

Santa Rosa County School District

Holley Navarre 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	11
III. Planning for Improvement	16
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	25
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	0
VI. Title I Requirements	0
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

Holley Navarre Middle School

1976 WILLIAMS CREEK DR, Navarre, FL 32566

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

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.

Holley Navarre Middle School is committed to providing the skills necessary for our students to compete both academically and technologically in the 21st century global community. Our mission will be accomplished through the collaboration of parents, teachers, students and community members.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Holley Navarre Middle School strives to create a positive atmosphere that encourages its students to work confidently towards reaching their potential by becoming critical thinkers and life-long learners.

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
DeStefano, Joann	Principal	Supervises the operation and management of all activities and functions which and occur at Holley Navarre Middle School. Develops, implements, and assesses the instructional programs at assigned school and coordinates with Santa Rosa County School District instructional staff in program planning. Interviews and selects qualified personnel to be recommended for employment. Establishes guidelines for proper student conduct and implements Santa Rosa County Code of Student Conduct along with disciplinary procedures and policies that ensure a safe and orderly environment. Directs the development of the Master Schedule and assigns teachers according to certification and identified needs. Ensures all state testing is completed within specified time.
Della Ratta, Pete	Assistant Principal	Acts on the Principal's behalf in his/her absence. Assists to develop and implement the school's instructional program with assistance from Santa Rosa County School District personnel and provides its articulation among school personnel as assigned by the principal. Facilitates the development of the Master Schedule and assigns teachers according to certification and needs. Utilizes current educational trends in the planning and preparation of the school instructional program. Manages and administers the attendance policy and procedures. Assists in design and implementation of all safety plans. Organizes and assigns Duty Schedules. Oversees the writing and implementation of Progress Monitoring Plans in accordance with Santa Rosa County guidelines. Aids in interpreting and enforcing the District's Code for Student Conduct.
Riggs, Hayden	Dean	Collaborates with school leadership to develop and implement Santa Rosa County Code of Student Conduct. De-escalates heightened student behavior and emotion. Communicates with at-risk students. Effectively communicates with parents and offers assistance as necessary. Effectively collaborates with teachers, leaders, parents, students, and district personnel. Assists in maintaining accurate documentation of all required safety drills and policies. Assists in maintaining a safe and orderly environment.
Locklin, Lisa	School Counselor	Provides assistance in the screening, referral, identification, and placement of all general education students as well as those students with special needs. Assesses students using the Multi-Tiered System of Support and provides assistance. monitors the 504 Plan process, including involving parents and school personnel, creating plans, and maintaining records as indicated/ needed. Assists students in the selection of classes; makes sure all state requirements are met. Makes necessary changes to student schedules throughout the year as indicated/needed. Provides input in the development of curriculum and the Master Schedule. Provides small group developmental guidance activities to all students, provides personal/social, behavioral, and/or academic counseling to all students. Provides assistance to parents of all students. Coordinates and/or assists with award presentations and 8th grade transition to high school. Coordinate state testing according to all test time

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		and procedural guidelines. Coordinates the proper maintenance, transfer, and acquisition of students' records as required.
Jeansonne, Brooke	School Counselor	Provides assistance in the screening, referral, identification, and placement of all general education students as well as those students with special needs. Assesses students using the Multi-Tiered System of Support and provides assistance. Monitors the 504 Plan process, including involving parents and school personnel, creating plans, and maintaining records as indicated/needed. Assists students in the selection of classes; makes sure all state requirements are met. Makes necessary changes to student schedules throughout the year as indicated/needed. Provides input in the development of curriculum and the Master Schedule. Provides small group developmental guidance activities to all students, provides personal/social, behavioral, and/or academic counseling to all students. Provides assistance to parents of all students. Coordinates and/or assists with award presentations and 8th grade transition to high school. Coordinate state testing according to all test time and procedural guidelines. Coordinates the proper maintenance, transfer, and acquisition of students' records as required

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 Team along with Department Heads review data from state testing; once we have discussed a direction for improvement we present it to the SAC for approval/questions at the first SAC meeting. (3rd Thursday of August)

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))

Our SAC and administrative team meet once a month; during our meetings student data is shared. Grades are checked every 4 1/2 weeks along with Progress Monitoring tests 1 & 2; we look at data and make adjustments as indicated.

