

Seminole County Public Schools

# Indian Trails Middle School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

---

**Table of Contents**

---

<b>SIP Authority and Purpose</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>I. School Information</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>II. Needs Assessment/Data Review</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>III. Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review</b>	<b>22</b>
<b>V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>VI. Title I Requirements</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus</b>	<b>0</b>

## Indian Trails Middle School

415 TUSKAWILLA RD, Winter Springs, FL 32708

<http://www.scps.k12.fl.us/schools/schoolinfopage.cfm?schoolnumber=0711>

### 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.**

The mission of the Indian Trails Middle School Community is to provide all students a safe, supportive environment where academic excellence is encouraged, individual strengths and talents are fostered, and respect for the rights of others prevail.

#### **Provide the school's vision statement.**

The Indian Trails Middle School staff will create a positive, student centered learning environment, where all students are expected to reach their potential both in the classroom and in the community. To accomplish this, we believe in cultivating strong relationships between all students and staff through collaboration, active engagement and mutual accountability.

### 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
Elkharchafi, Patrica	Principal	Assistant Principals/Deans/ Reading/Bookkeeper/Executive Secretary Operations of the School Obtain & Evaluate Data Within Your Departments Staffing/Personnel Standards Based Initiatives School Budget/Flex Funds 5 Essentials/SIP Pre-Plan & Closing Activities CIT SAC/PTSA Meetings/Community Relations Winter Springs Cluster ITMS Teacher Handbook Rotary Parent Newsletters Fundraisers Social Media Field Trips
Barnes, Jaime	Assistant Principal	Guidance/Science/Electives/Inst. Coach/AIP/Beh. Int./FTE Master Schedule Curriculum Guide/Registration Induction Program Covid Safety Manager (CSM Lead) Clinic lead/Injury Report lead/Tdap/Workman Comp MTSS lead Liaison Maps Lead Bell/Lunch Schedules 5 Essentials/Snapshot lead Honor Roll Attendance Schedule Pick-Up/1st Week Procedures Co-Lead Title IX Social Media/Website Updates Lead
Robinson, Kathleen	Assistant Principal	ELA/ESE/ESOL/Electives/Paraprofessionals/iSeries/Spanish/Robotics/ Virtual lab ESE Lead Oversee IEP's, EP's, Gifted, and 504's Compliance SST Administrator/ESE Articulation Coordinator CSM Back-Up, Clinic Back-Up/Injury Report Back-Up/ Workman Comp Back-Up High School Transition/Summer School Contact PTSA School Tours 6th Grade Night Intern Coordinator Dividends/Business Partners/Community Relations Social Media/Website Updates Backup

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Pagnotti, John	Assistant Principal	Social Studies/Math/IT/School Safety Guard/Custodians Testing Discipline back-up Technology Inventory/School Inventory Textbooks/School Libib Inventory Transportation Back-up Supervision Schedule Back-Up/Maps Back-Up Yearbook Evaluation Open House Schedule Pick-Up/1st Week Procedures Co-Lead SAC SIP Lead Facilities back-up
Turner, Grace	Dean	Supervise before, during and after school/School Discipline/Discipline Committee/Journeys Reentry Supervision Schedule Dress code/After school detention/Saturday School Transportation Liaison Bully Contact & Hope Scholarship: A-L/Red Ribbon Week Mentor Coordinator/Restorative Practices School Safety/Fire Drills/CRD/CYD/Em. Mgmt./Raptor School Pictures/IDs Student/Staff Recognition PBS/MTSS (A-L)/SPARK Lessons w/ PBS team Teach-In/Veteran's Day 5 Star Notebook/Golden School
Carrigan, Heather	Dean	Supervise before, during and after school School Discipline/Discipline Committee/Journeys Reentry Teacher of the Year/Employee of the Year First Day of School Set-Up/Plan(Both Semesters) Facilities Liaison School Safety/Fire Drills/CRD/CYD, etc... Back-up Bully Contact & Hope Scholarship:M-Z Mentor Coordinator/Restorative Practices PBS/MTSS (M-Z)/SPARK Lessons w/ PBS team Wellness Champion Bell/Lunch Schedules-Ensure compliance w/ contract Back-up Sports/Clubs Coordinator Workplace Giving Campaign Coordinator (Foundation)



**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.

We used the 2022-2023 Snapshot survey results to help guide the plan. The Snapshot survey was accessed through Qualtrics and was available to all stakeholders including parents/guardians, staff, students and community members. We utilized data from our 5Essential Survey which compiled information from teachers and students.

