

Seminole County Public Schools

Markham Woods Middle School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

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

Markham Woods Middle School

6003 MARKHAM WOODS RD, Lake Mary, FL 32746

<http://www.scps.k12.fl.us/schools/schoolinfopage.cfm?schoolnumber=0731>

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.

Markham Woods Middle School staff must support a wide variety of student backgrounds, needs and obstacles. We meet that challenge through a highly skilled and dedicated staff with a team mentality and a care for every student.

Provide the school's vision statement.

To increase the achievement of all students in a safe and supportive learning environment—through a culture of excellence, collaboration, and continuous improvement—with the explicit intent of closing the achievement gap.

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
McDonald, Jason	Principal	Operations of the School, School Improvement Plan, School Budget, Instructional Rounds, Professional Development, Human Resources, Literacy Plan, Behavior Coaching Academy
Basilo, Eric	Assistant Principal	Mathematics, Biomechatronics, Arts, i-Series, Spanish, Master Schedule, School Improvement Plan, Literacy Plan, Curriculum Leaders, Title IX, Professional Development, Certification, Marketing
Bradley, Yvonne	Assistant Principal	ELA, Reading, ESE, ESOL, School Improvement Plan, Literacy Plan, SAC, Behavior Coaching Academy
Barberino, Peter	Assistant Principal	Science, Social Studies, PE, Custodial, Facilities, School Improvement Plan, Literacy Plan, Testing, PBIS
Garret, Mallory	Dean	Discipline, Supervision Schedule, School Improvement Plan, Literacy Plan, NEST Lead, AIP, Restorative Practices Lead, Mentor Coordinator, PBIS, Conditions for Learning, Behavior Coaching Academy
Brown, Allisyn	Dean	Discipline, Supervision Schedule, School Improvement Plan, Literacy Plan, ESSER, Tutorial, Emergency Response Team Coordinator, Bullying/HOPE, MTSS, Mental Health, Behavior Coaching Academy
Rogers, Hollie	Instructional Coach	Professional Development, Literacy Plan, iReady, Reading Placements, Write Score, Media Center, Behavior Coaching Academy

Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Development

Describe the process for involving stakeholders (including the school leadership team, teachers and school staff, parents, students (mandatory for secondary schools) and families, and business or community leaders) and how their input was used in the SIP development process. (ESSA 1114(b)(2))

Note: If a School Advisory Council is used to fulfill these requirements, it must include all required stakeholders.

School Leaders work in partnership with the School Advisory Committee, PTSA, community surveys, and parent snapshot surveys to identify strengths and areas of growth and build relevant action plans and steps in support of the school.

SIP Monitoring

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

The SIP will be reviewed by the Literacy Team after progress monitoring assessments and data will be disaggregated by subgroups. Feedback from Literacy Team members will be elicited to understand why some groups are not making progress and what steps we can take to address deficiencies.

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	61%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	52%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	TSI
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: B 2019-20: B 2018-19: B 2017-18: B
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	71	47	54	172
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	30	31	30	91
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	22	12	9	43
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	25	13	16	54
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	80	71	74	225
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	117	46	42	205
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	107	57	60	224

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	36	17	0	53
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	3	0	14

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	0
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	19	29	17	65
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	19	8	43
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	22	28	35	85
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	65	65	48	178
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	101	79	41	221
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

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	40	34	26	100

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	46	46	15	107
Students retained two or more times	0	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	0
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	19	29	17	65
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	19	8	43
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	22	28	35	85
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	65	65	48	178
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	101	79	41	221
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

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	40	34	26	100

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	46	46	15	107
Students retained two or more times	0	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*	53	54	49	55	59	50	61		
ELA Learning Gains				49			57		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				38			35		
Math Achievement*	63	61	56	63	37	36	63		
Math Learning Gains				66			57		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				55			33		
Science Achievement*	57	56	49	59	62	53	58		
Social Studies Achievement*	67	72	68	73	62	58	68		
Middle School Acceleration	85	76	73	87	51	49	81		
Graduation Rate					59	49			
College and Career Acceleration					76	70			
ELP Progress	56	50	40	65	80	76	53		

* 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)	TSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	64
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	381
Total Components for the Federal Index	6
Percent Tested	98
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	61

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	610
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	97
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	23	Yes	4	3
ELL	42			
AMI				
ASN	88			
BLK	40	Yes	1	
HSP	56			
MUL	65			
PAC				
WHT	79			
FRL	49			

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	25	Yes	3	2
ELL	51			
AMI				
ASN	81			
BLK	44			
HSP	61			

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
MUL	61			
PAC				
WHT	67			
FRL	53			

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	53			63			57	67	85			56
SWD	19			27			10	36			4	
ELL	29			41			23	62			5	56
AMI												
ASN	64			88				100	100		4	
BLK	33			32			30	40	67		5	
HSP	41			54			46	55	80		6	57
MUL	63			70			46	79			4	
PAC												
WHT	68			81			78	81	88		5	
FRL	34			43			40	46	78		6	50

