South Seminole Middle School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

South Seminole Middle School

101 S WINTER PARK DR, Casselberry, FL 32707

http://www.scps.k12.fl.us/schools/schoolinfopage.cfm?schoolnumber=0201

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 South Seminole Academy is to empower all students to lead, find their voice and inspire others to find theirs. This is achieved through a commitment to academic excellence, providing opportunities to embrace cultural diversity and developing student leadership within a global society.

Provide the school's vision statement.

South Seminole Academy's vision is to provide an exceptional educational experience that promotes student achievement, and empowers students to demonstrate leadership skills through active engagement in current world issues.

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
Coleman , Mia	Principal	Standards Based Initiatives Collaborative Improvement Team Faculty Handbook Mag. Fac/Deans/APs/Guid. DPPs FTE, Bookkeeper, Guidance Sec Evals
Reid, Clifphene		Science Social Studies Leadership: L4L, EL, LS, JROTC Electives: Art, TV Production, Robotics Magnet Facilitation Liaison PTA/ Business Partners Community Relations: Rotary/Forum LEAD21 Newsletter Team Intern Coordination/Field Experience DPP Lead AP Sci/SS Quarterly Benchmark Assessment Statewide Science Assessment SS Instructional Coach
Hernandez-Craig, Nicole	Assistant Principal	Language Arts/ESOL Reading Foreign Language: World Languages, Spanish 1 Electives: Legal Studies, iSeries AIP/MTSS/PBIS Restorative Practices Trainer Master Schedule Team PLT/Professional Development Lead AP Tools 4 Seminole Schools Contact Summer School/ Transition ELA Quarterly Benchmark Assessment ACCESS for ELLs Literacy Instructional Coach
Cora, Wendy	Assistant Principal	Math ESE ESE Paraprofessionals Numeracy Electives: Band, Chorus, Dance, PE SEL Lead AP SAC/School Improvement Plan TOY/EOY Student Awards Program Schedule Pickup/Open House 5Essentials Math Quarterly Benchmark Assessments/STAR FSAA State Assessment
Bryant, Michael	Dean	Discipline 7th Grade; 8th Grade M-Z Discipline-Bullying accusations

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		Discipline Committee MTSS - Behavior School Safety and Security / Fire Drills Transportation Liaison Middle School Sports Coordinator Behavior Coach Academy Special Olympics Initiative-Coordinator Restorative Practices Team
Filmore, Earl	Dean	Discipline 6th Grade; 8th Grade A-L Discipline- Bullying accusations Discipline Committee MTSS - Behavior Anti-Bullying / Upstanders Program Academic Intervention Program Field Trips Behavior Coach Academy JROTC liaison (Program Rebuild)
Maffuz, Janice	Administrative Support	Testing Coordinator Facilities/ EOY Procedures Sonitrol Non-ESE Parapro/ Safety Guard/Custodial Substitutes Dividends/Raptor Sign in Health Services & Clinic Master Calendar Fundraisers/Lifetouch Pictures Supervision Schedule

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.

Our families, parents, and students are surveyed each year through The Snapshot Survey. These responses are taken into consideration when developing a new plan for campus events. All school events are advertised through SSA social media platforms, School Messenger, and SSA News where families, parents, and students can communicate their concerns or additions. We also communicate these plans through our Lead 21 weekly newsletter, Title 1 Corner (located in our newsletter), Skyward blast, and handouts. Parents are invited and encouraged to become active members of the School Advisory Council (SAC). Training is open to all participants in the school improvement process. Parents are invited to provide input in the development of all plans related to school improvement. Minutes are recorded during these SAC meetings. During SAC, PTSA, and Title 1 annual meetings, parents and other stakeholders are given detailed information on how funds are being expended. Feedback is taken into consideration and reviewed to revise and adjust as needed.

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 during Leadership Team meetings monthly to ensure fidelity to the action plans within. Should our data indicate our school is coming up short on any of our goals, the Leadership Team will discuss strategies for improvement. These will be revised by Dr. Cora – Assistant Principal, as needed.

