Sleepy Hill Middle School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Sleepy Hill Middle School

2215 SLEEPY HILL RD, Lakeland, FL 33810

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

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 Sleepy Hill Middle School is to create a learning community with a safe, caring, and supportive environment. We will create endless opportunities for achievement and success.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The vision of Sleepy Hill Middle School is to challenge students to achieve academic success with a rigorous and engaging curriculum to reach their full potential within a safe and caring environment.

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
Clark, Denay	Principal	Provides organizational leadership related to all facets of the school framework including, but not limited to instruction, personnel, student services, family and community engagement, fiscal management, etc.
Dyer, Jeni	Assistant Principal	Supports the school principal by providing organizational leadership related to all facets of the school framework including, but not limited to instruction, personnel, student services, family and community engagement, fiscal management, etc.
Campbell, John	Assistant Principal	Provides organizational leadership related to all facets of the school framework including, but not limited to instruction, personnel, student services, family and community engagement, fiscal management, etc.
Boyzo, Nicole	Dean	Supports the principal and assistant principals with implementation of individual, class and school-wide behavior interventions. Deliver appropriate teacher-to-teacher professional learning and support resulting in improved effectiveness of classroom instructional practices, increased learning time for students and enhanced student achievement.
Holt, Kara	Other	Coordinates educational placement and appropriate services for students with disabilities. Serves as the LEA (Local Education Agency) representative at staffings and IEP (Individual Education Plan) meetings at the assigned school. Provides direct support to students with disabilities and their general education and ESE teachers to promote inclusion of students with disabilities in the general education environment.
Dinwiddie, Michael	Teacher, K-12	Serves as a communication liaison between faculty, administration, and families. Serves as a leader in curriculum and pedagogy in the department. Facilitates department meetings that promote participation from all department members. Advocates for the Math department while supporting the wider mission of the school.
Shoupe, Lori	Teacher, K-12	Serves as a communication liaison between faculty, administration, and families. Serves as a leader in curriculum and pedagogy in the department. Facilitates department meetings that promote participation from all department members. Advocates for the Science department while supporting the wider mission of the school.
Pierce, Sharlene	Other	Plans and implements processes and schedules related to achieving school/district/state testing plans. Compiles data reports to determine progression toward meeting School Improvement Plan goals. Communicates with stakeholders regarding policies, related to district and state standardized tests.

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 school leadership team, teachers, school staff, and parents participate in the creation of the annual School Improvement Plan. School improvement plan goals and progress monitoring efforts are also discussed at all monthly School-Based Leadership Team meetings as well as Quarterly School Advisory Council meetings. The School Advisory Council is comprised of school administrators, school staff members, parents, and community members.

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 School Improvement plan will be regularly monitored for effective implementation of defined goals and strategies for improving student achievement. Progress will be discussed during administrative and coaches' meetings as well as SBLT and SAC meetings. Revisions to strategies will be discussed as part of the problem-solving process.

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	77%
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)* 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: 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	127	133	129	389
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	180	168	136	484
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	228	204	138	570
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	197	179	92	468
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	165	138	83	386

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	251	216	175	642

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	5	24	32
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	22	29

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	34	38	73	145
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	5
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	28	13	21	62
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	26	24	43	93
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	169	159	181	509
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	187	182	157	526
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	166	2	1	169

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	55	46	78	179

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	4	7	14	25
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5	11	20

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	34	38	73	145
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	5
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	28	13	21	62
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	26	24	43	93
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	169	159	181	509
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	187	182	157	526
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	166	2	1	169

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	55	46	78	179

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	4	7	14	25
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5	11	20

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	32	40	50	34		
ELA Learning Gains				39			43		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				31			37		
Math Achievement*	29	40	56	32	34	36	30		
Math Learning Gains				43			28		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				37			31		
Science Achievement*	23	34	49	34	40	53	40		
Social Studies Achievement*	64	66	68	75	49	58	73		
Middle School Acceleration	72	70	73	69	46	49	54		
Graduation Rate					36	49			
College and Career Acceleration					66	70			
ELP Progress	31	31	40	53	68	76	12		

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	41
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	5
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)	TSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	45
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	445
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	95
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	16	Yes	4	4
ELL	34	Yes	4	
AMI				
ASN	56			
BLK	37	Yes	3	
HSP	42			
MUL	30	Yes	1	1
PAC				
WHT	47			

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	40	Yes	1	

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	25	Yes	3	3
ELL	40	Yes	3	
AMI				
ASN	70			
BLK	37	Yes	2	
HSP	44			
MUL	55			
PAC				
WHT	51			
FRL	44			

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			29			23	64	72			31
SWD	12			12			7	34			5	17
ELL	18			21			11	56	67		6	31
AMI												
ASN	53			59							2	
BLK	24			22			14	52	71		5	
HSP	27			27			25	61	79		6	31
MUL	31			28							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	35			37			27	74	63		5	
FRL	28			28			23	62	69		6	31

