

Polk County Public Schools

Dundee Ridge Middle Academy School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	11
III. Planning for Improvement	16
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	23
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	23
VI. Title I Requirements	25
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	27

Dundee Ridge Middle Academy

5555 LAKE TRASK RD, Dundee, FL 33838

dra.polk-fl.net

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 Dundee Ridge Middle Academy is to prepare students to be lifelong learners by creating opportunities to develop the knowledge, attitudes, and skills needed to manage the complexity of an ever-changing 21st century. Through challenging curriculum delivered in a respectful, diverse learning environment, students will reach their full potential, master academic standards, and be prepared to take responsible action for the future.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The students at Dundee Ridge Middle Academy will engage in a rigorous academic program designed to prepare them for success in high school and beyond. Collectively, we will create an inviting and engaging school culture where students engage in real, meaningful work and teachers serve as facilitators of the learning process. Realizing that not all students come to the school with the same level of learning or framework of experiences, staff, students, and parents will partner to provide additional supports during the school year such as tutoring and summer learning opportunities.

In addition, staff at the school will provide targeted differentiated instruction, intensive learning supports, and appropriate assessments to maximize the learning of each student. Parents will be active partners and supporters in the learning process at Dundee Ridge, and will be knowledgeable participants in their student's education. Expectations for each student's success will be uniformly high, regardless of socioeconomic status, race, or gender. We acknowledge that discipline should primarily be used to teach and support students in learning the skills necessary to enhance a positive school climate and avoid negative behavior. School discipline that is paired with meaningful instruction, guidance, and strong relationships with adults and peers offers a student an opportunity to learn from their mistakes and contribute to the school community, and is more likely to result in getting the student re-engaged in learning. Four pillars to this approach include community, safety, communication, and reflection.

In order to assure that each classroom is a well organized, supportive model for student learning, teachers will participate in intensive training that will be tailored to fully implement the tenets of the International Baccalaureate Middle Years Programme. This program features an emphasis on creating a high quality education for a better world, with key elements including addressing students' academic, social, and emotional well-being; encouraging students to take responsibility for their own learning; supporting students' efforts to gain understanding of the world and to function comfortably within it; helping students establish personal values as a foundation upon which international-mindedness will develop and flourish; as well as assisting students in engaging in meaningful and varied service to their community. The school will value and embrace the critical role of community partners in supporting the rigor and authenticity of student learning, and in the process, provide a personal and powerful approach to career exploration and long-term goal setting.

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
GIDEONS, STACY	Principal	Ms. Gideons is the instructional leader of the school. Her responsibilities include organizing the school leadership team, monitoring student and staff data to make instructional decisions, and monitoring the implementation of instructional plans within the school. In addition, Ms. Gideons ensures the fidelity of all academic policies and programs, performs evaluative duties for staff members, serves as the school's community liaison, manages daily administrative tasks, and ensures the highest degree of campus safety.
Brown, Teddy	Assistant Principal	Mr. Brown oversees daily campus student management. He organizes and disseminates school safety procedures. Mr. Brown serves as a point of contact for parent questions and concerns, and supports the implementation of academic initiatives to support student success.
Rios, Kelly	Assistant Principal	Mrs. Rios is responsible for monitoring student data to support the implementation of the school's instructional programs and initiatives. Other responsibilities include providing professional development to staff, serving as a point of contact for parent questions and concerns, and overseeing academic policies at the school level.
Ogzewalla, Broderic	Dean	Mr. Ogzewalla is responsible for implementing and monitoring the school's positive behavior support system. He provides mentoring to at-risk students, and serves as a liaison between the school and the parents for disciplinary concerns.
Wade, Dawn	Dean	Ms. Wade oversees our school's literacy programs, provides literacy support to content area teachers, is responsible for monitoring student literacy data, and supports our new teacher mentoring program as the school's Induction Coordinator.
White, Mary	Behavior Specialist	Ms. White serves as the school's Behavior Interventionist and provides support and mentoring to at-risk students.
Dixon, Sherri	Teacher, K-12	Mrs. Dixon is the lead Language Arts teacher.
Johnson, Delvinal	Teacher, K-12	Mrs. Johnson is the lead math teacher.
Heter, Kathryn	Teacher, K-12	Mrs. Heter is the lead science teacher.
Evans, Eddie	Teacher, K-12	Mr. Evans is the lead social studies teacher.
Sebring, Liz	Parent Engagement Liaison	Mrs. Sebring serves as our parent and community liaison, Media Specialist, and Title 1 Facilitator.