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	Yes
2022-23 Minority Rate	68%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	74%
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: 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	76	53	42	171
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	31	41	29	101
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	39	22	79
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	15	25	44
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	83	112	79	274
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	116	75	36	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	

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	90	92	66	248

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	30	35	0	65
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	0	9

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	38	27	33	98
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	9	1	23
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	25	38	83
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	74	74	59	207
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	96	64	58	218
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	23	40	26	89

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	48	22	106
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	38	27	33	98
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	9	1	23
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	25	38	83
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	74	74	59	207
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	96	64	58	218
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	23	40	26	89

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	48	22	106
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*	42	54	49	53	59	50	52		
ELA Learning Gains				53			49		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				47			36		
Math Achievement*	49	61	56	56	37	36	55		
Math Learning Gains				64			42		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				58			29		
Science Achievement*	42	56	49	48	62	53	43		
Social Studies Achievement*	70	72	68	74	62	58	65		
Middle School Acceleration	68	76	73	84	51	49	77		
Graduation Rate					59	49			
College and Career Acceleration					76	70			
ELP Progress	53	50	40	57	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)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	54
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	324
Total Components for the Federal Index	6

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
Percent Tested	97
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	59
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	594
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	30	Yes	4	1
ELL	34	Yes	1	
AMI				
ASN	74			
BLK	45			
HSP	50			
MUL	45			
PAC				
WHT	63			
FRL	47			

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	39	Yes	3	
ELL	43			
AMI				
ASN	76			
BLK	49			
HSP	57			
MUL	53			
PAC				
WHT	66			
FRL	54			

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	42			49			42	70	68			53
SWD	16			27			19	38			5	50
ELL	20			32			12	53			5	53
AMI												
ASN	60			87							2	
BLK	30			38			31	55	71		5	
HSP	40			43			36	72	52		6	55
MUL	49			54			31				3	
PAC												
WHT	49			58			56	74	79		5	
FRL	35			42			34	65	57		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	53	53	47	56	64	58	48	74	84			57
SWD	24	38	38	24	55	54	27	36				54
ELL	21	40	44	31	63	67	23	42				57
AMI												
ASN	65	69		88	81							
BLK	34	39	41	36	55	52	32	68	88			
HSP	51	53	44	53	66	66	41	68	78			53
MUL	56	58		50	56		43	57				
PAC												
WHT	62	57	55	68	65	53	63	86	89			
FRL	45	51	44	48	60	55	41	67	77			54

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	52	49	36	55	42	29	43	65	77			53
SWD	20	31	25	22	31	26	14	33				46
ELL	29	54	48	28	34	34	15	48	70			53
AMI												
ASN	69	65		81	61		67	91	93			
BLK	41	43	30	38	36	23	26	51	71			
HSP	47	50	37	50	40	33	33	60	67			51
MUL	45	33		49	28	31	57	38	85			
PAC												
WHT	61	51	39	66	46	27	55	77	82			
FRL	44	44	32	48	39	29	34	60	74			54

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	40%	53%	-13%	47%	-7%
08	2023 - Spring	36%	50%	-14%	47%	-11%
06	2023 - Spring	38%	52%	-14%	47%	-9%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	39%	66%	-27%	54%	-15%
07	2023 - Spring	58%	67%	-9%	48%	10%
08	2023 - Spring	23%	31%	-8%	55%	-32%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	72%	54%	18%	50%	22%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	90%	53%	37%	48%	42%

CIVICS						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	67%	71%	-4%	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.

Analyzing the data, we noticed that while proficiency is low across the board, our students are losing proficiency at a faster rate than other schools. We need to improve reaching proficiency as well as include a focus on learning gains to improve our data.

In reflection, rigor was not implemented as expected. We notice teachers taught at a lower level of rigor (mostly recall) especially when they had Standard AND Advanced coursed in their teaching assignments. A pivot away from Station Rotations (as a means to fully differentiate instruction) and an increase in Direct Instruction was also noticed. Student behavior and teacher retention had a big impact on our scores overall. Test fatigue was mentioned and noticed among students and teachers.