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	32	39	31	32	43	37	34	75	69			53
SWD	7	23	23	12	33	25	10	35				55
ELL	20	36	36	25	45	40	22	61	64			53
AMI												
ASN	71	73		71	64							
BLK	22	30	22	20	34	35	21	65	82			
HSP	28	38	36	32	45	38	31	73	67			54
MUL	47	48		49	58		45	80				
PAC												
WHT	42	45	39	43	47	37	54	87	61			
FRL	28	37	32	31	43	38	34	71	70			57

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	34	43	37	30	28	31	40	73	54			12
SWD	14	22	23	16	24	22	21	55				
ELL	24	41	41	25	28	32	29	62	48			12
AMI												
ASN	75	79		73	31							
BLK	29	38	29	20	27	31	28	70	47			
HSP	30	42	40	29	28	31	40	70	53			8
MUL	50	46		41	26							
PAC												
WHT	40	46	42	36	30	33	46	81	52			
FRL	31	39	37	27	28	33	34	69	50			12

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	25%	36%	-11%	47%	-22%
08	2023 - Spring	31%	39%	-8%	47%	-16%
06	2023 - Spring	21%	35%	-14%	47%	-26%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	25%	38%	-13%	54%	-29%
07	2023 - Spring	15%	35%	-20%	48%	-33%
08	2023 - Spring	36%	42%	-6%	55%	-19%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	22%	33%	-11%	44%	-22%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	79%	37%	42%	50%	29%

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

CIVICS						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	64%	65%	-1%	66%	-2%

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.

Math, ELA, and Science showed the lowest performance when compared to student achievement goals. Science data was the lowest in terms of student proficiency. All three subject areas had several sets of classes that were covered by long-term substitutes or rotating daily substitutes.

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

Science and Civics both showed an 11 percent drop in student proficiency from the previous year. While our Civics scores were still above the state average, we experienced a decline nonetheless. As stated previously regarding science, we had several class loads that were taught by rotating daily subs for the majority of the schol year.

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.

At the time of SIP submission, state averages were not made available to school administration through edudata.fldoe.org.

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

No school grade cell showed an improvement during the 22-23 school year.

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

Students who scored Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment, students who scored Level 1 on statewide Math assessment

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

Improving Science achievement, displaying ELA learning gains, displaying Math learning gains, boosting Civics scores as it is our most promising subject area.

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.

Statewide assessment data shows a continuous trend of regression, particularly in the area of ELA. Mathematics improved slightly from 2021 to 2022 but dropped again in 2023. Science data showed a particularly drastic drop from 22-23 from 34% to 23%. Civics also dropped from 75% to 64%. With scores not showing an upward trend, in addition to data from benchmark-based instructional walks, it is evident that Tier 1 instruction must improve in terms of benchmark-based instruction.

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

State data will show a minimum of 5% increase for school grade calculation cells in ELA Achievement and Math Achievement; Social Studies will demonstrate a 10% increase in proficiency; Science will demonstrate a 15% increase in proficiency; Acceleration will hold steady in terms of proficiency. Our goal is also to show a minimum of 35% in the area of Learning Gains for ELA and Math. Improvement in all of these areas will be based on improved benchmark-aligned instruction.

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

Progress monitoring data based on district assessments as well as state assessments will determine if benchmarks are adequately mastered as a result of planning for benchmark-aligned instruction. Benchmark-based instructional walks will also be completed on a weekly basis by school-based administrators and instructional coaches to monitor implementation of benchmark-aligned instruction.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

[no one identified]

Evidence-based Intervention:
Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

1. Students who are exposed to grade level texts, instruction, and performance expectations have a greater opportunity to master content on which students will be tested during state standardized assessments.
2. Teachers will participate in purposeful benchmark-based planning protocols utilizing the Learning Arc Framework.

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

The Opportunity Myth highlights the direct correlation between academic success and ensuring that students are exposed to grade level equivalent standards-based experiences and also show master of these standards/benchmarks on standardized assessments. The Learning Arc framework will place a greater focus on assessing the key components of what students should be expected to know, understand, and do as a result of 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.

Strategy 1-Benchmark-Walkthrough Tool
Action Step 2-Schedule weekly time slots for administration and instructional coaches to complete benchmark-based instructional walks. Calibration will occur during the first month of school.

Person Responsible: Denay Clark (denay.clark1@polk-fl.net)

By When: August 30, 2023

Strategy 1-Benchmark-Walkthrough Tool
Establish protocol for reviewing data including evidence in Benchmark Walkthrough Tool.

