

Sarasota County Schools

Venice 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 | 9 |
| III. Planning for Improvement | 14 |
| IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review | 30 |
| V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence | 30 |
| VI. Title I Requirements | 32 |
| VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus | 34 |

Venice Middle School

1900 CENTER RD, Venice, FL 34292

www.sarasotacountyschools.net/venicemiddle

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 Venice Middle is to challenge and nurture our students by offering a high quality education and fostering a community of respect and understanding in a safe school environment. Our goal is to develop lifelong learners and caring citizens for the betterment of self and society.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The vision of Venice Middle is a school that fosters respect for and commitment to community and academic success.

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 |
|--------------------|---------------------|---------------------------------|
| Dinverno, Tomas | Principal | |
| Rice, Erin | Assistant Principal | |
| Woods, Chuck | Assistant Principal | |
| Walters, Elizabeth | Teacher, K-12 | |
| Mikarts, Kristin | Teacher, K-12 | |
| Bailey, Kim | School Counselor | |
| Singer, Amber | School Counselor | |

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.

The development of the SIP for VMS included school leadership, school staff, and the School Advisory Council. State reported data on VMS for 2022-23 was analyzed to draft school improvement plan goals that were edited with staff and SAC input. The School Advisory Council includes all the required stakeholders of staff, student, parents, and community members including business partners. The SAC reviews the SIP annually to approve the goals and content of the SIP. The SIP is also published for all stakeholders on the VMS website.

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))

As the SIP is an ongoing live document, progress on the goals of the SIP is reviewed by the SAC during the course of each school year. Monthly meetings of the SAC review progress monitoring data that directly correlates to the goals of the SIP. As two of the primary goals of the SIP are based on the performance of students in the ESSA demographics, specific review of progress monitoring data occurs with reporting out to stakeholders on the data. Revisions to the SIP plan include any edits or additions to language of the plan with SAC input. A mid-year review of progress on the goals of the SIP is conducted annually with an exact percentage of the progress toward the SMART goals of the SIP.

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 | 23% |
| 2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate | 39% |
| 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) 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 | 40 | 56 | 111 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 15 | 18 | 41 |
| Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 4 | 2 | 9 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 7 |
| Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 25 | 30 | 35 | 90 |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 20 | 25 | 30 | 75 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C. | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 25 | 30 | 35 | 90 |

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 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 6 |

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 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Students retained two or more times | 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 | 20 | 45 | 52 | 117 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 8 | 21 | 39 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 7 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 6 |
| Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 17 | 28 | 55 | 100 |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 36 | 35 | 33 | 104 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C. | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 17 | 28 | 55 | 100 |

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 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 5 |

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 | 3 | 2 | 5 |
| 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 | 60 | 64 | 156 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 23 | 25 | 52 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 8 | 13 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 12 | 19 |
| Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 29 | 56 | 73 | 158 |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 32 | 32 | 28 | 92 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C. | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 17 | 28 | 55 | 100 |

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 | 63 | 96 | 166 | 325 |

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 | 3 | 2 | 5 |
| 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* | 54 | 57 | 49 | 59 | 57 | 50 | 59 | | |
| ELA Learning Gains | | | | 56 | | | 56 | | |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | 45 | | | 42 | | |
| Math Achievement* | 69 | 64 | 56 | 74 | 38 | 36 | 73 | | |
| Math Learning Gains | | | | 71 | | | 61 | | |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | 65 | | | 51 | | |
| Science Achievement* | 61 | 56 | 49 | 66 | 64 | 53 | 59 | | |
| Social Studies Achievement* | 82 | 81 | 68 | 85 | 60 | 58 | 80 | | |
| Middle School Acceleration | 80 | 73 | 73 | 80 | 51 | 49 | 78 | | |
| Graduation Rate | | | | | 55 | 49 | | | |
| College and Career Acceleration | | | | | 83 | 70 | | | |
| ELP Progress | 25 | 57 | 40 | 71 | 76 | 76 | 44 | | |

