

Santa Rosa County School District

Gulf Breeze Middle School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	10
III. Planning for Improvement	15
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	0
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	0
VI. Title I Requirements	0
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

Gulf Breeze Middle School

649 GULF BREEZE PKWY, Gulf Breeze, FL 32561

<http://www.santarosa.k12.fl.us/schools/gbm/>

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Santa Rosa County School Board on 10/12/2023.

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.

Gulf Breeze Middle School is committed to providing the avenues whereby students and adults work in an enthusiastic partnership to inspire and develop life-long learners who value human dignity, contribute to society and strive for excellence.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Gulf Breeze Middle School produces students who are excited about the challenges of tomorrow, confident in their ability to chart the future and dedicated to the pursuit of life-long learning.

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
Brandon, Michael	Principal	Instructional Leader, Engage Stakeholders, Collaborative Decision Maker, Manges the Learning Environment and Student Learning, School Operations, School-wide Professional Development, Discipline, MTSS Team, Threat Assessment Team Member, School Safety
Murphy, Tracy	Assistant Principal	Instructional Leader, Engage Stakeholders, Collaborative Decision Maker, Manges the Learning Environment and Student Learning, School Operations, School-wide Professional Development, Discipline, MTSS Team, Threat Assessment Team Member, School Safety, Progress Monitoring, Operates under the leadership of the principal. Manages the SIP
Hepworth, Deborah	School Counselor	Counseling, Testing, Master Schedule Management, MTSS Team, Mentor, Threat Assessment Team Member
McLendon, Amy	School Counselor	Counseling, Testing, Master Schedule Management, MTSS Team, Mentor, Threat Assessment Team Member
Renfro, Randal	Dean	Disciplinarian, Mentor, Student Supervision, Safety, Threat Assessment Team Member, Safety Committee Leader

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.

School leadership, teachers, school staff, and School Advisory Council members meet to develop the School Improvement Plan. Schoolwide data is distributed and content departments meet to discuss their current years test data and compared it to their prior years test data. School Advisory Council members join and circulate around the groups to observe, study, ask questions, and give input on the drafting 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))

The SIP will be regularly monitored for effective implementation and impact on increasing the achievement of students on a monthly basis via teacher feedback, classroom walkthroughs, and monitoring the emphasis in which Focus areas are being implemented by the school and teachers. Each semester the principal and assistant principal will meet with District leaders including the Superintendent, Assistant Superintendent of Curriculum and Instruction, Grade Level Director, Literacy/Math/Science Coordinators, and the Director and Coordinator of Continuous Improvement. The purpose of the meeting will be o review current state progress monitoring data and to progress monitor the implementation of the School Improvement Strategies and Action Steps. Specific feedback will be provided and discussion will occur as to any barriers in applying the strategies of the plan.

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	17%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	22%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	N/A
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) 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: A 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	15	23	25	63
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	23	19	46
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	1	1	0	2
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	14	28	56
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	17	23	57
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	8	7	25

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	4	13	10	27

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

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

Prior Year (2022-23) As Initially Reported (pre-populated)

The number of students by grade level that exhibited each early warning indicator:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	22	29	39	90
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	16	13	46
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	2
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	3
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	33	37	88
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	22	29	17	68
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	14	12	35

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	9	13	13	35

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	1	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	22	29	39	90
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	16	13	46
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	2
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	3
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	33	37	88
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	22	29	17	68
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	14	12	35

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	9	13	13	35

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	1	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*	73	58	49	74	59	50	72		
ELA Learning Gains				58			57		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				47			46		
Math Achievement*	83	68	56	83	38	36	82		
Math Learning Gains				73			66		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				60			58		
Science Achievement*	69	61	49	77	69	53	79		
Social Studies Achievement*	84	74	68	87	66	58	83		
Middle School Acceleration	73	68	73	79	54	49	76		
Graduation Rate					64	49			
College and Career Acceleration					79	70			
ELP Progress		75	40		64	76			