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 to 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	34%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	41%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	ATSI
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD)* English Language Learners (ELL) Asian Students (ASN) Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: 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	0	22	35	57	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	40	37	77	
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	4	3	16	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	7	4	27	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	28	38	41	107	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	35	22	27	84	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	22	14	54	

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	14	32	24	70

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	2	4	4	10
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	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	32	30	37	99	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	25	42	81	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	4	3	16	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	7	5	28	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	44	47	36	127	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	41	36	37	114	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	38	23	33	94	

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	35	20	31	86

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	1	2	6
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	32	30	37	99	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	25	42	81	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	4	3	16	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	7	5	28	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	44	47	36	127	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	41	36	37	114	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	38	23	33	94	

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	35	20	31	86

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	1	2	6
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*	65	58	49	64	59	50	63		
ELA Learning Gains				59			55		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				50			38		
Math Achievement*	75	68	56	75	38	36	71		
Math Learning Gains				72			62		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				68			51		
Science Achievement*	68	61	49	71	69	53	59		
Social Studies Achievement*	84	74	68	86	66	58	80		
Middle School Acceleration	55	68	73	65	54	49	44		
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)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	69
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	347
Total Components for the Federal Index	5
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	68

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index

OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	610
Total Components for the Federal Index	9
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	38	Yes	2	
ELL	25	Yes	1	1
AMI				
ASN	80			
BLK	59			
HSP	59			
MUL	76			
PAC				
WHT	71			
FRL	64			

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	40	Yes	1	
ELL	51			
AMI				
ASN	69			
BLK	57			
HSP	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%
MUL	73			
PAC				
WHT	69			
FRL	62			

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	65			75			68	84	55			
SWD	33			42			30	48			4	
ELL	25			25							2	
AMI												
ASN	73			87							2	
BLK	49			56			44	88			4	
HSP	58			62			49	72	54		5	
MUL	68			82			70	94	67		5	
PAC												
WHT	66			77			73	84	53		5	
FRL	57			70			62	83	48		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	64	59	50	75	72	68	71	86	65			
SWD	25	41	45	35	49	51	25	46				
ELL	17	25		46	85	82						
AMI												
ASN	65	50		88	80				60			

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
BLK	49	50	47	62	71	71	44	64				
HSP	55	61	50	62	62	57	62	79	62			
MUL	74	62	56	78	74	69	76	91	81			
PAC												
WHT	65	59	52	78	73	69	74	88	62			
FRL	59	57	44	71	67	59	66	82	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	63	55	38	71	62	51	59	80	44			
SWD	27	43	40	35	52	49	11	45				
ELL	23			17								
AMI												
ASN	65	67		85	81		80					
BLK	46	51	33	52	49	35	53	60				
HSP	60	51	35	61	53	29	59	81	32			
MUL	62	53	24	76	59	71	53	75	64			
PAC												
WHT	65	56	41	73	64	53	60	81	40			
FRL	52	45	33	63	60	51	46	71	24			

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	64%	54%	10%	47%	17%
08	2023 - Spring	60%	56%	4%	47%	13%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	62%	55%	7%	47%	15%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	74%	63%	11%	54%	20%
07	2023 - Spring	61%	48%	13%	48%	13%
08	2023 - Spring	85%	76%	9%	55%	30%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	68%	58%	10%	44%	24%

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	86%	71%	15%	66%	20%

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.

SWD subgroup was scored below 41% (21-22) and therefore will be a targeted group. A significant number of SWD students score a level 1 in ELA (45 out of 84 total level 1 students).

In general ELA achievement showed a slight decrease; 62% 2023 (64% 2022)

Math achievement showed a slight decrease: 73% proficient (75%)

ELA results: 6th grade 62% proficient; 7th grade 65% proficient; 8th grade 60%.

Math results: 6th grade 75% proficient; 7th grade 60% proficient; 8th grade 85% proficient.

Algebra 99% Proficient

Geometry 100% Proficient

Civics: 86 % proficient which has remained steady (86% 2022)

Science: 68% proficiency (decrease of 3% from 2021)***

*** It should be noted that the Florida Assessment platform/format changed from FSA to FAST in the 2023 testing cycle so comparing results is not really appropriate.

ELA is a concern for HNMS especially in 8th grade; weaknesses primarily in Literary Elements and Purpose and Perspective in non-fiction.

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

SWD - Although there was not a significant decline most of this population did not show an increase their Scale score.

ELA main areas of concern were Literary Elements and Purpose and Perspective in non-fiction.

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.

SWD students performance was below 41% on the 21-22 state tests. In general HNMS scored above the state in all accountability components.

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

Math lowest 25% increased from 51 (2021) to 68 (2022) this is significant because our lowest quartile in 2019 was 67.

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

ELA both in general population and particularly in the SWD subgroup. ELA is a concern for HNMS especially in 8th grade; weaknesses primarily in Literary Elements and Purpose and Perspective in non-fiction.