** 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 | 62 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students | No |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 1 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 371 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 6 |

| 2021-22 ESSA Federal Index | |
|----------------------------|-----|
| Percent Tested | 100 |
| Graduation Rate | |

| 2021-22 ESSA Federal Index | |
|------------------------------------------------|------|
| ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI) | ATSI |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students | 67 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students | No |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 1 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 672 |
| 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 | 4 | |
| ELL | 51 | | | |
| AMI | | | | |
| ASN | | | | |
| BLK | | | | |
| HSP | 53 | | | |
| MUL | 65 | | | |
| PAC | | | | |
| WHT | 71 | | | |
| FRL | 55 | | | |

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 | 3 | |
| ELL | 61 | | | |
| AMI | | | | |
| ASN | 80 | | | |
| BLK | | | | |
| HSP | 64 | | | |
| MUL | 69 | | | |
| PAC | | | | |
| WHT | 67 | | | |
| FRL | 56 | | | |

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 | 54 | | | 69 | | | 61 | 82 | 80 | | | 25 |
| SWD | 19 | | | 39 | | | 24 | 50 | 50 | | 5 | |
| ELL | 43 | | | 65 | | | 40 | 60 | 75 | | 6 | 25 |
| AMI | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ASN | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| BLK | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| HSP | 45 | | | 61 | | | 52 | 63 | 84 | | 6 | 15 |
| MUL | 45 | | | 63 | | | 67 | 89 | 60 | | 5 | |
| PAC | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 57 | | | 71 | | | 61 | 85 | 82 | | 5 | |
| FRL | 44 | | | 60 | | | 51 | 73 | 75 | | 6 | 25 |

| 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 | 59 | 56 | 45 | 74 | 71 | 65 | 66 | 85 | 80 | | | 71 |
| SWD | 21 | 35 | 34 | 41 | 54 | 51 | 24 | 55 | | | | |
| ELL | 40 | 62 | 52 | 61 | 72 | 58 | 41 | 82 | 75 | | | 71 |
| AMI | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ASN | 72 | 69 | | 83 | 75 | | 73 | 100 | 91 | | | |
| BLK | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| HSP | 45 | 62 | 53 | 68 | 73 | 68 | 36 | 77 | 85 | | | 69 |
| MUL | 59 | 62 | 50 | 69 | 65 | 50 | 82 | 94 | 93 | | | |
| PAC | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 61 | 54 | 42 | 75 | 72 | 66 | 69 | 85 | 77 | | | |
| FRL | 44 | 49 | 41 | 65 | 63 | 56 | 46 | 69 | 67 | | | |

| 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 | 59 | 56 | 42 | 73 | 61 | 51 | 59 | 80 | 78 | | | 44 |
| SWD | 26 | 39 | 30 | 28 | 40 | 32 | 22 | 42 | | | | |
| ELL | 30 | 53 | 52 | 53 | 64 | 67 | | | | | | 44 |
| AMI | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ASN | 77 | 65 | | 86 | 75 | | | | 80 | | | |
| BLK | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| HSP | 50 | 63 | 57 | 61 | 69 | 62 | 50 | 92 | 57 | | | 47 |
| MUL | 63 | 55 | | 78 | 64 | | 57 | 71 | 90 | | | |
| PAC | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 59 | 55 | 39 | 74 | 59 | 45 | 61 | 79 | 80 | | | |
| FRL | 45 | 52 | 47 | 62 | 60 | 53 | 47 | 76 | 73 | | | 50 |

