability to read grade-level passages and answer corresponding comprehension questions. In addition, ELL students lacked access to reading materials at home and real world experiences. This affected their ability to make connections to the reading passages in class. ELL students also had vocabulary deficiencies which impeded their ability to effectively read and comprehend the grade-level passages.

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

ELA L25 learning gains showed the greatest decline from the prior year. SWD and FRL students had learning gaps in foundational reading skills. ELL students lacked access to at-home reading materials and real world experiences in the classroom. Students in the ELA, L25 group are significantly deficient in phonemic awareness skills such as blending, segmenting, and substitution. This affected their ability to comprehend grade-level texts and apply their skills successfully.

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

The greatest gap compared to the state average was science proficiency. 2023 science proficiency score was 33% compared to the state average of 44% proficiency. Reading and vocabulary skills among SWD, ELL, and FRL students were significantly below average. Additionally, students scored lower in benchmarks surrounding physical science and Nature of Science concepts.

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

Math achievement and learning gains showed the most improvement from the prior year. Classroom instruction that prioritized small groups, project-based learning, interactive notebooks, collaborative discussions, and after school tutoring were new actions that lead to improvement. These actions allowed teachers to target students based on their proficiency. SWD and ELL students had access to individualized remediation through a classroom teacher and support teacher. FRL students utilized an online platform with extra resources to promote learning gains at home.

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

Based on EWS data, one potential area of concern is student attendance. Our school had a quarter or more of students in each grade level with less than 90% attendance.

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

Our school's highest priority focuses on ELA, including proficiency, learning gains, and L25 gains. The second would be improving ELA proficiency among SWD, ELL, and FRL students. The third would be increasing science proficiency.

Area of Focus

(Identified key Area of Focus that addresses the school's highest priority based on any/all relevant data sources)

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups

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.

One area of focus is ELA. Based on state assessment data, our school-wide proficiency is lower than state and district averages and has declined steadily over the last 4 years (48%, 40%, 38%, 31*). Additionally, this proficiency level is the lowest in school history, and therefore has been identified as a crucial need. Our ESSA subgroups of SWD, FRL, and ELL are a concern, especially in the ELA components of Learning Gains and Learning Gains of the L25%. These subgroups have consistently declined in these areas as well over the last 4 years.

Measurable Outcome:

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

ELA proficiency will increase from 39 to 45 percent. ELA learning gains will increase from 44 to 50 percent. ELA lowest 25 gains will increase from 35 to 41 percent.

Monitoring:

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

Monitoring will be conducted through small group instruction, progress monitoring assessments, interventions such as the reading interventionist conducting push in and pull out sessions, and weekly data analysis.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Kathryn Mitchell (kathryn.mitchell@polk-fl.net)

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.)

Evidence-based interventions being implemented are the Corrective Reading and Intensive Math programs being implemented in classrooms for students that need additional interventions. These programs offer the level of intervention necessary for the student and provide data analysis opportunities for teacher and administration to use.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

To increase student proficiency, measurable data is necessary to show learning gains.

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.

Reading interventionist will strategically implement small group instruction based on student data and progress monitoring.

Person Responsible: Kara Donnelly (kara.donnelly@polk-fl.net)

By When: Monthly monitoring of assessment data.

Administration will conduct standards walks in ELA classrooms.

Person Responsible: Cynthia Cangelose (cynthia.cangelose@polk-fl.net)

By When: Standards walks will be conducted weekly.

Literacy coach will facilitate professional learning communities and collaborative planning with a focus on learning arcs and improving common assessments through equitable experiences.

Person Responsible: Kathryn Mitchell (kathryn.mitchell@polk-fl.net)

By When: Action steps will be conducted biweekly.

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

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

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

Teacher attendance is an area of focus. When teachers are present, students are provided an equitable learning experience.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Teacher attendance needs to improve to 90% of the staff on campus 95% percent of the time.

Monitoring:

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

Teacher attendance will be monitored through AESOP, an online attendance platform, and the teacher sign-in sheet.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Cynthia Cangelose (cynthia.cangelose@polk-fl.net)

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.)