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

Grade 8 ELA showed the greatest decline from 2022 to 2023. With 53% of our students demonstrating proficiency in 2022 to 36% of our students demonstrating proficiency in 2023 – that is a decrease of 17%. In reflection, rigor was not implemented as expected. We notice teachers taught at a lower level of rigor (mostly recall) especially when they had Standard AND Advanced coursed in their teaching assignments. A pivot away from Station Rotations (as a means to fully differentiate instruction) and an increase in Direct Instruction was also noticed. Student behavior and teacher retention had a big impact on our scores overall. Test fatigue was mentioned and noticed among students and teachers.

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.

6th grade ELA had the greatest gap when compared to the state average. Contributing factors include low performance of subgroup students.

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

South Seminole Academy showed an increase in 7th grade math scores of 4% from 21/22 to 22/23.

Consistency was a contributing factor in this area. In other areas, students schedules were disrupted due to two teachers leaving.

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.

• Increase student proficiency in ELA
• Increase student proficiency in Math
• Students demonstrate learning gains in ELA
• Students demonstrate learning gains in Math
• Teachers work collectively with the Leadership Team to demonstrate Collective Responsibility.

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:
Mia Coleman (mia_coleman@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?
Students who are in the lowest quartile will demonstrate Learning Gains or Proficiency as determined by individual assessments.

How will we know if they learn it?
Teachers and instructional coaches will utilize data from iReady, Write Score, STAR, Skills Aligned gradebook, and District Benchmark Assessments to determine if students have met growth/proficiency goals.

How will we respond when some students do not learn?
For students who did not learn, remedial efforts including Elevate period (focused on target skills), intensive reading (including iReady practice), and intensive math (incuding DreamBox) will be provided.

What evidence/data will there be to reflect monitoring for this strategy/action?
Teachers and instructional coaches will utilize data tracking in a shared spreadsheet to monitor for this action.

Teachers
What do we want all teachers to do?
We want all teachers to be committed to our students and their learning. We want all teachers to know the subjects they teach and how to teach those subjects to students. Teachers are responsible for managing and monitoring student learning. We want all teachers to work systematically within their practice, work to improve their craft, and learn from theirs and others' experiences through Professional Learning Communities.

How will we know if teachers are accomplishing this?
We will know if teachers are accomplishing this by conducting classroom walkthroughs, formal and informal observations, Assistant Principal presence at PLC Meetings, and cumulative overall performance.

How will school leaders respond when teachers need support?
In response to teachers in need of support, Assistant Principals will act as instructional leaders providing goal oriented, actionable, tangible, and timely feedback. Instructional coaches will be ever present providing assistance with classroom management, academics, and instructional planning.

How will we extend professional learning for teachers?
To extend professional learning for teachers, we will continue to familiarize teachers with BEST benchmarks and district curriculum as well as how to differentiate instruction to meet the needs of all students and subgroups.

Person Responsible: Mia Coleman (mia_coleman@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:

Mia Coleman (mia_coleman@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.

Focusing on Campus Safety
All students will be introduced to emergency procedures regarding campus safety twice per year by classroom teachers through our school-wide Leadership Jumpstart curriculum. These procedures include, but are not limited to, Fire Drill and Code Red drills. The procedures will be introduced during the first week of school and revisited at the start of the second semester.

Focusing on Collective Responsibility

Based on a comparison to the benchmark, South Seminole Academy's mScore of 17 means that the school is very weak in Collective responsibility - this score feel from 25 (weak) in the 2022 school year. Teachers report that other teachers in the school: Help maintain discipline in the entire school, not just their classroom (43% some), Take responsibility for improving the school (41% some), Feel responsible when students in this school fail (46% some). Our aim is to improve campus relationships, and teacher morale to drive Collective Responsibility. We will survey teachers to provide an opportunity to receive specific feedback for each of the measures of concern related to Collective Responsibility. Responses will be discussed during leadership team meetings in order to focus on providing support.

Person Responsible: Mia Coleman (mia_coleman@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).

Title I Requirements

Schoolwide Program Plan (SWP) Requirements

This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A SWP and opts to use the SIP to satisfy the requirements of the SWP plan, as outlined in the ESSA, Public Law No. 114-95, § 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

Provide the methods for dissemination of this SIP, UniSIG budget and SWP to stakeholders (e.g., students, families, school staff and leadership and local businesses and organizations). Please articulate a plan or protocol for how this SIP and progress will be shared and disseminated and to the extent practicable, provided in a language a parent can understand. (ESSA 1114(b)(4))
List the school's webpage* where the SIP is made publicly available.

