Kathleen Middle School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Kathleen Middle School

3627 KATHLEEN PNES, Lakeland, FL 33810

http://schools.polk-fl.net/kathleenmiddle

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.

The mission of Kathleen Middle School, a community of diverse learners, is to ensure rigorous and relevant learning experiences that result in high achievement for our students.

Provide the school's vision statement.

At Kathleen Middle School, we strive to provide a secure learning environment for all students to prepare them for the competitive world in which we live. Each student will be empowered to lead and influence the ever-changing, diverse, global economy as a creative and critical thinker.

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
Gregory, Sheila	Principal	Oversee and implement and evaluate all aspects of school
Christensen, Anna	Reading Coach	work with Reading Department to support and sustain reading instruction and interventions
Day, Bucky	Assistant Principal	scheduling, curriculum and instruction
Hill, William	Math Coach	support and sustain math instruction
Oliver, Joshua	School Counselor	scheduling and counseling
Sahay, Shikha	Instructional Coach	Literacy
Smith, Monique	Math Coach	Title One Coordinator, Math support and coaching
Taylor, Kevin	Science Coach	support and sustain science instruction
Webster, Yolanda	Dean	Instructional support; PBIS, discipline

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.

Academic Leadership team met monthly throughout the previous year to monitor and shift goals as needed. After the initial wave of Spring data was released, the team met again to work on goals for this year. Teachers were polled as to what strategies should be continued or discontinued based on how they rated the effectiveness of the goals/strategies. The SAC final meeting was held in May and data was also discussed and ideas to sustain for the next year was also on agenda.

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 is a living, breathing document and as such it will be revisited monthly with the Academic Leadership team, the SAC, and weekly during School Based Leadership meetings and with staff during PLC time. As needed, based on feedback and data, it will be edited.

Demographic Data	
Only ESSA identification and school grade history updated 3/11/2024	
2023-24 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Middle School 6-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	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	ATSI
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD)* English Language Learners (ELL)* 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: C
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	84	89	109	282
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	108	119	112	339
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	0	6
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	4	0	12
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	97	106	106	309
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	118	124	114	356
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	273	221	248	742

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	143	141	152	436

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	1	3	0	4
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	4	6	14

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	101	118	114	333
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	97	106	89	292
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	32	43
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	31	39
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	108	112	119	339
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	143	130	132	405
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	140	143	148	431

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	137	155	152	444

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	7	7
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	5	10

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	101	118	114	333
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	97	106	89	292
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	32	43
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	31	39
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	108	112	119	339
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	143	130	132	405
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	140	143	148	431

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	137	155	152	444

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	7	7
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	5	10

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*	29	36	49	30	40	50	29		
ELA Learning Gains				40			36		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				40			33		
Math Achievement*	28	40	56	35	34	36	30		
Math Learning Gains				49			29		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				54			28		
Science Achievement*	25	34	49	32	40	53	28		
Social Studies Achievement*	57	66	68	53	49	58	46		
Middle School Acceleration	65	70	73	65	46	49	60		
Graduation Rate					36	49			
College and Career Acceleration					66	70			
ELP Progress	44	31	40	55	68	76	30		

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

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

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	41
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	4
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	248
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	45
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	4
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	453
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	97
Graduation Rate	

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	22	Yes	4	1
ELL	32	Yes	4	
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	26	Yes	2	1
HSP	41			
MUL	15	Yes	4	1
PAC				
WHT	45			

2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
FRL	41			

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	32	Yes	3	
ELL	39	Yes	3	
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	37	Yes	1	
HSP	44			
MUL	34	Yes	3	
PAC				
WHT	50			
FRL	43			

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	29			28			25	57	65			44
SWD	18			16			13	40			4	
ELL	20			23			16	56			5	44
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	22			19			6	57			4	
HSP	26			28			26	58	63		6	44
MUL	25			5							2	

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2021-22	C & C Accel 2021-22	ELP Progress
PAC												
WHT	36			33			30	55	70		5	
FRL	26			26			23	56	67		6	47

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	30	40	40	35	49	54	32	53	65			55
SWD	14	30	27	20	39	40	20	33				62
ELL	17	44	43	22	43	50	12	43	60			55
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	22	38	35	23	44	63	17	46	45			
HSP	30	44	40	32	50	50	26	50	59			56
MUL	27	36		29	45							
PAC												
WHT	35	38	41	46	51	54	49	63	74			
FRL	29	40	40	32	46	51	29	52	59			52

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	29	36	33	30	29	28	28	46	60			30
SWD	13	33	34	18	24	21	21	34				
ELL	24	38	35	26	34	41	30	41	62			30
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	16	26	26	13	22	25	15	37	21			
HSP	27	35	31	29	29	32	28	42	74			30
MUL	33	36		36	50							
PAC												
WHT	39	43	40	41	32	24	36	53	62			
FRL	25	34	30	24	27	28	20	39	43			30

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	24%	36%	-12%	47%	-23%
08	2023 - Spring	26%	39%	-13%	47%	-21%
06	2023 - Spring	30%	35%	-5%	47%	-17%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	26%	38%	-12%	54%	-28%
07	2023 - Spring	26%	35%	-9%	48%	-22%
08	2023 - Spring	24%	42%	-18%	55%	-31%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	23%	33%	-10%	44%	-21%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	71%	37%	34%	50%	21%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	86%	37%	49%	48%	38%

CIVICS						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	55%	65%	-10%	66%	-11%

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.