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 | 47% | 55% | -8% | 47% | 0% |
| 08 | 2023 - Spring | 52% | 55% | -3% | 47% | 5% |
| 06 | 2023 - Spring | 55% | 54% | 1% | 47% | 8% |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|-------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 06 | 2023 - Spring | 55% | 61% | -6% | 54% | 1% |
| 07 | 2023 - Spring | 64% | 67% | -3% | 48% | 16% |
| 08 | 2023 - Spring | 72% | 54% | 18% | 55% | 17% |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
|---------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 08 | 2023 - Spring | 59% | 55% | 4% | 44% | 15% |

| ALGEBRA | | | | | | |
|---------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| N/A | 2023 - Spring | 96% | 65% | 31% | 50% | 46% |

| GEOMETRY | | | | | | |
|----------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| N/A | 2023 - Spring | 100% | 59% | 41% | 48% | 52% |

| CIVICS | | | | | | |
|--------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| N/A | 2023 - Spring | 82% | 79% | 3% | 66% | 16% |

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 greatest need for improvement is demonstrated by the category of students demonstrating a proficiency in English Language Arts. This data point has trended to be the area of most need for the school and continues to be a focus area for improvement. Contributing factors include students that are in the lowest quartile that are more than 1 year behind grade level with reading. The students do make gains in 1 year yet do not always achieve both a learning gain and proficiency in 1 year.

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

The data component that showed the greatest decline from the prior year was Science proficiency. The Science assessment continues to have a lot of text complexity for reading comprehension. Students that are striving readers in the 8th grade have more difficulty with the reading component of the Science assessment. The test also includes standards that are taught over the course of middle school with nature of science trending lower than the other standards with student proficiency.

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 one data component that both the state and the school had the same was 7th grade FAST ELA proficiency rate, both at 47%. In all other areas the school performed at higher rates than the state average. A contributing factor for the data component was the performance of the ESSA data group of students with disabilities specifically at the 7th grade. The data showed that students' response to intervention was not sufficient to have the students demonstrate either a learning gain or proficiency as an average compared to grade level peers.

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

The data component that showed the most improvement was in 8th grade proficiency rates for FAST MATH. The Math team worked diligently in the professional learning community to identify student progress throughout the year, regroup students by need based on standards, and provide small group intervention for those students that needed additional support to show proficiency on the standard.

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

Based on the early warning system data, students that are striving readers and behind their grade level peers in reading is one area of concern. This area of concern has implications in reading proficiency for FAST ELA as well as across other content areas with students ability to understand text on any given state assessment.

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

Priorities for school improvement include:

1. Learning gains of students in the lowest quartile on FAST ELA with focus on ESSA demographic of students with disabilities.
2. Proficiency of students in FAST ELA.
3. Learning gains of students in the lowest quartile on MATH ELA with focus on ESSA demographic of students with disabilities.
4. Proficiency of students in MATH ELA.
5. Proficiency of students on the state SCIENCE assessment.

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.

By 2024, there will be an 6% increase in students demonstrating a learning gain in the lowest quartile in ELA, compared to 2023 data, with specific focus on students with disabilities as identified in Every Student Succeed Acts. This will be measured by an increase in scale score growth from the 1st progress monitoring in the fall of Florida Assessment of Student Thinking to the 3rd progress monitoring of F.A.S.T. in the spring as compared to prior year data.

Measurable Outcome:

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

An increase of 6% from 1st progress monitoring to 3rd progress monitoring from 44% to 50%.

Monitoring:

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

The area of focus will be monitored both at the classroom and school level including disaggregation of students with disabilities, general education students, and students as defined in Every Student Succeed Act. Student progress on F.A.S.T., i-Ready and classroom performance on assessments will be used to identify growth for each student as well as provide additional supports.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Tomas Dinverno (tomas.dinverno@sarasotacountyschools.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.)

Evidence based strategy includes the best practice of Co-Teach in English Language Arts classrooms.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

This strategy has been identified by the Best Practices with Inclusion Education process implemented by both the district and school to support learners in the general education setting that have individual education plans.

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.

Tier 1 instruction in ELA including literacy strategies to support all learners. VMS will continue to implement the Focus 5 Literacy Strategies of Read Alouds, Shared Reading, Vocabulary, Quick Writes, and Summarizing. Professional Development for teachers will be available and a school wide effort to continue to utilize these strategies.