* 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)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	76
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	382
Total Components for the Federal Index	5
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	71
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	638
Total Components for the Federal Index	9
Percent Tested	100
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	1	
ELL				
AMI				
ASN	88			
BLK	77			
HSP	74			
MUL	76			
PAC				
WHT	76			

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	61			

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	41			
ELL				
AMI				
ASN	79			
BLK	50			
HSP	71			
MUL	67			
PAC				
WHT	71			
FRL	61			

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	73			83			69	84	73			
SWD	30			51			27	57	17		5	
ELL												
AMI												
ASN	92			100				80	80		4	
BLK	77			77							2	
HSP	70			81			61	89	71		5	
MUL	71			71			68	83	86		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	73			83			69	84	72		5	
FRL	57			74			59	72	44		5	

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	74	58	47	83	73	60	77	87	79			
SWD	31	39	28	39	51	35	42	50	55			
ELL												
AMI												
ASN	84	58		95	79							
BLK	50			50								
HSP	65	54	55	84	79	92	63	70	80			
MUL	72	64	25	74	62	47	88	89	85			
PAC												
WHT	75	58	48	84	73	60	77	88	78			
FRL	63	54	39	76	69	50	62	90	47			

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	72	57	46	82	66	58	79	83	76			
SWD	28	39	31	40	52	40	27	61				
ELL												
AMI												
ASN	89	92		94	100				90			
BLK												
HSP	65	64	48	79	64	54	68	67	80			
MUL	74	47	10	82	76	40	71	79	62			
PAC												
WHT	72	57	48	82	65	60	83	85	76			
FRL	56	50	44	70	64	59	62	78	40			

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	68%	54%	14%	47%	21%
08	2023 - Spring	69%	56%	13%	47%	22%
06	2023 - Spring	74%	55%	19%	47%	27%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	82%	63%	19%	54%	28%
07	2023 - Spring	72%	48%	24%	48%	24%
08	2023 - Spring	85%	76%	9%	55%	30%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	69%	58%	11%	44%	25%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	99%	58%	41%	50%	49%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	*	55%	*	48%	*

CIVICS						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	83%	71%	12%	66%	17%

III. Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis/Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources.

Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year's low performance and discuss any trends.

Our lowest performing area was 8th grade Science. Unfortunately, Science has shown a gradual decrease over the last few years. Last year we had more students score a level 1 (7) and level 2 (24) versus 2022 where we had students score fewer students score a level 1 (3) and level 2 (21).

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

Science showed our greatest decline from the prior year. Last year we had more students score a level 1 (7) and level 2 (24) versus 2022 where we had students score fewer students score a level 1 (3) and level 2 (21).

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.

All of our scores are higher than the state average. Our students and teachers worked extremely hard this year to perform at a high standard.

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

Our math scores showed the most improvement. Our teachers used the new textbooks, accompanying materials, and met as a department and grade levels to analyze their student data and problem solve student area of weaknesses throughout the school year in PLC's..

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

One area of particular concern for 22-23 school year compared to 21-22 school year is the number of students with 6+ days of OSS were up a total of 16 days compared to 0 the year before.

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

1. 8th grade Science
2. ELA across grade levels

Area of Focus

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

#1. 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.

A positive culture and environment focus area will be the implementation of Positive Behavior Interventions and Supports (PBIS) this school year.

Measurable Outcome:

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

The specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve is the reduction of the number of students with 6+ referral and OSS. This year, those students were assigned 16 hours of OSS compared to 0 the year before.

Monitoring:

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

This area of focus will be monitored monthly by keeping up with our discipline referrals and monitoring the number of referrals students in our Tier 1, 2, and 3 receive monthly. There will also be PBIS data that will have to be completed quarterly that will help with monitoring our desired outcome.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Michael Brandon (brandonm@santarosa.k12.fl.us)

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.)

PBIS establishes a healthy school climate and culture, increases student engagement and instructional time, empowers students to play a central role in their education, and reduces teacher burnout.

<https://www.pbis.org/pbis/why-implement-pbis>

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

By implementing PBIS at our school, we hope to achieve a better system of recognizing more Tier 1 students who do not receive recognition for doing the right things at school. Also, we hope that we will see a decrease in the referrals Tier 2 and 3 students receive and to improve on positive relationships between teachers and those students.