Our families, parents, and students are surveyed each year through The Snapshot Survey. These responses are taken into consideration when developing a new plan for campus events. All school events are advertised through SSA social media platforms, School Messenger, and SSA News where families, parents, and students can communicate their concerns or additions. We also communicate these plans through our Lead 21 weekly newsletter, Title 1 Corner (located in our newsletter), Skyward blast, and handouts. Parents are invited and encouraged to become active members of the School Advisory Council (SAC). Training is open to all participants in the school improvement process. Parents are invited to provide input in the development of all plans related to school improvement. Minutes are recorded during these SAC meetings. During SAC, PTSA, and Title 1 annual meetings, parents and

other stakeholders are given detailed information on how funds are being expended. Feedback is taken into consideration and reviewed to revise and adjust as needed.

https://sim.scps.k12.fl.us/school/info/0201

Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission, support the needs of students and keep parents informed of their child's progress.
List the school's webpage* where the school's Family Engagement Plan is made publicly available. (ESSA 1116(b-g))

eachers and administrators use multiple strategies to communicate with families, including but not limited to:
1) contacting families prior to the start of school to welcome students to the new school year.
2) inviting parents to Open House and Curriculum Nights to meet teachers and school staff and to learn about the curriculum and how to support their child academically at home
3) mail quarterly newsletter to parents and post on SSA website. The newsletter includes school activities and parenting tips related to school achievement such as homework tips, organizational skills, and study skills
4) use multiple genres of social networking to families on a regular basis (e.g. School Messenger, Skyward, Twitter, Facebook, eCampus) to encourage open communication

https://ssms.scps.k12.fl.us/

Describe how the school plans to strengthen the academic program in the school, increase the amount and quality of learning time and help provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum. Include the Area of Focus if addressed in Part III of the SIP. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)ii))

2023 data shows that high support will be needed for the upcoming school year to help students and staff adjust to the BEST Standards and FAST testing. Strategies that will need to be implemented in the upcoming school year in order to strengthen the academic program in the school, increase the amount and quality of learning time, and help provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum include: greater focus on ensuring teachers are thoroughly teaching the Benchmark in all subject areas, return to station rotations to increase differentiation, introduce Data Chats and assist students with making goals - include Benchmark Track Sheets and look at Benchmarks of non-mastery and focus remediation, focus on targeted skills in ELEVATE, continue purposeful tutorial and Boost Camps, encourage and monitor use of FEV tutoring, rigorous Coaching Cycles between our Instructional Coaches and teachers of need, request support from District Level Teachers on Assignment. We noticed 7th graders out-performed ELA in Civics - Civics teachers can model strategies to teachers through PLCs and classroom visits. Finally, encourage teacher retention to provide the consistency and relationships our students need to excel!

If appropriate and applicable, describe how this plan is developed in coordination and integration with other Federal, State, and local services, resources and programs, such as programs supported under ESSA, violence prevention programs, nutrition programs, housing programs, Head Start programs, adult education programs, career and technical education programs, and schools implementing CSI or TSI activities under section 1111(d). (ESSA 1114(b)(5))

During the planning phase of Title I school-wide plans, which typically begins late February or early March for the upcoming school year, leadership from the Department of Teaching and Learning (Title II, Part A), ESOL World Languages and Student Access (Title III, Part A), Families in Need (Title IX, Part A), Student Support Services (IDEA), Student Assignment and Program Access (magnet programs), Alternative Program (Title I, Part D), and Early Learning (Pre-K/VPK) are invited to participate in collaborative planning sessions. At these collaborative planning sessions, school leadership teams begin

developing their Title I, Part A plans for the upcoming school year, with support and guidance from these various district-level grant and/or program managers. For instance, the Director of ESOL/World Languages and Student Access would share with Title I school leadership teams relevant updates to those programs for the upcoming school year, which may lead them to leverage their Title I, Part A funds to supplement such initiatives.