Person Responsible: Kristin Mikarts (kristin.mikarts@sarasotacountyschools.net)

By When: Review bi-weekly and quarterly.

Tier 2 Support: Students who are experiencing academic difficulties will be referred to the School Wide Support Team (SWST). The SWST team meets weekly and can assist teachers when making decisions on how to best support our students academically, behaviorally, socially, and emotionally.

Person Responsible: Kim Bailey (kim.bailey@sarasotacountyschools.net)

By When: Weekly and quarterly.

English Language Arts classes will use benchmark assessments to monitor student performance on standards based instruction. Standards mastery reports will be reviewed in PLC and with Leadership Team to identify areas of strength and areas for improvement for students demonstrating knowledge on standards. Reteaching and small group instruction on specific standards will be used to reinforce learning and support students striving to reach level of peers.

Person Responsible: Tomas Dinverno (tomas.dinverno@sarasotacountyschools.net)

By When: Ongoing observations quarterly.

Students scheduled in an ELA Co-Teach classes where the student to teacher ratio is 22 to 2, and one of the teachers is a certified ESE teacher. This instruction philosophy is also identified by the state of Florida as best practice when providing differentiated instruction and varying tiers of support related to the MTSS/RTI process.

Person Responsible: Tomas Dinverno (tomas.dinverno@sarasotacountyschools.net)

By When: Beginning of 23-24 school year.

#2. 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.

A review of the school assessment data compared to district assessment data shows that the overall average of proficiency for the school is lower than the district average, although higher than the state. The goal is to improve on the average to attain higher than the district average for middle schools.

Measurable Outcome:

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

By 2024, there will be a 6% increase in students demonstrating proficiency from prior year to current year in English Language Arts 6th-8th grade as demonstrated on the F.A.S.T Progress Monitoring 3 assessment from 51% to 57%.

Monitoring:

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

Monitoring of student progress to include weekly review of student grades and attendance data. Student performance on benchmark assessments in core content area will be progress monitored.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Tomas Dinverno (tomas.dinverno@sarasotacountyschools.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.)

Identify ELA students that need Tier II Interventions. Contact Parent(s)/Guardians as to the extra resources that are available for their student. Give identified students a schedule that offers additional resources within the classroom. Continue to use i-Ready diagnostics and benchmarks assessments to tailor instruction.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

To ensure students in the lowest quartile receive the instructional support necessary to attain the required learning gains in ELA as outlined in this Area of Focus.

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.

Identify students that need additional support in small group and provide targeted small group support based on a standard.

Person Responsible: Kristin Mikarts (kristin.mikarts@sarasotacountyschools.net)

By When: 1st semester of 23-24 school year.

Provide 1-1 after or before school tutoring for students based on progress monitoring class data.

Person Responsible: Kristin Mikarts (kristin.mikarts@sarasotacountyschools.net)

By When: 1st semester of 23-24 school year.

ELA teachers receive and implement professional development on instructional strategies.

Person Responsible: Chuck Woods (charles.woods@sarasotacountyschools.net)

By When: 1st semester 23-24 school year.

Tier 2 Support: The administrative team and selected teachers will be meeting with identified students during the i-Ready period to implement Tier II interventions twice a week. The team will meet with eight small groups of students (between 4 to 6) to provide more intense instruction in an identified area of need. Provide small group instruction to include:

- a. i-Ready Toolbox lessons in the ELA domain
- b. Progress monitoring data by i-Ready standards mastery
- c. Document outcomes and evaluate outcomes and progress and complete Tier II for SWST referral if the student is not responding to the intervention based on data.

Person Responsible: Tomas Dinverno (tomas.dinverno@sarasotacountyschools.net)

By When: 1st semester 23-24 school year.