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Montero, Cathy	Teacher, K-12	Mrs. Montero is the lead specials teacher.

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.

A School Advisory Committee, comprised of school leaders, parents, teachers, students, and business partners, meet regularly to review and discuss the school's improvement plan. During these sessions, school data is reviewed and goals are mutually agreed upon. These shared goals become part of the school improvement plan.

SIP Monitoring

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

During the course of the school year, school leaders routinely collect data to support the implementation of our school's action steps towards our ultimate school improvement goals. Data is compiled in a centralized document, and these documents are reviewed during ongoing leadership team and administrative meetings. As progress monitoring data is received throughout the school year, goals and action steps are revised to best meet the needs of our students.

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	80%
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)

	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: A 2018-19: A 2017-18: A
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	46	57	72	175
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	57	43	33	133
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	3
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	2
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	73	60	59	192
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	54	27	13	94
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	69	51	48	168

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	69	51	48	168

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students identified retained:

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

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	51	62	86	199
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	44	60	35	139
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	2
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	32	41	63	136
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	63	46	61	170
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	69	85	95	249

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	69	85	95	249

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

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	51	62	86	199
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	44	60	35	139
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	2
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	32	41	63	136
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	63	46	61	170
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	69	85	95	249

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	69	85	95	249

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

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*	51	36	49	51	40	50	52		
ELA Learning Gains				51			56		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				41			51		
Math Achievement*	58	40	56	58	34	36	56		
Math Learning Gains				63			55		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				65			62		
Science Achievement*	59	34	49	45	40	53	54		
Social Studies Achievement*	78	66	68	73	49	58	77		
Middle School Acceleration	77	70	73	66	46	49	47		
Graduation Rate					36	49			
College and Career Acceleration					66	70			
ELP Progress	34	31	40	52	68	76	55		

* 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	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	357
Total Components for the Federal Index	6
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	57
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	565
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	36	Yes	2	
ELL	42			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	59			
HSP	57			
MUL	75			
PAC				
WHT	73			

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	56			

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	39	Yes	1	
ELL	50			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	56			
HSP	55			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	63			
FRL	54			

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	51			58			59	78	77			34
SWD	29			44			36	61			5	12
ELL	31			37			38	55	59		6	34
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	43			50			41	76	86		5	
HSP	50			55			59	75	71		6	34
MUL	67			83							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	56			69			67	87	84		5	
FRL	48			53			54	75	72		6	32

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21	ELP Progress
All Students	51	51	41	58	63	65	45	73	66			52
SWD	31	45	29	34	56	56	13	50				
ELL	36	43	42	48	60	64	31	65	57			52
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	48	55	36	46	67	67	39	78	67			
HSP	49	49	40	57	62	63	42	70	62			54
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	56	51	53	66	63	65	63	79	70			
FRL	45	49	39	55	64	69	38	71	58			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	52	56	51	56	55	62	54	77	47			55
SWD	33	49	38	45	60	50	30	60				
ELL	39	54	55	41	50	59	39	67	48			55
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	53	56	60	49	53	53	57	88	56			
HSP	51	56	52	53	54	61	50	72	40			54
MUL	58	67		67	67							
PAC												
WHT	56	55	40	70	60	76	55	78	57			
FRL	50	55	44	50	54	57	50	70	43			48

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	49%	36%	13%	47%	2%
08	2023 - Spring	54%	39%	15%	47%	7%
06	2023 - Spring	44%	35%	9%	47%	-3%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	47%	38%	9%	54%	-7%
07	2023 - Spring	62%	35%	27%	48%	14%
08	2023 - Spring	66%	42%	24%	55%	11%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	58%	33%	25%	44%	14%

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	96%	37%	59%	48%	48%

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.

