
Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	10
III. Planning for Improvement	15
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	20
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	0
VI. Title I Requirements	0
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

Chiles Middle School

1240 SANCTUARY DR, Oviedo, FL 32766

<http://www.scps.k12.fl.us/schools/schoolinfopage.cfm?schoolnumber=0721>

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Seminole County School Board on 10/24/2023.

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.

Lawton Chiles Middle School, a collaborative environment embracing diversity and supporting the local community, focuses on developing students to be productive lifelong learners able to compete on a global scale through self-directed learning, critical thinking, creative expressions, and inquiry based study.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Lawton Chiles Middle School will provide a 21st century, high quality education experience for all students. Instruction will be diverse, differentiated, and enriched to ensure growth, knowledge, and success for all.

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
Laudani, Melissa	Principal	Community Relations, Instructional Model, Curriculum, Human Resources, School Finance, Leadership Development
McDonald, Lauren	Assistant Principal	Math, Electives, CTE, Testing Administrator, School/Staff Recognition, PTSA and Fundraising, Title IX, PBIS Administrator, Mentoring Program
Richardson, Dana	Assistant Principal	Science, Social Studies, School Counselors, Master Schedule, IS Advisory, Advanced Opportunity, Articulation, Virtual School, SIP, and SAC
Taylor, Jonathan	Assistant Principal	Reading, Language Arts, Electives, Exceptional Student Education; Program of Emphasis, MTSS, Professional Development, Gradebook and Technology, Business Partners and Dividends, New Teacher Induction
Bridges, Tricia	Administrative Support	Discipline, HOPE, Wellness Wednesdays, PBIS, Transportation, Tutorial Program
Velazquez-Rivera, Johanna	Administrative Support	Discipline, Testing Coordinator, Facilities and Maintenance, Emergency Management, Extracurricular Activities

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 administrative team collaborated with the School Advisory Counsel to review the 5 Essential Survey and SIP from the previous year. Feedback was provided by all stakeholders, including teachers, parents, and community leaders to develop the plan.

SIP Monitoring

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

SIP will be reviewed with teachers during pre-plan and our first SAC meeting and receive feedback; Each administrator will monitor the action steps for their department as it relates to the ESSA findings; data analysis meeting with administrator and teachers using BMA and FAST assessments ; and any updates will be reviewed with SAC for approval

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	35%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	28%
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	45	48	76	169
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	35	38	78
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	24	29
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	7	16	27
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	45	68	87	200
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	59	53	56	168
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

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	42	47	77	166

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

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

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

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	15	16	42
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	10	8	21
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	17	27	52
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	29	49	61	139
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	49	49	45	143
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	10	15	15	40

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	7	15	20	42
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	15	16	42
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	10	8	21
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	17	27	52
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	29	49	61	139
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	49	49	45	143
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	10	15	15	40

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	7	15	20	42
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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*	63	54	49	69	59	50	69		
ELA Learning Gains				57			56		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				39			34		
Math Achievement*	71	61	56	73	37	36	70		
Math Learning Gains				68			50		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				53			36		
Science Achievement*	62	56	49	68	62	53	68		
Social Studies Achievement*	80	72	68	84	62	58	77		
Middle School Acceleration	89	76	73	86	51	49	77		
Graduation Rate					59	49			
College and Career Acceleration					76	70			
ELP Progress	30	50	40	90	80	76	60		

* 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	66
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	395
Total Components for the Federal Index	6
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

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	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	687
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	96
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	35	Yes	2	
ELL	37	Yes	1	
AMI				
ASN	94			
BLK	56			
HSP	65			
MUL	61			
PAC				

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%
WHT	75			
FRL	58			

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	35	Yes	1	
ELL	61			
AMI				
ASN	90			
BLK	66			
HSP	67			
MUL	67			
PAC				
WHT	65			
FRL	58			