English Language Arts and Mathematics classes will use benchmark assessments to monitor student performance on standards based instruction. Standards mastery reports will be reviewed in PLC and with Leadership Team to identify areas of strength and areas for improvement for students demonstrating knowledge on standards. Reteaching and small group instruction on specific standards will be used to reinforce learning and support students striving to reach level of peers.

Person Responsible: Kristin Mikarts (kristin.mikarts@sarasotacountyschools.net)

By When: 1st/2nd semester 23-24 school year.

#3. 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.

A review of the state assessment data from Every Student Succeeds Act indicate that performance levels for ESSA students in core areas is below the federal index of 41%. The ESSA data shows a need to improve the level of performance, therefore a focus area for the school is in increasing student learning gains.

Measurable Outcome:

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

By 2024, there will be a 6% increase in students demonstrating a learning gain in the lowest quartile in math, as compared to 2023 data, with specific focus on students with disabilities as identified in Every Student Succeed Acts. This will be measured by an increase in scale score growth from the 1st progress monitoring in the fall of Florida Assessment of Student Thinking to the 3rd progress monitoring of F.A.S.T. in the spring from 67% to 73% as compared to prior year data.

Monitoring:

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

The area of focus will be monitored both at the classroom and school level including disaggregation of students with disabilities, general education students, and students as defined in Every Student Succeed Act. Student progress on F.A.S.T., i-Ready and classroom performance on assessments will be used to identify growth for each student as well as provide additional supports.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Chuck Woods (charles.woods@sarasotacountyschools.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.)

Evidence based strategy includes the best practice of Co-Teach in English Language Arts classrooms.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

This strategy has been identified by the Best Practices with Inclusion Education process implemented by both the district and school to support learners in the general education setting that have individual education plans.

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.

Mathematics classes will use benchmark assessments to monitor student performance on standards based instruction. Standards mastery reports will be reviewed in PLC and with Leadership Team to identify areas of strength and areas for improvement for students demonstrating knowledge on standards.

Reteaching and small group instruction on specific standards will be used to reinforce learning and support students striving to reach level of peers.

Person Responsible: Chuck Woods (charles.woods@sarasotacountyschools.net)

By When: 1st Semester 23-24 school year.

Instructional Staff and Leadership team to analyze data from i-Ready Standards Mastery to then utilize data to drive instructional decisions around student need based on performance on grade level standards. Along with focus area of classroom discussion, instructional staff to work with students on i-Ready data chats with the lower quarter and ESSA students to ensure there is clarity related to current placement with instructional lessons and progress toward i-Ready typical and stretch goals.

Person Responsible: Chuck Woods (charles.woods@sarasotacountyschools.net)

By When: AP1 - AP2 of i-Ready, 1st/2nd semester of 23-24 school year.

Tier 1 Instructional Model: Students scheduled in Math Co-Teach class where the student to teacher ratio is 22 to 2, and one of the teachers is a certified ESE teacher. This instruction philosophy is also identified by the state of Florida as best practice when providing differentiated instruction and varying tiers of support related to the MTSS/RTI process.

Person Responsible: Chuck Woods (charles.woods@sarasotacountyschools.net)

By When: Beginning of school 23-24.

#4. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math**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.

To ensure students in the lowest quartile receive the instructional support necessary to attain the required learning gains in Mathematics as outlined in this Area of Focus. This rationale also places efficiencies on Students with Disabilities as identified by our Every Student Success Act (ESSA) data which makes up the school's Targeted Support & Improvement students (ATS&I) .

Measurable Outcome:

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

By 2024, there will be a 6% increase in students demonstrating proficiency from prior year to current year in Mathematics 6th-8th grade as demonstrated on the F.A.S.T Progress Monitoring 3 assessment from 63% to 69%.

Monitoring:

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

The area of focus will be monitored by instructional and leadership staff in professional learning communities, department/curricular team meetings, and reported out to staff and stakeholders.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Chuck Woods (charles.woods@sarasotacountyschools.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.)