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

ELA - SWD subgroup

ELA all subgroups.

Mentor Program for all students "Bulldog Breaks"

Area of Focus

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

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

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.

SWD subgroup were an area of Focus in ELA; (21-22 proficiency was at 41%). 45 students out the a total of 74 Intensive Reading students are ESE for the 23/24 school year. (60% of Intensive reading students are ESE).

Measurable Outcome:

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

SWD subgroup Level 1 readers in Intensive math will decrease by 25% (decrease by 11 students).

Monitoring:

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

A dual certified teacher (ESE & Reading) will be teaching the course.

Progress Learning Lift off will be administered within the first 2 weeks of each quarter.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Joann DeStefano (destefanoj@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.)

1. Dual certified teacher (ESE and Reading) will be the teacher for all Intensive Reding Classes. - Tier 4
- 2.. Progress Learning - Tier 4

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

2. Progress Learning - (Ref. article "Reforms in Relation to Research-Based Theories Resulting in Successful Test Results" Christian V.F. (2015) found the treatment group scored significant 7.4 points huiher on the posttest when compared to the control group.

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. Dual certified teacher assigned to this course

Person Responsible: Joann DeStefano (destefanoj@santarosa.k12.fl.us)

By When: by 8/10/23

2. Progress Learning Lift off will be administered within the first 2 weeks of each quarter.

Person Responsible: Pete Della Ratta (dellarattap@santarosa.k12.fl.us)

By When: Progress Learning Lift off will be administered within the first 2 weeks of each quarter.

#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.

We are expanding our "Bulldog Breaks," mentor program to all 3 grade levels. The program will help to foster positive relationships with our students and encourage good study habits. We will also include some resiliency training which will compliment our Mental Health lessons and Hope Squad Themes. The purpose of "Bulldog Breaks" is to foster a positive relationship between students and their Mentor Teacher. We will continue to be a PBIS school as well. PBIS is a school wide program which strives to support and positively impact each student. This is a natural fit with the Mental Health training and our "Bulldog Breaks."

Measurable Outcome:

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

Students will log into grade portal and check their grades a minimum of once a month and improve assignment completion.

Teachers will document completion of assigned lessons.

Decrease in discipline referrals.

Monitoring:

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

Documentation forms will be turned in and completion of lessons recorded.

Academic progress will be monitored quarterly

Student referrals and complaint forms will show a decrease in number.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Joann DeStefano (destefanoj@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.)

The state of Florida mandates at least 5 hours of mental health training. SRCSB has chosen a product which meets the required instruction components. The Resiliency Lessons are part of the "Hope Squad" Initiative, and will help to support student teacher and student peer relationships.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Last year HNMS and MHS were tasked with creating a mentor program. We started with 6th grade and the plan was to include all grade levels this year. "Every child who winds up doing well has had at least one stable and committed relationship with a supportive adult." (Center on the Developing Child; Harvard University)

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 3 - Promising 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. Daily Period Schedule will be sent separately. We will be taking 4 minutes off each period and not have ITV on those days.

Person Responsible: Joann DeStefano (destefanoj@santarosa.k12.fl.us)

By When: September - May

2. Sessions will be held the 2nd and 4th Thursday of the month (dates will be adjusted for holidays) All sessions will be 20 minutes in length and will take place at the beginning of 6th period on the designated days.

2nd Thursday of the month – this session will be comprised of students checking grades; academic coaching; ice breakers or “getting to know you” activities.

4th Thursday of the month – this session will be comprised of 1 of the 2 monthly required resiliency lessons supplied by the county. (We will identify which lesson will be used.)

Person Responsible: Joann DeStefano (destefanoj@santarosa.k12.fl.us)

By When: September-May

#3. 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.

2022-23 FAST Assessments results demonstrated the following percentages: ELA - 64%; Math - 75%; Science - 71%. Benchmark-aligned instruction is a process for planning, delivering, monitoring, and improving expectations clearly defined in academic content standards which provide the basis for content in instruction and assessment. Increased exposure to explicit, benchmark-aligned instruction will improve learning outcomes for all students.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Teachers will use Standards Base instruction and utilize Marzano Rubrics and Scales. Walkthrough data will reflect at least 75% of teachers will demonstrate use of Rubrics and Scales in their classrooms. Teachers will also explore student led teams.

Monitoring:

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

Rubrics and Scales should be evident in classroom observations and lesson plans.

Use of Student Led Teams should be evident in classroom observations and lesson plans.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Joann DeStefano (destefanoj@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.)

