Lakeland Highlands Middle School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Lakeland Highlands Middle School

740 LAKE MIRIAM DR, Lakeland, FL 33813

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

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.

To serve every student with the highest quality education through interest-driven academies providing a focused and engaging learning environment.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Through a collaborative focus on rigorous and engaging instruction, students in grades six through eight will build on their previous years' knowledge empowering them to be critical thinkers and active contributors in preparation for successful academic achievement in high school.

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
Martinez, Jennifer	Assistant Principal	
OLDHAM, SYBILLE	Principal	
Scheloske, Amy	Assistant Principal	
Brito-Sierra, Eneyda	Teacher, K-12	
Lee, Dee	Other	
Thomas, Judy	Teacher, K-12	
Jones, Lisa	Instructional Media	Media Specialist and assist with ensuring students are able to use online resource, and take AR assessments
	Instructional Coach	Assisting with instructional strategies,

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.

Members of the leadership team will participate in student data collection; coordinate weekly collaborative planning and Professional Learning Community meetings, and communicate the support district initiatives. All staff will participate in student data collection and analysis, with tiered interventions; utilize progress monitoring data to adjust tiered interventions and instruction, and collaborate with one another to develop and implement instructional plans addressing student achievement needs.
The Teacher Engagement committee will meet weekly to support new teachers, increase communication between new teachers and administration.
School counselors, School Psychologist, and Social Worker- School Counselors will provide quality services and expertise on issues ranging from program design to assessment and intervention with individual students. The counselors will communicate with parents and child-serving agencies to support all students' academic, emotional, behavioral, and social success. Counselors will serve on the school-wide MTSS committee and Crisis Team. The School Psychologist and Social Worker will participate in the collection, interpretation, and analysis of data facilitate development of the intervention plans, provide support for intervention fidelity and documentation, provide professional development and technical evaluation; assist in facilitating data-based decision making activities.

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 regularly monitored through weekly leadership meeting with administration, department leader and SAC committee.

Demographic Data Only ESSA identification and school grade history updated 3/11/2024	
2023-24 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Middle School 6-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	50%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	74%
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)* Asian Students (ASN) Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)

School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: B
	2019-20: B
	2018-19: B
	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	122	108	113	343
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	120	92	85	297
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	1	1	8
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	4	0	16
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	85	131	126	342
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	85	110	111	306
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	95	84	66	245

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	148	134	125	407

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	3	0	4	7
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	19	24

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	72	81	97	250
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	82	83	98	263
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4	8
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4	9
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	67	105	101	273
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	72	93	78	243
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	50	16	29	95

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	117	113	140	370

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	1	5	7
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	6	12

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	72	81	97	250
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	82	83	98	263
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4	8
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4	9
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	67	105	101	273
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	72	93	78	243
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	50	16	29	95

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	117	113	140	370

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	1	1	5	7
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	6	12

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*	48	36	49	49	40	50	53		
ELA Learning Gains				43			46		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				29			32		
Math Achievement*	55	40	56	60	34	36	57		
Math Learning Gains				56			43		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				51			34		
Science Achievement*	42	34	49	52	40	53	52		
Social Studies Achievement*	80	66	68	82	49	58	77		
Middle School Acceleration	79	70	73	76	46	49	78		
Graduation Rate					36	49			
College and Career Acceleration					66	70			
ELP Progress	54	31	40	40	68	76	21		

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	60
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	358
Total Components for the Federal Index	6
Percent Tested	97
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	54
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	538
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	99
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	37	Yes	4	
ELL	34	Yes	4	
AMI				
ASN	85			
BLK	41			
HSP	56			
MUL	61			
PAC				
WHT	66			

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	49			

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	30	Yes	3	1
ELL	37	Yes	3	
AMI				
ASN	80			
BLK	42			
HSP	49			
MUL	42			
PAC				
WHT	61			
FRL	42			

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	48			55			42	80	79			54
SWD	19			22			19	47	77		5	
ELL	21			33			22	42			5	54
AMI												
ASN	70			88			91	100	77		5	
BLK	31			29			18	63	65		5	
HSP	46			50			35	80	72		6	52
MUL	45			48			54	75	83		5	

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	53			64			48	83	82		5	
FRL	38			42			29	68	70		6	45

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	49	43	29	60	56	51	52	82	76			40
SWD	14	23	17	18	37	41	15	57	45			
ELL	19	34	31	35	46	42	22	65				40
AMI												
ASN	74	59		90	66		93	91	84			
BLK	30	36	27	34	42	45	31	72	64			
HSP	43	40	33	53	50	41	36	81	69			40
MUL	42	40	13	42	40	43	27	86				
PAC												
WHT	56	45	30	70	62	63	63	85	79			
FRL	35	36	25	43	47	42	28	74	56			31