Venice Middle School will utilize the MTSS/RTI process as the researched/ evidence-based instruction strategy to better support the identified students related to this the area of focus as well as the school's TS&I students. As part of this focus we will establish a baseline of achievement for each student in reading using the i-Ready educational software. This platform will allow Administration and Teachers to assess every student and establish baseline data, including areas of need, provide instructional feedback, and the ability to progress monitor every student in both this area of focus and the school's ATS&I students. This data and instructional information will then be the bases for determining the instructional strategy applied based on the three-tiered framework that uses increasingly more intense instruction and interventions matched to need.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Venice Middle School's rationale for using the MTSS/RTI process is to better align the school's instructional strategies to the Best Practices referenced by the FLDOE. The Response to Intervention (RtI) has been described in Florida as a multi-tiered system of supports (MTSS) for providing high quality instruction and intervention matched to student needs using learning rate over time and level of performance to inform instructional decisions.

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.

Math Instructional Staff monitor Alerts, Minutes, Pass rates for i-Ready data and specifically in Math recommend students for math acceleration based on student performance on i-Ready diagnostic, standards mastery, and FSA performance.

Person Responsible: Chuck Woods (charles.woods@sarasotacountyschools.net)

By When: Ongoing during 23-24 school year.

Tier 2 Support: Students who are experiencing academic difficulties can be referred to the School Wide Support Team (SWST). The SWST team meets weekly and can assist teachers when making decisions on how to best support our students academically, behaviorally, socially, and emotionally.

Person Responsible: Amber Singer (amber.singer@sarasotacountyschools.net)

By When: Weekly reviews at SWST during 23-24 school year.

Review of student schedules and performance data to identify areas to accelerate students based on achievement in preparation for following course in curriculum. Utilize the math flowchart for middle school and articulate with high school to identify pathways for students to take upper level coursework in English Language Arts and Mathematics, including A.P., AICE, and I.B. programs.

Person Responsible: Chuck Woods (charles.woods@sarasotacountyschools.net)

By When: By spring scheduling of 2024.

#5. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

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

The Venice Middle School rationale for this area of focus is to ensure students in Science classes at all grade levels are receiving the instructional support necessary to attain the required Science achievement as outlined in this area of focus.

Measurable Outcome:

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

By 2024, there will be a 6% increase in students demonstrating proficiency in Science compared to prior year data from 59% to 65%.

Monitoring:

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

The area of focus will be monitored in weekly professional learning communities by instructional and leadership staff. Data review will include sharing with VMS stakeholders.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Erin Rice (erin.rice@sarasotacountyschools.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.)

Leadership Team, along with Science Department Teachers and Support Staff, will analyze the 2022-23 Science Benchmark Assessment Data along with 2022-23 NSSA information and complete gap analysis. Students performing lower than peers in specific standards will be provided remediation and reteaching in specific areas.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Using the tier 2 and tier 3 educational support for students, research based on Florida RTI and MTSS (multi-tiered systems of support) provides evidence based strategies for instruction with 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.

Utilize PLCs to review and discuss the MTSS/RTI Problem Solving Process.. Our curriculum leaders will facilitate the process with a focus on the 8th grade standards as all levels work to prepare our students to be successful on the Science Assessment.

Person Responsible: Elizabeth Walters (elizabeth.walters@sarasotacountyschools.net)

By When: Weekly during 23-24 school year.

Additional support for aligned lesson development using district resources on MYSCS and PENDA. These lesson will align to state standards and look to emphasize classroom discussions and inquiry based learning.

Person Responsible: Elizabeth Walters (elizabeth.walters@sarasotacountyschools.net)

By When: 1st/2nd semester leading up to May 2024 assessment window.

The creation of a Science "Boot Camp" in the spring to provide an additional layer of support for those students who can benefit from additional targeted instruction. Science standards and skills will be instructed using PENDA as well as teacher created materials. The camp will utilize certified science teachers that are/have been participating in the action plan outlined here to ensure consistency within this focus area.