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. Assistant Principal and two teachers attended a district-led PBIS training held for three days during the summer.
2. After the training, the three of us met with Mr. Brandon and discussed what was learned at the training.
3. The school's teachers and staff will be introduced to PBIS and how it will be implemented at our school.

4. Quarterly, students will be recognized and celebrated who are successfully meeting the guiding principals of PBIS.

5. This will be an ongoing learning and implementation for our school since it is the first year we are using PBIS.

Person Responsible: Michael Brandon (brandonm@santarosa.k12.fl.us)

By When: We hope to see some change in discipline by the mid-school year.

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Professional Learning Communities

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.

Based on the results from the Standards Assessment Inventory (SAI) that our Office of Professional Learning submitted to all school teachers across the district, GBMS teachers felt there was a lack of establishing expectations for equity, creating structures to ensure all staff members have access to learning, and the ability to sustain a culture of support for all staff.

Measurable Outcome:

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

The SAI showed that we scored a 3.4 which indicates a need for improvement in the area of professional development in Equity Foundations.

Monitoring:

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

By utilizing our Professional Learning Liaison who is our school's assigned representative and consistently monitoring monthly teachers professional development needs, we hope to meet the professional development needs of our teachers.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Michael Brandon (brandonm@santarosa.k12.fl.us)

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.)

As a school we are going to meet in teams to hold conversations to determine challenges to student concerns and gaps in teacher professional learning. Better define what a PLC should look like in our school and areas of focus for PLCs. Coordinate school and district resources for educator learning.

<https://learningforward.org/report/evidence-of-how-standards-for-professional-learning-are-associated-with-improved-teacher-instruction-and-student-outcomes/>

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The rationale for the selected strategy is to find out what teachers professional development needs are as they perceive them and how we as a school administrative team can better meet their PD 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.

1. Meet with teacher teams and hold conversations on student concerns and determine gaps in teacher professional learning needs.
2. Meet as an administrative team with our Professional Learning Liaison to plan how to provide

professional development to our teachers based on their perceived needs.

3. Coordinate school and district resources to implement professional development.

4. Professional development that will be provided at the beginning of school will be Student-Led Teams and Marzano Rubrics and Scales.

Person Responsible: Michael Brandon (brandonm@santarosa.k12.fl.us)

By When: To begin the first nine weeks of school.

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

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

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

Teacher/staff attendance was at 93% rate in 2022/2023. Student attendance rate was 95%. Student attendance was greater than teacher attendance.

Measurable Outcome:

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

We want to raise our teacher/staff attendance rate to 95%.

Monitoring:

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

Administration will check Frontline monthly for all staff to monitor attendance.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Michael Brandon (brandonm@santarosa.k12.fl.us)

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.)

Teachers/staff who have high absentee rates or had unpaid leave for the 22-23 school year will meet with school administration. Professional development and meetings will not be held during the school day to reduce the number of teacher absences from their students.

<https://report.heritage.org/ib5322>

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The single most important factor in student achievement is the quality of the teacher. However, if the teacher isn't present, it has an impact on every student assigned to that teacher. Whereas, if a student is absent, the effect is only on the one student.

www.gogreenva.org

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 4 - Demonstrates a Rationale

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. Meet with staff at the beginning of year to go over attendance data from previous year.

Person Responsible: Michael Brandon (brandonm@santarosa.k12.fl.us)

By When: 1. Pre-planning meeting with teachers/staff that had high absenteeism the previous year or were on unpaid leave.

2. Check monthly attendance in Frontline

Person Responsible: Michael Brandon (brandonm@santarosa.k12.fl.us)

By When: 2. Monitor monthly the Frontline system.

3. Meet with staff with excessive absences

4. Put staff on warning and given verbal/written notice

Person Responsible: Michael Brandon (brandonm@santarosa.k12.fl.us)

By When: 3. Meet with teachers/staff that fall into high absenteeism or unpaid leave.