Person Responsible: Denay Clark (denay.clark1@polk-fl.net)

By When: August 30, 2023

Strategy 1-Benchmark-Walkthrough Tool
Conduct weekly Benchmark-Based walks, debrief with administration/instructional coaches, and use data to guide collaborative planning sessions

Person Responsible: Denay Clark (denay.clark1@polk-fl.net)

By When: Ongoing

Strategy 1-Benchmark Walkthrough Tool
Discuss Benchmark-Based Walkthrough Data at monthly School Based Leadership team meetings

Person Responsible: Denay Clark (denay.clark1@polk-fl.net)

By When: Ongoing

Strategy 2-Instructional Planning using the Learning Arc Framework
Action Step 1-Create master schedule that includes intentional collaborative planning.

Person Responsible: Jeni Dyer (jeni.dyer@polk-fl.net)

By When: Prior to start of 23-24 school year

Strategy 2-Instructional Planning using the Learning Arc Framework
Action Step 3-Review Learning Arc protocol with department chairs as they will facilitate lead incorporation of Learning Arc Framework during collaborative planning sessions.

Person Responsible: Jeni Dyer (jeni.dyer@polk-fl.net)

By When: August 30, 2023

Strategy 2-Instructional Planning using the Learning Arc Framework
Incorporate Learning Arc Planning protocol during all collaborative planning sessions.

Person Responsible: Jeni Dyer (jeni.dyer@polk-fl.net)

By When: Ongoing

#2. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Other

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 loss of instructional time due to ISS and OSS has a great impact on students' exposure to curriculum and, thus, drastically impacts student achievement.

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

By rolling out a PBIS program, a greater emphasis will be placed on POSITIVE behavioral expectations and reinforcing those behaviors we want to see school-wide. Through the PBIS program, it is our goal to reduce the total number of referrals, ISS, and OSS days by 10%.

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

Referrals and subsequent ISS/OSS days will be monitored on a weekly basis by administration, as well as monthly with the School-Based Leadership Team.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

[no one identified]

Evidence-based Intervention:
Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Schools that have a strong PBIS program and system for documenting minor referrals have shown to have a reduction in their total number of referrals.

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

Rewarding and incentivizing positive behaviors will result in the reduction of undesirable behaviors that we do not want to occur on campus.

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.

Renew PBIS Reward program to facilitate implementation of PBIS program, tracking PBIS points, and documenting behavioral referrals.

Person Responsible: Denay Clark (denay.clark1@polk-fl.net)

By When: July 30, 2023

Train teachers on use of PBIS Rewards program, including documenting student incentives as well as documenting student referrals.

Person Responsible: John Campbell (john.campbell01@polk-fl.net)

By When: August 11, 2023

Monitor teacher expectations regarding documentation of student referrals.

Person Responsible: John Campbell (john.campbell01@polk-fl.net)

By When: Ongoing

Monitor teacher expectations regarding "awarding" of student incentive points.

Person Responsible: Jeni Dyer (jeni.dyer@polk-fl.net)

By When: Ongoing

Plan and implement incentives related to PBIS Rewards points.

Person Responsible: Jeni Dyer (jeni.dyer@polk-fl.net)

By When: Ongoing

Review discipline data related to student minor and major referrals. Implement appropriate interventions, as needed.

Person Responsible: John Campbell (john.campbell01@polk-fl.net)

By When: Ongoing

Schedule parent meetings and Implement behavioral contracts for students continuously not meeting expectations. Collaborate with district as needed to secure additional support/services, as needed.

Person Responsible: John Campbell (john.campbell01@polk-fl.net)

By When: Ongoing

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

• 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/District Webpage, PEN Notebook, Parent/Family/Community Input Meetings, Annual Title I Parent Meeting

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))

Quarterly Family Engagement capacity-building workshops, staff professional development opportunities, student/family conferences, school-student-home-community relationships, family/community input regarding school improvement and school initiatives, school website, annual Title I Parent Meeting

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), extended learning opportunities for students, staff professional development, weekly collaborative planning sessions, district Response-to-Data initiative, implementation of 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 Data Com review, School Improvement Planning Trainings, regional district meetings, Summer Leadership Academy, Title I Technical Assistance (Use of Funds, PFE Input, Back-to-School meeting), Comprehensive Needs Assessment Technical Assistance, ESE and Work Force Education departments

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))

District mental health/wellness lessons, district mental health support staff (school psychologist, Mental Health Facilitator, School Social Worker), school counselors working with students to provide necessary mental health assistance, collaboration with community service providers (Peace River Center, Bay Care, Lakeland Regional Health)

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))

Pre-career academies (Aerospace, Criminal Justice, Engineering), annual transition events for incoming 6th graders (from elementary school) and outgoing 8th grade students (to high school)

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, Behavior Interventionist, Student Success Coaches, 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 benchmark-based instructional practices, Data Com, district RTD initiative, 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