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	63			71			62	80	89			30
SWD	21			31			22	30	71		5	
ELL	39			53			25				4	30
AMI												
ASN	86			94			100	97	95		5	
BLK	53			47			53		69		4	
HSP	55			65			43	77	84		5	

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2021-22	C & C Accel 2021-22	ELP Progress
MUL	73			67			25	83	55		5	
PAC												
WHT	62			72			68	79	92		5	
FRL	46			54			47	63	79		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	69	57	39	73	68	53	68	84	86			90
SWD	18	28	23	28	48	43	18	45	62			
ELL	56	49	54	56	62	50		67				90
AMI												
ASN	89	71		97	87		91	100	97			
BLK	55	65		60	76	75	40	88				
HSP	70	62	46	69	67	58	70	83	80			
MUL	67	54	50	73	66	55	64	80	91			
PAC												
WHT	68	55	37	73	66	49	67	82	86			
FRL	54	51	36	58	62	56	55	70	76			

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	69	56	34	70	50	36	68	77	77			60
SWD	20	33	24	27	34	30	33	35	57			
ELL	53	67	47	47	44	39	40	71				60
AMI												
ASN	87	76		88	64		86	96	88			
BLK	71	58	45	54	36	31	54	50	83			
HSP	64	56	27	66	47	36	66	72	77			
MUL	69	63	60	69	46		67		79			
PAC												
WHT	69	55	34	71	51	36	68	78	75			

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
FRL	53	48	35	55	41	35	60	58	68			

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	62%	53%	9%	47%	15%
08	2023 - Spring	58%	50%	8%	47%	11%
06	2023 - Spring	61%	52%	9%	47%	14%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	58%	66%	-8%	54%	4%
07	2023 - Spring	77%	67%	10%	48%	29%
08	2023 - Spring	37%	31%	6%	55%	-18%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	61%	55%	6%	44%	17%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	91%	54%	37%	50%	41%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	97%	53%	44%	48%	49%

BIOLOGY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	*	68%	*	63%	*

CIVICS						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	78%	71%	7%	66%	12%

III. Planning for Improvement

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

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

The greatest need for improvement would be to decrease the achievement gap for each subgroup in Language Arts, Math, Algebra, and Geometry.

The contributing factors to this needs for improvement are academic personalism, peer support for academic work, student-teacher trust, and safety. The new actions taken to address the need for improvement are instructional plan; conditions for learning; PBIS; RP circles; teaching strategies; BMA data analysis for intervention and enrichment; MTSS interventions, RP conferences; 1:1 intervention; and Behavior intervention plan.

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

Students with disabilities / factors that contributed to the decline are: academic personalism, peer support for academic work, student-teacher trust, and safety

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

All data components are above the state average.

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

Based on progress monitoring and the 2023 state assessments, the most improvement was Language Arts.

Some contributing factors to this improvement was the use of appropriate collaborative strategies and active listening skills when engaging in discussion in a variety of situations. Also, students will use academic and content-specific vocabulary when speaking and writing.

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

Student attendance and on-grade level performance in ELA and Math

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

1) Safety 2) Student-teacher trust 3) academic personalism 4) peer support for academic work

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.

Increasing academic achievement of students with disabilities. ESSA Federal Percent of Points Index indicates this is a high priority need and focusing on the success of these students will reduce achievement gaps and prepare these students for future academic success.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Increase achievement and learning gains for students with disabilities.

Monitoring:

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

This area of focus will be monitored through classroom walk throughs, review of progress monitoring data and through data chats with professional learning communities.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Melissa Laudani (melissa_laudani@scps.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 following evidence-based interventions are available to middle schools to help them support students based upon the area of need of the individual student: CAR-PD, iReady, Lexia, Corrective Reading, and Reading Mastery.

The following evidence-based interventions are available to middle schools to help them support students based upon the area of need of the individual student: iReady, DreamBox, Seminole Numeracy Project.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

A variety of interventions are available to the schools to allow them to meet the needs of individual students. This allows all the areas of reading to be addressed from foundations to comprehension across the K-12 continuum.