Person Responsible: Elizabeth Walters (elizabeth.walters@sarasotacountyschools.net)

By When: Spring 2024.

Draft of list of possible students looking at 5th grade FSA scores and teacher assessments and recommendations – that are only a few points from the 3 (one or two questions away). Give all 8th graders a pre-test using test spec questions in November to identify material misconceptions and any additional students that might be on the bubble. Target in class those students identified in the bubble and give extra attention when reviewing – small group pullout.

Person Responsible: Elizabeth Walters (elizabeth.walters@sarasotacountyschools.net)

By When: 1st semester 23-24.

#6. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Social Studies

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

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

The Venice Middle School rationale for this area of focus is to ensure students in Social Studies classes at all grade levels are receiving the instructional support necessary to attain the required Social Studies achievement as outlined in this area of focus.

Measurable Outcome:

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

By 2024, there will be a 4% increase in students demonstrating proficiency in Civics compared to prior year data from 82% to 86% proficiency.

Monitoring:

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

Social Studies district benchmark data will be utilized to compare longitudinal data at school as well as provide comparison data to district and other middle schools. Student grades in Social Studies 6th-8th grade courses will be monitored at mid and end of quarter to identify students in need of tiered intervention.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Chuck Woods (charles.woods@sarasotacountyschools.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.)

Instructional strategies and best practices are aligned to learning intention and success criteria and effect size research along with Research Based Teaching's instructional models and philosophies. The school is continuing to infuse these philosophies, specifically classroom discussions in Social Studies, working with our curriculum leaders and providing ongoing PD so that all teachers are utilizing best practices aligned to Hattie's and Sapphire's work.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The effect size of instructional practice of classroom discussion in social studies is researched at a level above a years growth for student achievement. Therefore, implementation of this researched based practice will support students in their application of knowledge of the standards.

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.

Schedule on-going professional development with our district curriculum specialist. The related PDs will focus on the standards being assessed on district benchmarks and lesson development centered around those standards. Teachers will use the formative, summative, and district Benchmark assessments to

track and ensure students are achieving mastery learning in the core area. Using this data as needed along with the MTSS/RTI Problem solving process to reevaluate instructional strategies and provide feedback and support as instruction moves into the more intensive levels of the Tiered process.

Person Responsible: Chuck Woods (charles.woods@sarasotacountyschools.net)

By When: 1st and 2nd semester 23-24 school year.

United States History teacher will support our Civics teacher by providing the lowest quartile data to our Civics teachers from his or her Final Exam from the previous year. Civics teacher will give a Pre/Post Test for Civics at the beginning of the year and near the end of the year to gauge academic growth. Collaborate with our Social Studies Director to identify areas of weakness in our Unit Assessment data year-to-year. Work closely with 7th grade to correlate the standards and benchmarks that specifically pertain to civics curriculum. Utilize Social Studies program specialist to pinpoint benchmark data to better help us remediate lowest quartile and learning gaps.

Person Responsible: Chuck Woods (charles.woods@sarasotacountyschools.net)

By When: 1st semester 23-24.

The creation of a Civics "Boot Camp" in the spring to provide an additional layer of support for those students who can benefit from additional targeted instruction. Science standards and skills will be instructed using IXL as well as teacher created materials. The camp will utilize certified science teachers that are/have been participating in the action plan outlined here to ensure consistency within this focus area.

Person Responsible: Chuck Woods (charles.woods@sarasotacountyschools.net)

By When: Spring 2024.

#7. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Early Warning System**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

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

Suspension Rate Reduction Strategies: To be proactive and educate students related to expectation and behaviors so as to reduce the number of students receiving 2 or more referrals.

Measurable Outcome:

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

By 2024, there will be a 6% reduction of out of school incidents in comparison to the previous year from 62 incidents to 58 incidents.