The data component showing the lowest performance continues to be ELA overall proficiency. For the past few years, the school has seen a steady, slow decline in ELA proficiency levels. Overall proficiency for ELA was 51% during the 2021-2022 school year and dropped to 48% for the 2022-2023 school year. Several factors may have contributed to this result. This was the first school year with the new state standards, as well as new curriculum and resources. In addition, we added several new teachers to our literacy department, after losing veteran teachers the prior year. We also lost two ELA teachers during the course of the school year, leaving vacancies that were internally filled with our literacy coach and substitute teachers. This lack of consistent instruction impacted overall performance in this area.

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

The data component showing the greatest decline is overall ELA proficiency, as described in the previous response. For the past few years, the school has seen a steady, slow decline in ELA proficiency levels. Overall proficiency for ELA was 51% during the 2021-2022 school year and dropped to 48% for the 2022-2023 school year. Several factors may have contributed to this result. This was the first school year with the new state standards, as well as new curriculum and resources. In addition, we added several new teachers to our literacy department, after losing veteran teachers the prior year. We also lost two ELA teachers during the course of the school year, leaving vacancies that were internally filled with our literacy coach and substitute teachers. This lack of consistent instruction impacted overall performance in this area.

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

The data component with the greatest gap when compared to state averages is science achievement. Our school proficiency in science was 58%, compared with a state average of 44%. The greatest contribution to these scores was the strategic placement of science teachers. Our 8th grade science teachers worked tirelessly with their students to set goals for improvement. In addition, the science team regularly developed the curriculum vertically, so that student achievement was maximized.

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

The data component showing the most improvement was science. Science proficiency increased from 45% in the 2021-2022 school year, to 58% for the 2022-2023 school year. This year, teacher placement was strategically addressed to ensure that 8th grade science students received comprehensive

instruction from our strongest science teachers. Our science department worked vertically to ensure that all standards were taught and assessed appropriately, and the 8th grade science team, in particular, worked together daily to ensure there were no gaps in science instruction.

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

Based upon the Early Warning Systems data, the two major potential areas of concern both address deficiencies in ELA: Students scoring a Level 1 on the statewide ELA assessment, and the number of students with substantial reading deficiencies.

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

Our highest priorities for school improvement for the upcoming year are increasing ELA proficiency, increasing ELA learning gains for lowest performing students, intensifying our International Baccalaureate program (as this is a reauthorization year), and retaining our high performing teachers.

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.

Over the past four tested school years, our ELA proficiency levels have steadily declined. In addition, we have seen declines in both ELA learning gains and proficiency levels for the lowest 25%. In order to address this area of need, we will ensure that all students receive standards-aligned instruction in ELA courses.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Our goal is to increase overall ELA achievement from 48% proficient to 52% proficient.

Monitoring:

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

ELA achievement levels will be monitored using the progress monitoring data from district level assessment platforms. The data from administrative standards-based walks will also be monitored to ensure students are mastering the benchmarks following classroom instruction and the development of student learning arcs.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

STACY GIDEONS (stacy.gideons@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.)

Intentional, collaborative planning will assist all ELA teachers in building student activities and tasks that match the intent of the benchmark standard. Exposure to standards-based tasks will promote increased achievement levels for our students. The monitoring of this system by the administration will allow for specific and precise feedback to further guide the implementation process.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

This is only the second school year of a new set of state standards, and most teachers still have a baseline level of knowledge. By collaboratively examining these standards and building quality student tasks for each grade level, we can ensure that all of our students are exposed to quality instruction and assignments that will facilitate their growth in reading and writing.

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.

Administration will create a master schedule that provides ELA teachers a common planning time to collaboratively plan for standards-based instruction.

Person Responsible: Kelly Rios (kelly.rios@polk-fl.net)

By When: August 2023

ELA teachers and administration will meet on an on-going basis to create Learning Arcs for anchor ELA benchmarks, in order to build benchmark aligned student lessons and tasks.

Person Responsible: Kelly Rios (kelly.rios@polk-fl.net)

By When: August 2023

Monthly department meetings, to include ELA teachers and administration, to review student work samples and data to address areas of deficiency.