An employee attendance incentive program will be implemented as an intervention to increase teacher presence on campus.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

When teachers are on campus, it has a direct impact on student learning.

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.

An employee attendance incentive program will be curated to entice teachers to consistently be on campus.

Person Responsible: Cynthia Cangelose (cynthia.cangelose@polk-fl.net)

By When: Monthly monitoring of attendance.

#3. 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.

Alignment between the benchmarks and the instruction students are receiving has been inconsistent across subject areas. This can have great impact on student understanding and success. Focusing on improvement in the planning process, as well as monitoring and tracking data trends across classrooms can lead to greater alignment of instruction to the benchmarks and improved consistency in the subject area instruction.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Specific goals set for this focus area include a continuation of the learning arc initiative created by our district. Our teachers began this process last school year and continuing this process will enable them to plan for instructional alignment to the benchmarks. The goal will be to have 90% of our teachers participating in the learning arc process to improve instructional alignment to the benchmarks.

Monitoring:

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

Administrators will use the Qualtrics tool regularly during classroom observations to track trend data and monitor benchmark alignment. Administration will analyze this data and create plans for helping teachers improve upon the planning and instruction processes to further increase benchmark alignment.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Cynthia Cangelose (cynthia.cangelose@polk-fl.net)

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 learning arc is an evidence based planning system that encourages instructional alignment to the benchmarks in all aspects of the instructional planning process. Weekly monitoring of benchmark alignment by administrators using the Qualtrics tool.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The learning arc process enables teachers to collaboratively plan with a focus on benchmark alignment. Using the Qualtrics tool for weekly classroom observations allows administration to collect data regarding benchmark alignment and analyze this data to find trends and areas in need of attention.

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).

Title 1 funds will be used to employ additional school personnel to support students and staff. Additionally, these funds will be used to provide tutoring sessions, learning arc professional development, and collaborative planning time. Furthermore, Title 1 funds will be allocated towards various parental and community involvement nights that address student learning gaps among SWD, ELL, and FRL students. Programs to enrich student learning, such as AVID and CFES, are provided through Title 1 funding. Administration will attend Data Com and summer leadership academy/retreat. Administration learned new policies and procedures applying to literacy, the standards-based walk implementation, and the pillars of standards-based instruction. At Data Com, administration defended data, in addition to creating a 65-day plan for school improvement. The school leadership team attended a SIP training to adequately prepare the team to effectively analyze and review data to set intentional goals for school improvement.

Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE)

Area of Focus Description and Rationale

Include a description of your Area of Focus (Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA) for each grade below, how it affects student learning in literacy, and a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed. Data that should be used to determine the critical need should include, at a minimum:

- The percentage of students below Level 3 on the 2022 statewide, standardized ELA assessment. Identification criteria must include each grade that has 50 percent or more students scoring below level 3 in grades 3-5 on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.
- The percentage of students in kindergarten through grade 3, based on 2021-2022 end of year screening and progress monitoring data, who are not on track to score Level 3 or above on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.
- Other forms of data that should be considered: formative, progress monitoring and diagnostic assessment data.

Grades K-2: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

N/A

Grades 3-5: Instructional Practice specifically related to Reading/ELA

N/A

Measurable Outcomes

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each grade below. This should be a data-based, objective outcome. Include prior year data and a measurable outcome for each of the following:

- Each grade K -3, using the coordinated screening and progress monitoring system, where 50 percent or more of the students are not on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment;
- Each grade 3-5 where 50 percent or more of its students scored below a Level 3 on the most recent statewide, standardized ELA assessment; and
- Grade 6 measurable outcomes may be included, as applicable.

Grades K-2 Measurable Outcomes

N/A

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

N/A

Monitoring

Monitoring

Describe how the school’s Area(s) of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcomes. Include a description of how ongoing monitoring will impact student achievement outcomes.