Monitoring:

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

Data will be shared with staff at monthly meetings to report out progress toward the outcome. Biweekly district data reports will be cross checked with internal reporting systems at the school to monitor students that have received suspensions based on a breach of the student code of conduct.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Erin Rice (erin.rice@sarasotacountyschools.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.)

Positive Behavior Intervention and Support (PBIS), which encompasses a range of research-based strategies used to increase the quality of life and decrease problem behavior by teaching new skills and making changes in a person's environment" At Venice Middle School we have implemented three layers of PBI Supports.

A. CHAMPS

B. The Hero rewards program

C. Civility Squad (monthly character traits for Student of the Month)

MTSS/RTI process to better align the schools behavioral strategies to the Best Practices referenced by the FLDOE. Collaborating with the School Wide Support Team (SWST) to provide attendance interventions that better support students and provide intervention to meet this focus goal.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Venice Middle School's rationale for using the two strategies outlined above is to better align the schools behavioral strategies to the Best Practices referenced by the FLDOE related to the MTSS/RTI Process and PBIS to build awareness of behavior expectations throughout the school day whether in class, in common areas, in hall ways, in café, etc. to ensure we are creating a culture of respect, responsibility, and trust.

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.

HERO Rewards program where students are rewarded by teachers, administrators, and staff with Charger Ca\$h in their HERO account to be redeemed for rewards and incentives.

Person Responsible: Erin Rice (erin.rice@sarasotacountyschools.net)

By When: Ongoing and monthly review during 23-24 school year.

Chart and track discipline data, put plans in place for students with repeated referrals and/ or Notice of Concerns (NOCs). Data is shared at staff meeting so teachers are aware of number of referrals and NOCs at each grade level and any trends. All referrals can be viewed on the school SharePoint Tracking System. 2. PLC and School Wide Support Team (SWST) will identify priority social and behavioral strategies. School psychologist and social worker referral when appropriate. Behavior Specialist to work with and provide teacher with Behavior Intervention Plans (BIPs) and support for students requiring Tier 3 interventions.

Person Responsible: Erin Rice (erin.rice@sarasotacountyschools.net)

By When: Monthly during 23-24 school year.

Parent conferences/communications to learn what does/does not work for students at home or in past educational situations. Behavior contracts written for students for use with specific teachers. These contracts are developed in a meeting with student, teacher, parent/guardian and behavior specialist.

Person Responsible: Erin Rice (erin.rice@sarasotacountyschools.net)

By When: 1st/2nd semester 23-24 school year.

Establish Tier 2 Positive Behavior group meetings to include leadership team, school guidance counselors, ESE Liaison and Behavior Specialist to review tiered interventions for behavior support.

Person Responsible: Erin Rice (erin.rice@sarasotacountyschools.net)

By When: Monthly review 23-24 school year.

Individual, small group, and assembly behavior programs to include bullying, school rules/ procedures, dress code, emotional control.

Person Responsible: Erin Rice (erin.rice@sarasotacountyschools.net)

By When: Beginning of year 23-24.

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).

District annual training on School Improvement has been completed for the 2023-24 school year including a review of applicable funding sources for School Improvement. School Advisory Councils review specific requests made at the school site related to projects aligned to SIP goals. These funding requests are included in SIP minutes that are then reported to the district for review.

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.

Not applicable

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))

Not applicable

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)

Not applicable

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))

Not applicable

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))

Not applicable

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))

Not applicable

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).

Not applicable

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))

Not applicable

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))

Not applicable

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: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities | \$0.00 |
| 2 | III.B. | Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA | \$0.00 |
| 3 | III.B. | Area of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities | \$0.00 |
| 4 | III.B. | Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math | \$0.00 |
| 5 | III.B. | Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Science | \$0.00 |
| 6 | III.B. | Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Social Studies | \$0.00 |
| 7 | III.B. | Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Early Warning System | \$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.
 No