Person Responsible: Kelly Rios (kelly.rios@polk-fl.net)

By When: Monthly

Create an administrative calendar of standards-based walks of ELA classrooms.

Person Responsible: STACY GIDEONS (stacy.gideons@polk-fl.net)

By When: August 2023

Conduct weekly standards-based walks of ELA classrooms

Person Responsible: STACY GIDEONS (stacy.gideons@polk-fl.net)

By When: Weekly

Review data from ELA standards-based walks as an administrative team and share trends with ELA department teachers

Person Responsible: STACY GIDEONS (stacy.gideons@polk-fl.net)

By When: Monthly

#2. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Teacher Retention and Recruitment**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 2022-2023 school year, a total of 11 teachers left the school. This amounts to a 25% turnover rate of instructional staff. Overall student achievement is negatively impacted with high turnover rates of school staff. In addition, mastering the International Baccalaureate principles and curriculum takes a significant amount of time and training. The fidelity of our school's overall IB instruction is dependent on a consistent and qualified teaching staff.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Our goal is to decrease our teacher turnover rate from 25% to 15%.

Monitoring:

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

Teacher retention will be monitored during monthly administrative meetings.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

STACY GIDEONS (stacy.gideons@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.)

In order to address teacher retention, we will focus on a four pronged, research-based approach that includes supporting overall teacher wellbeing, promoting teacher engagement, creating a supportive school climate, and monitoring teacher retention.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Support of new teachers to campus cannot solely focus on classroom and instructional related concerns. New teachers to campus must feel involved and included, and should be supported with a wholistic approach. By addressing both specific curriculum needs, as well as interpersonal needs, our goal is to create a school climate that fosters long term teacher retention.

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.

Organize a meet-and-greet session for new staff members with the leadership team. Create a space to first get to know one another on a personal level, before focusing on school related concerns.

Person Responsible: Dawn Wade (dawn.wade02@polk-fl.net)

By When: August 2023

Pair each new teacher to campus with a veteran 'buddy' teacher to establish an interpersonal point of contact. Buddy teachers will check in with their new teacher weekly to provide guidance and assistance.

Person Responsible: Kelly Rios (kelly.rios@polk-fl.net)

By When: August 2023

Establish a weekly time for new teachers to meet with the teacher induction coordinator for the school.

Person Responsible: Dawn Wade (dawn.wade02@polk-fl.net)

By When: August 2023

Create a tiering system for new teachers on campus to establish the level of support each individual teacher will need. Those teachers needing the most support will be scheduled for observations of model classrooms around campus. These teachers will also receive the opportunity to work collaboratively with administration and/or lead department teachers to create model lessons and jointly implement those lessons.

Person Responsible: Kelly Rios (kelly.rios@polk-fl.net)

By When: End of 1st 9 weeks

New teachers to campus will participate in a school based International Baccalaureate Boot Camp. During this intensive training they will be introduced to the tenants of IB learning. Teachers will learn how to use the IB Unit Planner and how to incorporate IB learning into their lessons.

Person Responsible: Dawn Wade (dawn.wade02@polk-fl.net)

By When: End of 1st 9 weeks

The academic dean will create a new teacher visit schedule to spend time weekly in each new teacher's classroom. Informal, non-evaluative feedback specific to the lesson observed will be provided back to the classroom teacher.

Person Responsible: Dawn Wade (dawn.wade02@polk-fl.net)

By When: End of 1st 9 weeks

#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.

This is the first school year that we have had an ESSA subgroup fall below the Federal Index Target of 41%. Our students with disabilities fell to 39%, and was our lowest achieving subgroup in both math and ELA proficiency levels.

Measurable Outcome:

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

The ESSA Federal Index points for our students with disabilities will increase to at least the minimum 41% required.

Monitoring:

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

Progress monitoring results for our students with disabilities will be reviewed after each progress monitoring window.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Teddy Brown (teddy.brown@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 students with disabilities population will receive targeted and specific support scaffolds to increase their achievement levels. The evidence based intervention of developing a collaborative IEP team comprised of our school LEA, inclusion teachers, academic dean, parents, guidance counselors, and administrative staff will be used to create a support system focused on academic growth.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

This is the first school year that we have had a subgroup fall below the ESSA Federal Index Target. In addition, our students with disabilities subgroup was our lowest performing subgroup in the areas of both math and ELA proficiency.

