

Seminole County Public Schools

Rock Lake 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

Rock Lake Middle School

250 SLADE DR, Longwood, FL 32750

<http://www.scps.k12.fl.us/schools/schoolinfopage.cfm?schoolnumber=0621>

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 Rock Lake Middle School is to prepare all students to become productive citizens, future leaders and lifelong learners by inspiring and empowering them to become problem solvers and innovative thinkers to excel in society.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Rock Lake Middle School will provide a safe, equitable and supportive learning environment for all students. We acknowledge all students' intellectual, personal, social, physical, and creative needs. RLMS encourages cooperative involvement from all stakeholders to provide a positive learning experience through rigorous learning opportunities rich in technology. We strive to celebrate diversity with high expectations for all students.

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
Dunlop, Martin	Principal	Oversee day to day operations and monitor a variety of organizational tasks to determine overall efficiency, safety, and function in the school setting.
Wysong, Nicole	Assistant Principal	Principal's designee, supervise and evaluate teachers and paraprofessionals, IEP and 504 compliance, SIP, Transition, Title IX Coordinator, school safety team, schedule, student supervision and discipline, substitutes
Hogan, Beau	Assistant Principal	Supervise and evaluate teachers, master schedule, ESOL compliance, student supervision and discipline, textbooks, supervise custodians, facilities, school events calendar, clubs, school safety team, SAC liaison
Sowpel, Erica	Assistant Principal	Supervise and evaluate teachers, testing, professional development, field trips, student supervision and discipline, interns and observers

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.

Administration meets with parents during SAC meetings and PTO meetings. Administration meets with parents during SAC meetings, and PTO meetings. In addition, the administration invites parents to discuss concerns regarding parent surveys and maintains open communication for feedback. Parents are invited to share feedback through parent surveys and administration maintains open communication with parents, receiving frequent feedback.

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))

Departments will work through Professional Learning Communities (PLCs) to review state academic standards and the district instructional plan. PLCs will revisit the instructional plan weekly and bi-weekly as they plan lessons. PLCs will review student data for quarter assessments and unit assessments to determine student needs regarding standards mastery.

ESE teachers will monitor student progress and provide additional support to students as needed. The student study team will case review students not making progress.

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	40%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	35%
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	38	35	33	106	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	5	9	
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	15	26	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	3	3	11	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	36	67	52	155	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	39	35	27	101	
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	34	43	43	120

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	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

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

Indicator	Grade Level										Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	10	17	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	7	16	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	9	12	23	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	32	29	54	115	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	43	27	32	102	
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	8	7	15	30

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	5	24	39	
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	3	4	10	17	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	7	16	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	9	12	23	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	32	29	54	115	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	43	27	32	102	
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	8	7	15	30

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	5	24	39	
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	66	59	50	64		
ELA Learning Gains				54			56		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				43			35		
Math Achievement*	77	61	56	76	37	36	73		
Math Learning Gains				71			57		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				62			34		
Science Achievement*	65	56	49	62	62	53	62		
Social Studies Achievement*	75	72	68	74	62	58	73		
Middle School Acceleration	78	76	73	73	51	49	73		
Graduation Rate					59	49			
College and Career Acceleration					76	70			
ELP Progress	43	50	40	68	80	76	74		

** 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	67
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	401
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	65
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	649
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	35	Yes	4	
ELL	44			
AMI				
ASN	82			
BLK	71			
HSP	59			
MUL	81			
PAC				
WHT	75			

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%
FRL	55			

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY

ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	37	Yes	3	
ELL	50			
AMI				
ASN	67			
BLK	58			
HSP	57			
MUL	61			
PAC				
WHT	69			
FRL	55			

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			77			65	75	78			43
SWD	24			46			24	43	39		5	
ELL	37			68			30	42			5	43
AMI												
ASN	68			94			75	90	83		5	
BLK	60			67			73	65	92		5	
HSP	55			67			51	67	67		6	44
MUL	70			78			82	75	100		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	66			81			69	79	78		5	
FRL	49			67			50	60	63		6	40