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	32	57	43	34	52	77	78			21
SWD	11	24	25	19	27	23	16	30				
ELL	31	39	42	41	36	25	25	44	90			21
AMI												
ASN	81	60		77	52			90	82			
BLK	36	38	27	31	31	28	20	57	56			
HSP	42	45	43	50	41	36	46	67	74			23
MUL	41	33	33	42	34	36	54	64				
PAC												
WHT	61	49	28	66	47	37	61	86	80			
FRL	34	34	29	36	32	29	39	62	61			

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	46%	36%	10%	47%	-1%
08	2023 - Spring	47%	39%	8%	47%	0%
06	2023 - Spring	45%	35%	10%	47%	-2%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	53%	38%	15%	54%	-1%
07	2023 - Spring	26%	35%	-9%	48%	-22%
08	2023 - Spring	53%	42%	11%	55%	-2%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	41%	33%	8%	44%	-3%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	89%	37%	52%	50%	39%

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	78%	65%	13%	66%	12%

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.

Statewide Assessment data from the 2022-23 school year showed the lowest performance was in Science. Proficiency was at 41%. This is a decrease in 11% from 221-22 school year. Our trend data consistently shows inconstant performance in Science proficiency. Contributing factors include a new teacher and another teacher was on leave for half of the school.

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

Based on the Statewide Assessment data from 2021-22 data, 6th grade ELA showed the greatest decline. Historically the major deficit in the area of ELA has been due to teacher retention difficulties and quality instruction.

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.

Based on the Statewide Assessment data, the greatest gap when compared to the state average is 8th grade ELA. Level 1's, level 3's, level 4's. When analyzing contributing factors that contributed to this gap was one of the ELA teachers were new to teaching middle school.

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

Based on Statewide Assessment data, performance of students showing proficiency in 6th grade Math from 48% to 54% resulting in an 6% increase in percent of students demonstrating their ability to perform at the proficient level. The new actions that were implemented by the school were district coach were supporting vacancies in the 7th grade. The admin team provided standards based lessons for the students in those classrooms. Common assessments were also created among the grade level Math teachers.

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

Upon reflection of the EWS Data from Part I, the two most prevalent area of concern are students with attendance below 90% and students scoring Level 1's on statewide assessments.

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

1. Improvement in the area of ELA.
2. Improve Science proficiency
3. Improve attendance for students
4. Decrease amount of Out of School suspensions
5. Improve student behaviors

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

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

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

Improvements in 6th and 8th grade ELA core instruction focused on literacy.
Based on state assessments of Spring 2022, student proficiency in ELA has dropped 7% in 6th grade and 5% in 8th grade. Student proficiency in the 7th grade maintained performance from pervious year.

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

Student proficient in ELA based on state assessment of Spring 2024 will improve by 8% for student population.

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

Teachers will collaboratively develop instructional lessons/strategies and common targeted formative assessments aligned to the depth of the standards. Teachers will create common assessments through Professional Learning Communities with Literacy Coach and admin. Teachers will discuses the results of the common assessments with their collaborative planning group to reflect on best practices and make adjustments as needed. Data from the classwork work, test, PM assessments, and quarterly writing assessments will be sued to determine relative areas of need and guide remediation, small group, and differentiated instruction.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

SYBILLE OLDHAM (sybille.oldham@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.)

Using Learning Arc through collaborative planning and PLC's teachers will collaboratively review standards based lessons. Teachers will collaboratively review student data detailing individual growth and strength areas generating tier groups and identifying learning targets for all students. Teachers will also develop common targeted formative assessment probes aligned to the depth of the standards. Teachers will review and evaluate progress monitoring results using it to drive instruction to include needed remediation and enrichment to ensure academic success for all learners.

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

The rational behind selecting Standards Based Instruction is to ensure all students develop a clear and precise rationale of what they are learning and why. They also allow the teacher to intentionally instruct with the students earning on the forefront of the lesson. Research shows teachers who collaboratively plan standards-based instruction, develop common instructional lessons and common assessments based on data driven intentions achieve greater student success. The Learning Arc and Standards-Based Instruction both model with shaping the vision of academic success for all students based on high expectations and data drive instruction.

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.

1. Collaborative planning among subject areas/unpacking standards using the Learning Arc twice per month
2. Monitoring of authentic and student centered lesson plans-This will be accomplished by evaluative and non-evaluative walk-throughs, creating standards-based learning arcs, as well as check lesson plans. Another means of monitoring will be teacher having their lesson plans available during collaborative planning time. Data from the Standards Based Walk Tool will also be used.
3. Classroom observations.
4. Analyze and dissecting data from common assessments.
5. Provide constructive feedback aligned with the Standards Based Walk Tool monthly

Person Responsible: Jennifer Martinez (jennifer.martinez@polk-fl.net)

By When: End of School year- 2023-24.