All of the listed interventions have been approved by Just Read, Florida through the vetting process for the K-12 Comprehensive Evidence- Based Reading Plan.

Math- All the listed interventions have research-based evidence for efficacy.

Standards based lessons differentiated to meet the needs of these specific student groups and data driven deliberate action planning will improve achievement and learning gains for our students. This strategy is aligned to having high expectations for all learners and teachers.

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.

Students

What do we want all students to do?

We want our students to know and be able to do is to demonstrate their thinking and understanding of the content by encouraging student work to be at the center of the lesson. Students will engage in cooperative learning to enhance group processing, individual accountability, positive independence, and social skills.

How will we know if they learn it?

Administrators and teachers will be able to analyze data using BMA and FAST assessment to progress monitor all students. In the classroom, teachers will have data chats with students to monitor their academic learning and levels of understanding the content.

How will we respond when some students do not learn?

Plan and differentiate the lesson using resources from the framework and revisit the topics in upcoming lessons.

What evidence/data will there be to reflect monitoring for this strategy/action?

Administrators participate in the PLC/COL meetings and professional development training for teachers; data chats with the admin team; instructional support coach and new teacher facilitator; effective instructional feedback to teachers by completing admin walks in the classroom.

Teachers

What do we want all teachers to do?

Teachers should be able to explain how content aligns with course benchmarks, using specific strategies and probing questions to promote critical thinking, and monitor the use of specific strategies.

How will we know if teachers are accomplishing this?

Administrators participate in the PLC/COL meetings and professional development training for teachers; data chats with the admin team; instructional support coach and new teacher facilitator; effective instructional feedback to teachers by completing admin walks in the classroom.

How will school leaders respond when teachers need support?

Administrators and the literacy coach will provide opportunities for professional growth using peer observation, instructional support, and professional development trainings.

How will we extend professional learning for teachers?

Administrators will provide effective instructional feedback to teachers by completing admin walks in the classroom.

Person Responsible: Melissa Laudani (melissa_laudani@scps.k12.fl.us)

By When: Ongoing throughout the school year`

#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.

Students succeed when conditions for learning are optimized. A focus on campus safety, development of a culture where student voice and belonging are valued and sharing collective responsibility for the success of all students in the school increase student achievement.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Increase 5 Essentials Survey and SCPS Safety Survey results indicating a high degree of trust, collective responsibility and academic personalism.

Monitoring:

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

Conditions for Learning monitoring will occur during classroom walk through, PLC meetings, attendance and discipline data reviews.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Melissa Laudani (melissa_laudani@scps.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 Multi-Tiered Support System (MTSS) process is a team-based approach that relies on a strong collaboration between families and professionals from a variety of disciplines regardless of the level implemented. MTSS provides a positive and effective means to support student learning, attendance and behavior.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

MTSS methods are research-based and proven to positively impact school climate and increase academic performance.

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.

Our school will have a positive school culture and climate. Increase the percent of students who have a trusted adult by 15% on our campus.

1:1 intervention with administration, mentorship program, and behavioral intervention plan

Increase the score on student-teacher relationships and academic personalism on 5 Essentials by 25% BMA data analysis for intervention and enrichment; MTSS, and RP conferences

Person Responsible: Melissa Laudani (melissa_laudani@scps.k12.fl.us)

By When: Ongoing throughout the school year

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)).

In collaboration with the Assistant Superintendent, school leaders identify and align resources to meet the needs of all students and maximize desired student outcomes. Evaluation of student achievement data and related early warning factors such as attendance and discipline referrals are at the core of this work. Principals review data with the school leadership team, staff, and other relevant stakeholders, then develop or modify goals and strategies to align with the school needs presented. These goals and strategies are then operationalized through action items within the annual School Improvement Plan. These specific interventions or activities are noted within the SIP, and funding resources are assigned (i.e., Title I, Part A, UniSIG).