Our 7th Grade data, overall, showed the weakest performance in ELA. We were without a steady teacher in half our our classes due to vacancy and instruction was inconsistent with the standards not being fulling met. Our staffing in this grade level has been weak the past couple of years due to the inconsistency in the instruction and lack of teaching methodology.

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

Our Math showed the greatest decline with a 9.4% decrease from the previous year. Our 7th grade Math class had the greatest hurdles as the instruction was inconsistent and lacked the rigor to elevate our student learning. With inexperienced teachers put into tested areas, the instructional methodology and grasp of the new benchmarks impacted our progress.

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.

Our 6th Grade Math score was 26% compared to the state average of 54%. Our students came to us from area low performing schools with many gaps. We utilized the new intervention tool from the district and provided more foundational skills to students that were scheduled into the course. We were only able to provide seats for 125 students due to staffing and this was not enough for the number of students who needed interventions.

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

Our Civics showed the most improvement with over 5% increase from the previous' year. We put new teachers in place and worked on unpacking the standards and using the ARC planning to go to the full intent of the standard and provide equitable experiences for our students.

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

One area will be our suspensions/referrals, based on the increase from the previous' year, we are going to work more closely with the District's Behavior Specialists. Of the 419 students with referrals, 14 students had referrals greater than 20, most of which are ESE/504 students.

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

Suspension/Referral rates
Proficiency in all core academic/tested areas
ESSA subgroups making adequate progress

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.

Our Multi-Racial, Hispanic and Students with Disabilities are our lowest performing subgroups. Our students are not prepared for the rigor of the assessment. With AVID, all students are held to high standards and are properly supported in academics. Culturally relevant teaching practices will help our stakeholders build authentic relationships, holding to higher expectations, empower student voices and build a strong infrastructure, prepared to learn and excel. Our ELL students also have the added bonus of the language acquisition piece that will enable our students to develop literacy and academic language.

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

The students in all subgroups will increase their proficiency levels on the FAST progress monitoring from PM 1 to PM 3 by 5%.

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

Weekly, calibrated observations conducted by the Administration using the SBI walk thru tool. Benchmark assessment data will be collected and analyzed by Leadership team and interventions will be put in place. Collaborative planning will be held weekly with the Administration actively participating and monitoring.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Sheila Gregory (sheila.gregory@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.)

ARC will be the tool for unpacking and developing lessons that are aligned to the targeted benchmark with the task aligned to the breadth and depth of the benchmark.
AVID's WICOR strategies will be embedded in all content areas when building lessons and implementation.

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

WICOR stands for Writing, Inquiry, Collaboration, Organization and Reading. It is the foundation for high engagement teaching and learning. WICOR provides a learning model that faculty can use to guide students to comprehend materials and concepts with differentiation, with language immersions, with articulate ideas, with scaffolds built in within developmental, general education and discipline based curriculum.

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.

Faculty professional development will be created and facilitated by our AVID site based team. Particular attention will be embedded in the sessions on our fragile population and the scaffolds that may be needed.

Person Responsible: Kevin Taylor (kevin.taylor@polk-fl.net)

By When: During Pre-planning week and ongoing for the school year.

Peer observations during PLC time will occur using the SBI. During the debrief with admin and academic coaches, ESOL and ESE staff will discuss the different scaffolds that were or could be put in place to support and sustain student growth.

Person Responsible: Bucky Day (bucky.day@polk-fl.net)

By When: Ongoing

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Benchmark-aligned Instruction

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

Our ESSA subgroups continue to show an area of need in instructional support in Math, ELA and Science. With the assessment going into the second year of implementation, our students are still learning to grasp the new benchmarks and assessment practices.

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

Our students will show a progressive increase in proficiency from the end of year FAST, 2023, thru the three progress monitoring assessments that will occur in the 2023-24 school year. The ESSA subgroups outcomes will show a 3% increase.

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

The FAST progress monitoring will be the monitoring tool that will be utilized to show the progress toward the end of year proficiency. Ongoing benchmark assessments will be analyzed and intervention groups will be put together as the data shows the need. ELL and ESE personnel and analyze the data and will pull small groups to work in conjunction with classroom teacher.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:
Sheila Gregory (sheila.gregory@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.)

Monitor students engaged in equivalent experiences aligned to state expectation using the SBI tool. Engage teachers in standards-based protocols, schoolwide, using the Learning ARC framework. ELL designated staff to push into ELA and Math classes. ESE personnel to offer support in all tested areas.