#2. 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.

Increase student attendance and behaviors to promote learning proficiency.
Based on data from EWS and statewide assessment form Spring 2023 50% of the 445 students who achieved a score of a Level 1 on ELA were suspended from school one or more days and 47% pf this same population of students were in attendance less than 90% of the 2022-23 school year.

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

The school will increase student attendance and behavior by 5% for students with a trend of scoring below proficiency level and increase their learning gains by 3%, as measured by attendance/discipline reports and statewide Spring 2024 assessment.

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

The Student Success Team (SST) which includes administrations, school counselors, support staff, LEA Facilitator, Department heads, Literacy Coach, and Testing Coordinator will develop weekly meetings to monitor/mentor students, review attendance and discipline data to build positive relationships and encourage students to achieve academic success.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

SYBILLE OLDHAM (sybille.oldham@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.)

Using MTSS and PBIS framework administration, school counselors, support staff, LEA Facilitator, Department heads, Literacy Coach, testing coordinator, school social worker will generate individual, targeted attendance and discipline goals for Tier 1 and Tier 2 groups. The MTSS and PBIS framework will be used to adopt, monitor and organize evidence based on behavioral interventions into an integrated continuum that enhances academic and social behavior outcomes for all students. The SST which includes administrations, school counselors, support staff, ELA Facilitator, testing coordinator, social worker will develop weekly meetings to monitor and mentor students, review attendance and discipline data to build positive relations and encourage the students to archive academic success.

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

The rationale for selecting this strategy is if students are in attendance, activity engaged and not out of the classroom setting, they can and will learn. It is imperative we serve the entire child physical and mental well being. The data was collected through the EWS and Statewide assessments.

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.

1. Define targeted Students
2. Implement and facilitate behavior's and attendance incentive program.
3. Monitor and adjust effectiveness of developed program throughout the course of the year- This will be done by analyzing student referral data to ascertain trend behaviors, including increasing and decreasing behaviors. This will help determine the effeteness of the program in place. If the programs are not showing positive growth, adjustments such as mentoring students showing regression will be implemented. If a student is already in the mentoring program, frequency on mentor meetings will be increased.
4. Follow and adjust incentives as needed based on collective data Students can receive incentive daily from all staff members via a reward system, called "Cougar Cash."

Person Responsible: Amy Scheloske (amy.scheloske@polk-fl.net)

By When: End of school year, 2023-24.

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Intervention

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 aligned improving student interventions relating to core academics.
Improve and increase Level 1 and 2 students in Literacy Strategies and Foundational Skills instruction to elevate proficiency levels and learning gains for all students. Upon analyzing Statewide Assessment data for Spring 2023, Level 1 and 2 students proficiency levels are inconsistent and have declined for our school student population. Students are not performing at the proficient level including SWD's, African Americans, and ELL's are not achieving adequate growth.

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

The school will increase in learning gains for level 1 and 2 students by 5% for subgroups in the area of Literacy Strategies and Foundational Skills, as measured by achievement scores on the Spring 2024 Statewide Assessments.

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

Using the district course progression, student progression plan, student data, school counselors will strategy schedule students based on academic performance and specific needs of students. Level 1 and 2 students will be scheduled in to Literacy Strategies and Foundational Math. Tier 2 teachers will work with grade level teachers to review student data detailing individual growth and strength areas generating their groups and identifying learnings needs for all students. Tier 1 and 2 teachers will focus on standards based lessons using BEST Standards. Based on data collection, tier 2 teachers will collaborative develop instructional lessons/strategies and common targeted formative assessment probes aligned to the standards and the needs of the students.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

SYBILLE OLDHAM (sybille.oldham@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.)

Utilizing progress monitoring data, Achieve benchmark assessment, Imagine Math benchmark assessment, teachers will collaboratively probe and evaluate student data, detailing growth and areas of need generating tier groups and developing learning targets differentiated for all students. Focus will be on standards based lessons as well as data chats to promote and encourage student autonomy and engagement.

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

Identify intervention needs for Level 1 and Level 2 students is critical in improving proficiency for students. Creating standard-based lessons with tier 1 and tier 2 teachers allows for collaboration and data analysis of students individual needs.

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 plan to monitor effectiveness of the action plan will include review of student core academic placement based on academic performance on state assessments and trend data. In addition, school counselors will monitor student academic progress using student grades, ensuring students academic needs are being met and they will adjust as needed. Tier 2 teachers will monitor student performance quarterly on formative assessments and review progress monitoring data to identify additional, individual targeted interventions.

During PLC's teachers will bring data based on quarterly assessments and plan as a department to create grade level and equivariant experiences based on student needs.

Person Responsible: Jennifer Martinez (jennifer.martinez@polk-fl.net)

By When: End of school year- 2023-24.