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	55	49	38	63	66	55	59	73	87			65
SWD	15	29	24	20	42	37	12	24				
ELL	33	55	59	47	71	65	24	40				65
AMI												
ASN	78	62		85	81		86		91			

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21	ELP Progress
BLK	29	39	30	33	53	46	22	56	88			
HSP	50	48	47	56	64	65	55	68	85			67
MUL	51	50		65	71	60	73	55				
PAC												
WHT	66	51	42	76	70	57	68	83	86			
FRL	40	45	39	45	58	52	43	58	82			63

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	57	35	63	57	33	58	68	81			53
SWD	8	26	25	15	31	27	4	26				
ELL	37	53	55	38	40	30	20	29				53
AMI												
ASN	84	81		88	75		94	96	100			
BLK	34	41	29	31	36	27	38	33	61			
HSP	52	59	45	50	47	37	39	56	60			56
MUL	65	47		63	41		69		92			
PAC												
WHT	72	61	33	77	68	40	68	83	87			
FRL	42	49	35	41	40	31	38	42	68			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	49%	53%	-4%	47%	2%
08	2023 - Spring	50%	50%	0%	47%	3%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	46%	52%	-6%	47%	-1%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	55%	66%	-11%	54%	1%
07	2023 - Spring	67%	67%	0%	48%	19%
08	2023 - Spring	27%	31%	-4%	55%	-28%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	56%	55%	1%	44%	12%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	95%	54%	41%	50%	45%

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	65%	71%	-6%	66%	-1%

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.

ELA proficiency showed the greatest decline from last year due to teachers learning new standards and standards not being taught at the correct complexity level.

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

ELA proficiency showed the greatest decline from last year due to teachers learning new standards and standards not being taught at the correct complexity level.

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.

Civics EOC scores were one point below the state average. Contributing factors include the low performance of students with disabilities.

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

Acceleration showed the most improvement. Students who achieved a level 3 on the 21-22 FSA Math assessments, were placed in either Algebra or Geometry. PLCs met weekly to discuss how teachers knew which students had mastered particular benchmarks and what interventions teachers were going to put into place for the students who did not master benchmarks. Before school tutorial was provided and selected students were required to attend prior to the end of year assessments.

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. Increase rigorous instruction in all classes
2. Students will write about the content in each class daily
3. Increase ELA proficiency scores
4. Decrease the achievement gap between White students and traditionally underserved minority students (Black and Hispanic)
5. Intensive Reading teachers will monitor student progress on iReady with more fidelity and will use that to guide individualized instruction

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:

Jason McDonald (jason_mcdonald@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?

The BEST standards in ELA and Mathematics, the Next Generation Sunshine State Standards in Science and Civics, CPALMS standards for electives, and Florida Department of Education Career and Technical Education Curriculum Frameworks.

How will we know if they learn it?

Use of common formative assessments developed by the PLC and other types of formative assessments such as checking student bell work, having students use response cards to a prompt, and managing responses rates.

How will we respond when some students do not learn?

We will provide systematic Tier 2 and Tier 3 interventions in class and before/after school tutorial by student and by standard and require students to attend. Support facilitators will push into classes and pull students with disabilities out to focus on specific standards with individual students or in small groups with students who all struggle with the same standard. Level 1 students will receive a Tier 3 intervention and will be placed in an Intensive Reading course.

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

FAST progress monitoring results, common formative assessments, and summative assessments broken down by demographic subgroups (e.g., SWD, race, FRL, etc.)

Teachers

What do we want all teachers to do?

Be able to understand the "what" and the "why" behind Professional Learning Communities (PLC) and the three big ideas that drive the work: a focus on learning, a collaborative culture and collective responsibility, and a results orientation.

How will we know if teachers are accomplishing this?

Teachers will submit PLC agendas to their administrator and will be able to use a common language regarding the PLC process. Teachers will be able to talk about which specific students are struggling with particular standards and have a plan to address.

How will school leaders respond when teachers need support?

Assistant Principals (AP) will attend PLC meetings to answer questions and explain the "why" behind the process. APs will help teachers locate the standards they are expected to teach and model how to create effective common formative assessments.

How will we extend professional learning for teachers?

Teachers will be offered opportunities to attend a Solution Tree conference on effective PLC practices.

Person Responsible: Jason McDonald (jason_mcdonald@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:

Jason McDonald (jason_mcdonald@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.

Markham Woods staff will focus on increasing collective responsibility by sharing a strong sense of responsibility for student development, school improvement, Along with maintaining discipline in their classrooms, teachers will also maintain discipline in the entire school, will take responsibility for improving the school, will take on more ownership to help their fellow teachers succeed, feel responsible that all students learn, feel responsible for helping students manage themselves by developing self-control, and will feel responsible when students fail.

Markham Woods staff will focus on increasing academic personalism where they will connect with more of their students in the classroom and support them in achieving their academic goals.

Teachers will know which students are behind academically and have a plan to catch students up, will provide extra help and guidance on school work, will notice which students are having trouble with specific standards, gives timely and specific feedback to students on how they can improve their work, and explain concepts in a different manner with various critical input experiences if students do not understand.

Person Responsible: Jason McDonald (jason_mcdonald@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).