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

TNTP's The Opportunity Myth speaks to the relationship between academic success and enduring students ar able to engage in grade level standards based

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.

Create calendar for SBI Walks

Person Responsible: Sheila Gregory (sheila.gregory@polk-fl.net)

By When: August 1, 2023

Calibration Walks using SBI with new administration

Person Responsible: Sheila Gregory (sheila.gregory@polk-fl.net)

By When: September, 2023

Share SBI walk thru data with SBLT and discuss trends and interventions

Person Responsible: Sheila Gregory (sheila.gregory@polk-fl.net)

By When: ongoing thru end of year

ARC training with new staff and administration

Person Responsible: Kevin Taylor (kevin.taylor@polk-fl.net)

By When: September, 2023

Quarterly ARC planning sessions with tested areas and academic coaches. ARCs will be collected with work samples attached.

Person Responsible: Sheila Gregory (sheila.gregory@polk-fl.net)

By When: ongoing thru May, 2024

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

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

During the 2022-23 school year we had a smaller increase in discipline referrals than the previous' year with only an increase of 251 referrals over the previous increase of 597. Our number of referrals was 2222, with 414 students accounting for this. Our student population has continued to rise in conjunction with the increase in referrals. With fourteen students, the majority in 6th grade, counting for over 250 of the referrals. Our 88 of our ELL students accounted for 320 of our referrals while our SWD students accounted for our 793 of the referrals.

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

The school is aiming to decrease our referral per student ratio by 3%. SWD and ELL students with referrals will decrease by 5%.

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

Our weekly SBLT meetings monitor this data and the trends. This year, the subgroups will be directly monitored by the Discipline Team. Monthly and quarterly district reports will also be utilized. These reports breakdown the data by student, subgroup, grade and gender.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Sheila Gregory (sheila.gregory@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.)

Our school will continue to utilize PBIS. We have a diverse group of educator and student voices on our committee. We are working on incentives for students and staff to decrease the number of classroom referrals. We are continuing our Student of the Month program along with our Positive Influencer Award and Thumbs Up Award for staff and students. These awards are given to stakeholders who illustrate positive behavior both in and out of the classroom.

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

PBIS is a recognized program that recognizes the positive in stakeholders, not focusing on the negatives. This will continue to promote a more positive culture on campus. The will thereby increase the student time in classrooms.

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.

School Bell schedule will be modified to move one grade level at a time to decrease the amount of students transitioning at the same time to decrease the negative behaviors.

Person Responsible: Bucky Day (bucky.day@polk-fl.net)

By When: By the beginning of the school year, bell schedules will be adjusted and students and staff will be trained in the proper transition time behaviors.

PBIS Committee will be formed with staff and students with a schedule created for a reward system and meetings scheduled monthly to monitor the implementation.

Person Responsible: Yolanda Webster (yolanda.webster@polk-fl.net)

By When: By the end of the first month of school.

Teacher support and coaching given for teachers who are struggling in the classroom with management based on observation and number of referrals written. Teachers with high numbers from the 2022-23 school year will be worked with prior to the beginning of the school year.

Person Responsible: Yolanda Webster (yolanda.webster@polk-fl.net)

By When: Monthly until the end of the school year

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

• Title I/UniSIG Comprehensive Needs Assessment (CNA)
• Data Com
• Summer Leadership Academy/Retreat
• School Improvement Plan Meetings/Trainings
• PURE Process
• Regional and Office of School Transformation review SIP plans

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.

School webpage (http://kms.polk-fl.net/title-i-parent-involvement/), Facebook page, SAC meetings, and quarterly Title I news letter. Progression on our SIP goals will be shared at SAC meetings and through our quarterly news letter.

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))

School webpage (http://kms.polk-fl.net/title-i-parent-involvement/), Facebook page, monthly family nights, and open house.

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))

• Supplemental Staff (academic coaches, interventionists, paraprofessionals)
• Supplemental Resources
• Extended Learning
• Professional Development
• Collaborative Planning
• MTSS – Tier Support for Students

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))

• Data Com
• School Improvement Planning Trainings
• Regional (area) Meetings
• Summer Leadership Academy
• Title I Technical Assistance – Use of Funds, PFE Input, Back to School Mtg
• Comprehensive Needs Assessment Technical Assistance
• ESE, Migrant, Work Force

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))

• https://polkschoolsfl.com/mentalhealth/
• Individual Counseling
• Group Counseling
• School Consultations
• Drumbeats
• Collaboration with community providers – Peace River Center, Watson Clinic Behavioral Health, Sweet Center – Winter Haven Hospital
o Support Groups
o Grief Support
o Children's Home Society

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))

N/A

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).

• PBiS
• MTSS
• Mental Health Counselors, School Counselors, Deans

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))

• Professional Learning Communities to improve instruction and data
• Data Com
• RTD
• Collective Bargaining Stipends – Title I, Critical Shortage Area, Highly Effective
• Recruitment and Educator Quality Department - PCPS Culture Ambassador Program

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