In order to increase benchmark-aligned instruction in classrooms, we will effectively implement the Marzano Focused Teacher Evaluation Model framework with “provides a methodology to support teacher growth as teachers make instructional shifts necessary to support students in rigorous, standards-based classrooms” (1). The model draws upon data from field research and validation studies, couples with findings from the extant literature on rigorous, standards-based instruction (2).

(1) <https://www.marzanocenter.com/wp-content/uploads/sites/4/2018/10/MC06-14-FTEM-White-Paper-1-16-18-Digital-4.pdf>

(2) https://www.marzanocenter.com/wp-content/uploads/sites/4/2019/04/FTEM_Updated_Michigan_08312017.pdf

PLC - conducted by H/R on use of Marzano Rubrics and scales in the classroom. Teachers will use consistent and objective descriptions of mastery of content being taught. This will allow for accurate measurement levels of proficiency for a given standard.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Explicit, standards-aligned instruction ensures students have the opportunity to access the targeted grade level expectations. The Marzano Focused Teacher Evaluation Model is supported by wide research and demonstrates significantly increased student growth scores (1). The model is comprised of four domains directly tied to student achievement, two, Standards-Based Planning and Standards-Based Instruction, explicitly align to the Area of Focus.

(1) https://www.marzanocenter.com/wp-content/uploads/sites/4/2019/04/FTEM_Updated_Michigan_08312017.pdf

Student chances of successfully comprehending the content is increased. This strategy will allow timely, specific feedback to students and should reduce grading time.

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 2 - Moderate 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.

Instructional coaches with school administration will facilitate grade-level planning and provide support on how to develop benchmark-aligned lessons. - August 22 for all teachers
Monthly PLC's will focus on incorporating student teams in classes.

Person Responsible: Joann DeStefano (destefanoj@santarosa.k12.fl.us)

By When: PLC on Marzano rubrics and scales - August 22 for all teachers Monthly PLC's will focus on incorporating student teams in classes. The leadership team will meet to review trends in observation data, classroom walkthrough data, lesson plans, and feedback from coaches to adjust as needed.

#4. 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.

Student Attendance.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Daily Average Daily Attendance 2022-23 school year was 94.68%.

The number of Truancy Plans for 2022-23 school year was 35; our goal is to reduce this by 20% (7 students)

Monitoring:

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

We will monitor student attendance each quarter and will document the number of Truancy Monitoring Plans.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Pete Della Ratta (dellarattap@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.)

We will have a competition between classes according to their lunch periods. Winning classes will choose a team to compete in a preselected activity. These "games" will occur during their lunch periods and winning team (class) will receive a

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Building rapport with your students and establishing yourself as their mentor is an excellent way to combat chronic absenteeism. Research suggests that reward systems can have positive effects on student motivation and achievement.

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.

Mr. Della Ratta will set this competition up on a bracket type format. Teachers were briefed on the strategy on 8/2/23.

Person Responsible: Pete Della Ratta (dellarattap@santarosa.k12.fl.us)

By When: 9/5/23

#5. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA**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.

ELA is a concern for HNMS especially in 8th grade; weaknesses primarily in Literary Elements and Purpose and Perspective in non-fiction. Based on ELA PM3 (May 2023) FAST data, 62% of 6th graders, 65% of 7th graders and 60% of 8th graders at our school were proficient.

Measurable Outcome:

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

6th-8th grade students will use literary elements and purpose and perspective (nonfiction) to comprehend grade level text as evidenced by ELA FAST PM3 showing 65% proficiency.

Monitoring:

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

Teachers will use PM1 and PM2 assessments along with classroom performance to measure progress toward goal.

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.)

ELA teachers will participate in professional development through a PLC on how to teach strategies on comprehending fiction and nonfiction texts. ELA teachers will participate in a PLC learning about strategies to use to help students comprehend text followed by reflecting on how this can improve student achievement.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

PLCs allow teachers an easy way to share best practices and brainstorm innovative ways to improve learning and drive student achievement. Learning from others in your PLC allows you to reflect on ways to enhance your teaching and to adjust your practice.

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.

ELA teachers will participate in a PLC learning about strategies to use to help students comprehend text followed by reflecting on how this can improve student achievement.

Person Responsible: Joann DeStefano (destefanoj@santarosa.k12.fl.us)

By When:

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)).

We are an ATSI school based on the 21/22 school year results. We have planned for an ESE/Reading certified teacher to be the primary instructor in those classes; this teacher is funded by the school district not by any other source.

We are also a PBIS school and receive funds for that program which we use for incentive rewards to our students. Other PBIS activities along with attendance initiative funding comes from a community/business partner that sponsors our ice cream socials.