N/A

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Evidence-based Practices/Programs

Description:

Describe the evidence-based practices/programs being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each grade and describe how the identified practices/programs will be monitored. The term “evidence-based” means demonstrating a statistically significant effect on improving student outcomes or other relevant outcomes as provided in 20 U.S.C. §7801(21)(A)(i). Florida’s definition limits evidence-based practices/programs to only those with strong, moderate or promising levels of evidence.

- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs meet Florida’s definition of evidence-based (strong, moderate or promising)?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align with the district’s K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align to the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards?

N/A

Rationale:

Explain the rationale for selecting practices/programs. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting the practices/programs.

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs address the identified need?
- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

N/A

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken to address the school’s Area(s) of Focus. To address the area of focus, identify 2 to 3 action steps and explain in detail for each of the categories below:

- Literacy Leadership
- Literacy Coaching
- Assessment
- Professional Learning

Action Step

Person Responsible for Monitoring

N/A

Title I Requirements

Schoolwide Program Plan (SWP) Requirements

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

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

List the school’s webpage* where the SIP is made publicly available.

The Title 1 coordinator will ensure that the parent and family engagement plan is displayed on the school website, and will place the parent and family engagement notebook in the front office, which is available to all stakeholders. Furthermore, the Title 1 coordinator will conduct parent, family, and community input meetings which allows stakeholders to provide feedback on how Title 1 funds are being used.

Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school’s mission, support the needs of students and keep parents informed of their child’s progress.

List the school’s webpage* where the school’s Family Engagement Plan is made publicly available. (ESSA 1116(b-g))

The school will engage stakeholders through various parent engagement nights, which include literacy, math, and data nights. Data chats and conferences will be utilized to ensure student and parent autonomy.

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

Title 1 funds will be used to employ coaches and interventionists, which are used to support students in core subject areas, as well as social-emotional development. Furthermore, these funds will be used for collaborative planning, professional development, and extended learning opportunities. Additionally, funds will be used towards MTSS.

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

District Title 1 personnel attended Data Com with school administration and shared possible ways to use their Title 1 budget. The school leadership team attended SIP training in order to effectively review and analyze data to establish goals for school-wide improvement. Our school will regularly be in correspondence with district Title 1 personnel to ensure that the school is in compliance with Title 1 requirements.

Optional Component(s) of the Schoolwide Program Plan

Include descriptions for any additional strategies that will be incorporated into the plan.

Describe how the school ensures counseling, school-based mental health services, specialized support services, mentoring services, and other strategies to improve students' skills outside the academic subject areas. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(I))

The school has mental health facilitators on campus daily who conduct groups for student mental health counseling. Additionally, there are monthly threat assessment and orange team meetings for monitoring student mental health concerns. Mental health facilitators conduct red team assessments to discuss and monitor students that are severe concerns.

Describe the preparation for and awareness of postsecondary opportunities and the workforce, which may include career and technical education programs and broadening secondary school students' access to coursework to earn postsecondary credit while still in high school. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(II))

Our Brilliant Pathways program prepares students for college and career readiness through enrichment and exposure to postsecondary opportunities and the workforce.

Describe the implementation of a schoolwide tiered model to prevent and address problem behavior, and early intervening services, coordinated with similar activities and services carried out under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. 20 U.S.C. 1400 et seq. and ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(III).

The school uses MTSS strategies, including PBIS, for positive behavior interventions. Additionally, the school engages in progressive discipline to assess each student individually to curate an effective behavior management plan.

Describe the professional learning and other activities for teachers, paraprofessionals, and other school personnel to improve instruction and use of data from academic assessments, and to recruit and retain effective teachers, particularly in high need subjects. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(IV))

The school utilizes professional development, professional learning communities, learning arc planning, and collaborative planning to ensure an equitable learning experience for all students.

Describe the strategies the school employs to assist preschool children in the transition from early childhood education programs to local elementary school programs. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(V))

N/A

Budget to Support Areas of Focus

Part VII: Budget to Support Areas of Focus

The approved budget does not reflect any amendments submitted for this project.

1	III.B.	Area of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups	\$0.00
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Teacher Attendance	\$0.00
3	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Benchmark-aligned Instruction	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00

Budget Approval

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

Yes