**SIP Monitoring**

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

Our SIP will be continuously monitored for effective implementation as part of our weekly leadership team meetings and during our teacher led PLC time each week. Tweaks will be made to our plan after progress monitoring events after PM1 & 2 administrations and CBA's.

**Demographic Data**

Only ESSA identification and school grade history updated 3/11/2024

<b>2023-24 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Middle School 6-8
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2022-23 Title I School Status</b>	No
<b>2022-23 Minority Rate</b>	42%
<b>2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b>	47%
<b>Charter School</b>	No
<b>RAISE School</b>	No
<b>ESSA Identification</b> *updated as of 3/11/2024	ATSI
<b>Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)</b>	No
<b>2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (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)
<b>School Grades History</b> *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: B

	2019-20: A
	2018-19: A
	2017-18: B
<b>School Improvement Rating History</b>	
<b>DJJ Accountability Rating History</b>	

### 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	48	62	56	166	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	43	23	86	
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	26	4	33	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	7	1	13	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	50	92	88	230	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	63	77	72	212	
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		

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	46	83	71	200	

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	10	18	0	28	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	3	

### 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	6	9	5	20	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	12	27	42	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	20	11	35	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	44	62	90	196	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	63	94	70	227	
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		

**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	4	36	25	65

**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	17	21	13	51
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	6	9	5	20	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	12	27	42	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	20	11	35	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	44	62	90	196	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	63	94	70	227	
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		

**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	4	36	25	65

**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	17	21	13	51
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*	57	54	49	61	59	50	61		
ELA Learning Gains				45			49		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				27			28		
Math Achievement*	58	61	56	61	37	36	61		
Math Learning Gains				54			38		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				45			29		
Science Achievement*	55	56	49	66	62	53	53		
Social Studies Achievement*	75	72	68	76	62	58	77		
Middle School Acceleration	73	76	73	81	51	49	69		
Graduation Rate					59	49			
College and Career Acceleration					76	70			
ELP Progress	79	50	40	61	80	76	67		

\* 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	397
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	58
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	577
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	98
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	32	Yes	2	
ELL	56			
AMI				
ASN	90			
BLK	40	Yes	1	
HSP	57			
MUL	62			
PAC				
WHT	68			

**2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY**

<b>ESSA Subgroup</b>	<b>Federal Percent of Points Index</b>	<b>Subgroup Below 41%</b>	<b>Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%</b>	<b>Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%</b>
FRL	56			

**2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY**

<b>ESSA Subgroup</b>	<b>Federal Percent of Points Index</b>	<b>Subgroup Below 41%</b>	<b>Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%</b>	<b>Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%</b>
SWD	38	Yes	1	
ELL	50			
AMI				
ASN	81			
BLK	46			
HSP	55			
MUL	55			
PAC				
WHT	59			
FRL	48			

**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**

<b>Subgroups</b>	<b>ELA Ach.</b>	<b>ELA LG</b>	<b>ELA LG L25%</b>	<b>Math Ach.</b>	<b>Math LG</b>	<b>Math LG L25%</b>	<b>Sci Ach.</b>	<b>SS Ach.</b>	<b>MS Accel.</b>	<b>Grad Rate 2021-22</b>	<b>C &amp; C Accel 2021-22</b>	<b>ELP Progress</b>
All Students	57			58			55	75	73			79
SWD	29			32			20	46			4	
ELL	44			39			50	69			5	79
AMI												
ASN	81			94			83	92	100		5	
BLK	35			30			28	67			4	
HSP	50			48			45	69	62		6	70
MUL	56			58			35	88	71		5	

## 2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS

Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2021-22	C & C Accel 2021-22	ELP Progress
PAC												
WHT	62			64			63	78	75		5	
FRL	44			44			40	66	62		6	77

## 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	61	45	27	61	54	45	66	76	81			61
SWD	29	39	27	30	45	40	29	38	67			
ELL	38	45	52	44	58	52	29	70				61
AMI												
ASN	68	71		90	76		75	100	88			
BLK	42	40	26	37	55	48	55	46	65			
HSP	56	44	33	53	50	44	61	65	82			65
MUL	52	51	15	58	54		56	80	73			
PAC												
WHT	66	44	21	66	54	44	70	82	81			
FRL	46	36	25	46	48	39	50	63	71			56

## 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	61	49	28	61	38	29	53	77	69			67
SWD	25	31	16	30	30	27	17	39	41			
ELL	49	53	47	43	49	33	29	46	36			67
AMI												
ASN	76	79		77	54		64	69	92			
BLK	42	45	20	40	32	27	42	68	71			
HSP	52	45	34	51	32	27	35	76	54			63
MUL	59	50	9	64	48	36	69	67	85			
PAC												
WHT	66	49	26	66	40	29	63	81	72			
FRL	46	43	28	44	30	24	36	64	49			65