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	66	54	43	76	71	62	62	74	73			68
SWD	20	37	42	33	53	50	22	29	47			
ELL	40	49	39	56	66	59	35	40				68
AMI												
ASN	64	55		78	57		31	92	92			
BLK	57	51		65	71	45	37	87	50			
HSP	55	49	41	66	68	60	45	58	67			59
MUL	58	44	50	67	65	70	52	82	64			
PAC												
WHT	71	58	45	82	73	66	73	78	75			
FRL	49	48	40	63	65	57	45	57	60			67

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS

Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20	ELP Progress
All Students	64	56	35	73	57	34	62	73	73			74
SWD	19	30	30	29	29	20	21	35	36			
ELL	33	52	53	54	57	47		33				74
AMI												
ASN	70	67		83	75		85	64	88			
BLK	52	44	24	58	30	20	39	47	80			
HSP	54	54	40	63	52	36	55	64	65			76
MUL	71	46		61	52	60		75				
PAC												
WHT	68	58	34	78	61	31	67	78	73			
FRL	49	46	32	59	45	31	47	59	61			76

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	58%	53%	5%	47%	11%
08	2023 - Spring	62%	50%	12%	47%	15%
06	2023 - Spring	61%	52%	9%	47%	14%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	71%	66%	5%	54%	17%
07	2023 - Spring	79%	67%	12%	48%	31%
08	2023 - Spring	62%	31%	31%	55%	7%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	64%	55%	9%	44%	20%

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	100%	53%	47%	48%	52%

CIVICS						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	74%	71%	3%	66%	8%

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 7th grade ELA scores were lowest for RLMS. These are current 8th grade students. Our focus needs to be on 8th grade standard classes.

7th grade ELA had challenges in terms of employee stability and PLC collegiality. 7th grade also had the most discipline struggles.

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

Students with Disabilities

Students struggle to adapt to middle school's rigor while also facing social emotional challenges. Sixth and seventh-grade students struggle more, while eighth-graders are more successful as they have learned to overcome academic barriers and cope with adolescent challenges.

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?

Math and science showed the most growth.

Personnel changes occurred for this school year. Teacher PLCs were stronger, and more teachers withing PLCs looked at data more frequently.

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. Students with Disabilities
2. ELL Students

3. Civics

4. ELA

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:

Martin Dunlop (martin_dunlop@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?

Achieve a proficient score on reading and math assessments.

How will we know if they learn it?

We will monitor student data through PLCs using classroom assessments and quarter exams.

How will we respond when some students do not learn?

PLCs will adjust instruction based on the student data. This data will be used to determine what lessons need to be retaught and which students need additional support. We will look at the students' current tiers and determine whether additional supports are needed.

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

Students with Disabilities and ELL students will increase proficiency.

Teachers

What do we want all teachers to do?

Departments will work through Professional Learning Communities (PLCs) to review state academic standards and the district instructional plan. PLCs will revisit the instructional plan weekly and bi-weekly as they plan lessons. PLCs will review student data to determine student needs in regards to standards mastery.

How will we know if teachers are accomplishing this?

Administrators will monitor PLC meetings to ensure dialogue on student data and progress. Administrators will meet with individual teachers to discuss data.

How will school leaders respond when teachers need support?

Teachers will be referred to supports, such as team leaders, the instructional coach, and district support personnel.

How will we extend professional learning for teachers?

Teaching and Learning content TOAs will be invited to some PLC meetings and to provide professional development and support as needed.

Person Responsible: Martin Dunlop (martin_dunlop@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:

Martin Dunlop (martin_dunlop@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.

Minimizing the student perception that student behavior interferes with learning
New teachers will receive support during new employee training on classroom management. All teachers will have access to training by the school psychologist and social worker on working with students in general, working with students with behavior plans, and working with students with social/ emotional needs.

Teachers will increase their Collective Responsibility (strong sense of responsibility for student

development, school improvement, and professional growth) for the 2023-2024 school year.

As part of the Department/ PLC norm setting process, teachers will set forth expectations for themselves to work collaboratively and with students.

Person Responsible: Martin Dunlop (martin_dunlop@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).