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 a collaborative committee focused on the academic growth of the students with disabilities subgroup.

Person Responsible: Kelly Rios (kelly.rios@polk-fl.net)

By When: August 2023

Create a calendar of monthly meetings of the SWD academic committee.

Person Responsible: Kelly Rios (kelly.rios@polk-fl.net)

By When: New calendar each 9 weeks

Create a support facilitation schedule to ensure each student receives the necessary academic support in the classroom setting from an inclusion teacher.

Person Responsible: Kelly Rios (kelly.rios@polk-fl.net)

By When: August 2023

Conduct quarterly data chats with students with disabilities to review progress monitoring results and set goals for improvement.

Person Responsible: Dawn Wade (dawn.wade02@polk-fl.net)

By When: Each 9 weeks

Invite parents to attend a parent night after the second round of progress monitoring to share school year data and provide guidance to parents for supporting the student at home.

Person Responsible: Broderic Ogzewalla (broderic.ogzewalla@polk-fl.net)

By When: February 2024

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).

As school improvement funding allocations are received, the leadership team will meet to discuss the best use of funds to meet the needs of our students. Data will be reviewed, and areas with the highest deficits will be addressed.

Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE)

Area of Focus Description and Rationale

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

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

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

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

Measurable Outcomes

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

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

Grades K-2 Measurable Outcomes

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

Monitoring

Monitoring

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

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Evidence-based Practices/Programs

Description:

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

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

Rationale:

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

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

Action Steps to Implement

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

- Literacy Leadership
- Literacy Coaching
- Assessment
- Professional Learning

Action Step	Person Responsible for Monitoring
-------------	-----------------------------------

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.

During the first week of teacher preplanning, the school improvement plan will be reviewed by the staff as a whole to ensure all staff members are aware of our school goals for the upcoming year. The school improvement plan will also be presented to all stakeholders during the first SAC meeting of the school year, where an opportunity for discussion and questions will be provided.

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))

Several parent involvement activities are planned for the upcoming school year. Some of these events include data chat evenings, where parents are able to meet one-on-one with staff to review their child's specific data and goals for improvement. In addition, students have the opportunity to present their learning portfolios for the year to their parents at an evening event in the spring semester. Interim reports are sent home with students several times during each 9 week grading period, and all parents are strongly encouraged to join Parent Portal during the school's orientation event each August.

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)

Our school plans to strengthen our academic programs in the school by hiring and retaining a high quality, consistent teaching staff. In addition, all department area teachers will work collaboratively on an

ongoing basis to create student lessons and tasks that are directly aligned to the state standards for their content areas. All students who qualify to take accelerated classes will be scheduled accordingly.

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))

As in International Baccalaureate school, our academic programs are directly supported by the tenants of IB learning.

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))

Our mental health team, comprised of guidance counselors, administrative staff, our school resource deputy, and district level social services staff, meet monthly to develop and review plans to best support our student population in need of specialized counseling and mental health services.

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

Our school offers several career and technical education classes, including a variety of agriculture classes, computer, and fabrication lab classes. Students enrolled in these courses are provided guidance and preparatory skills to join the workforce and postsecondary opportunities.

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).

Our schoolwide, tiered model to address problem behavior includes a behavior tracking form that classroom teachers are able to use to communicate problem behaviors with parents and administration. For tiered students requiring more direct support, our dean and guidance department provide individualized support services to those students and parents.

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))

As progress monitoring scores are received, department area teachers, along with the leadership team, collaboratively review the data and set goals and action steps for improvement. Professional development opportunities are offered to teachers in this area, as needed. The administrative team regularly conducts employment interviews and meets in committee to select the most qualified applicant for each vacancy.

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

N/A

Budget to Support Areas of Focus

Part VII: Budget to Support Areas of Focus

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

1	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Benchmark-aligned Instruction	\$0.00
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Teacher Retention and Recruitment	\$0.00
3	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Intervention	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00

Budget Approval

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

Yes