**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	56%	53%	3%	47%	9%
08	2023 - Spring	53%	50%	3%	47%	6%
06	2023 - Spring	54%	52%	2%	47%	7%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	52%	66%	-14%	54%	-2%
07	2023 - Spring	65%	67%	-2%	48%	17%
08	2023 - Spring	30%	31%	-1%	55%	-25%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	54%	55%	-1%	44%	10%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	78%	54%	24%	50%	28%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	91%	53%	38%	48%	43%



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	75%	71%	4%	66%	9%

### III. Planning for Improvement

#### Data Analysis/Reflection

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

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

Our SWD subgroups need the most support to show improvement. ELA shows the greatest disparity, specifically 6th and 8th grade.

There was a significant gap in proficiency performance in ELA and Math between SWD and their peers on FAST PM3. An emphasis on provided differentiated instruction and targeted interventions to reach all learners will be the priority.

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

Our Students with Disabilities showed the greatest achievement gap. Specifically in 8th Grade ELA where SWD showed 4% proficiency while there non SWD peers showed proficiency at 58% after PM3.

**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.**

Algebra and Geometry show a slight gap gap when compared to the state average. Contributing factors in emphasis on reducing access barriers to high school credited math courses by placing all on grade level students in Algebra 1 in 8th grade.

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

Civics students showed the most improvement on assessments as they performed at 75% proficiency on the EOC, where as less the 35% of 7th graders showed proficiency in Civics Standards mid year based on CBA's. 7th Grade Math and 6th Grade ELA was a relative area of strength.

Strategic and Targeted interventions in small groups and stations were prioritized. We utilized FEV tutoring in core content classes, implemented targeted intervention groups during our school intervention blocks and provided for tutorials for students before and after school.

**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.**

Our SWD are our priority.

**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:**

Patrica Elkharchafi (patricia\_elkharchafi@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 all students to be proficient in reading and math based on their grade level. Additionally, we want all students in the lowest quartile to show 1 year of academic growth in ELA and Math.

How will we know if they learn it?

The FAST Progress Monitoring Assessments (PM1-3), Common Benchmark Assessments (CBA), Write Score and STAR Assessments will drive data chats in PLCs throughout the year. Teachers will also check for understanding using formal and informal methods at frequent intervals (daily/weekly). Examples of such methods are exit tickets at the end of a unit, assignments that allow students to demonstrate mastery of understanding and formal unit exams.

How will we respond when some students do not learn?

Lowest Quartile Student Data from Progress Monitoring and Common Benchmark Assessments will be analyzed in ELA and Math 3 times a year. Those students will receive targeted interventions based upon identified areas of weakness during our scheduled Tiered Intervention/Enrichment Block and via stations in the classroom during the class period. Interventions will be put in place and monitored as part of data driven PLC discussion.

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

Data from PM 1-3 and CBA will be reviewed during the PLC process for ESE students in the lowest quartile.

### Teachers

What do we want all teachers to do?

We want all teachers to use data and leverage students relationships to truly know where students have gaps and plan meaningful differentiated instruction to close those gaps.

How will we know if teachers are accomplishing this?

We will know if teachers are accomplishing through the PLC process where the focus is on student data and through the SST/MTSS process.

How will school leaders respond when teachers need support?

School leaders will respond with increased involvement in PLC discussions focusing on targeted students, providing coaching assistance through our instructional coach and working with district instructional support staff to identify resources and lesson planning assistance to teachers.

How will we extend professional learning for teachers?

By allowing all teachers to facilitate and lead PLC discussions focused on students data.

**Person Responsible:** Patrica Elkharchafi (patricia\_elkharchafi@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:**

Patrica Elkharchafi (patricia\_elkharchafi@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.

Ensure every student has a trusted adult that they feel comfortable with. Members of the leadership team will work to ensure that they are being seen in classrooms on a regular basis. Restorative Practice will be rolled out with fidelity during preplanning and also with follow-up PDs throughout the year, which have already been scheduled.

We will hold weekly PLC meetings with teachers in each content area.

We will meet in PLC teams where we focus on data and ways for intervention and extension if needed. 5

Essentials domain of student-teacher trust data has been shared. As part of our 3 big focus PD areas (Relationship Building, Engaging Teaching and Learning, and Teaching of Mastery), these areas will be reviewed and planned for.

**Person Responsible:** Patrica Elkharchafi (patricia\_elkharchafi@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).