

Manatee County Public Schools

Rowlett Middle Academy School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	9
III. Planning for Improvement	14
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

Rowlett Middle Academy

400 30TH AVE W, Bradenton, FL 34205

www.rowlettmiddleacademy.org

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 Rowlett Academy K-8 is to provide a high-quality educational experience for all students that will foster leadership and a love of learning for a diverse population by promoting creativity through arts and communication.

Provide the school's vision statement.

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
Clark, Jamara	Principal	
Ericsson, Shelbi	Assistant Principal	
Dean, Rebecca	Assistant Principal	
Rousan, Lindsey	School Counselor	
Wyar, Joanne	School Counselor	

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.

- Weekly MTSS Team meetings
- Monthly Leadership Team meetings
- Monthly Staff meetings
- Three annual SAC meetings
- Six annual Board meetings
- Three annual Student Council Voice Sessions with Admin

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))

Rowlett Middle Academy's SIP will be monitored by the MTSS Team on a weekly basis. The team will review data pertaining to our goals and modify our school's interventions along the way. Instructional Staff will meet with the Leadership Team monthly to discuss our goals, progress, challenges, and the interventions put in place to determine if modifications need to be made within the classroom.

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	43%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	40%
Charter School	Yes
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) 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: 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	0	27	35	62	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	34	34	44	112	
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	3	9	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	4	11	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	31	38	22	91	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	36	25	8	69	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	31	38	22	91	

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	14	35	14	63

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
Absent 10% or more school days		
One or more suspensions		
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)		
Course failure in Math		
Level 1 on statewide FSA ELA assessment		
Level 1 on statewide FSA Math assessment		
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.		

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Students with two or more indicators		

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Retained Students: Current Year		
Students retained two or more times		

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 school days	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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	0	0	0	

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	

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*	68	47	49	70	49	50	72		
ELA Learning Gains				56			60		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				36			40		
Math Achievement*	68	61	56	72	35	36	68		
Math Learning Gains				62			42		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				49			31		
Science Achievement*	68	48	49	73	57	53	61		
Social Studies Achievement*	92	70	68	91	54	58	83		
Middle School Acceleration	71	81	73	74	47	49	72		
Graduation Rate					47	49			
College and Career Acceleration					76	70			
ELP Progress	42	34	40	59	79	76	47		

* 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	68
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	409
Total Components for the Federal Index	6
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	64

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	642
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	99
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	38	Yes	2	
ELL	39	Yes	1	
AMI				
ASN	90			
BLK	59			
HSP	62			
MUL	72			
PAC				
WHT	79			
FRL	60			

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	32	Yes	1	
ELL	45			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	57			
HSP	53			

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	59			
PAC				
WHT	71			
FRL	56			

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	68			68			68	92	71			42
SWD	26			29			25	70			5	40
ELL	28			34			19	70			5	42
AMI												
ASN	90			90							2	
BLK	47			47			52	86	63		5	
HSP	62			57			54	88	64		6	44
MUL	68			66			69	83			4	
PAC												
WHT	73			75			74	95	76		5	
FRL	57			54			55	86	59		6	46

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	70	56	36	72	62	49	73	91	74			59
SWD	26	22	23	23	34	23	35	50				55
ELL	32	47	43	31	50	37	31	75				59
AMI												
ASN												

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	62	65	40	58	57	48	44	81				
HSP	55	49	32	59	58	37	52	84	50			58
MUL	68	59	18	65	65		55	82				
PAC												
WHT	77	56	42	78	64	59	88	96	83			
FRL	57	51	31	58	59	48	57	83	56			62

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	72	60	40	68	42	31	61	83	72			47
SWD	28	47	39	33	39	27	23	43				
ELL	36	45	38	38	28	27	17	50				47
AMI												
ASN	100	60		100	20							
BLK	62	57	32	58	37	24	60	73				
HSP	57	57	45	53	31	28	48	71	61			46
MUL	72	56		73	49		69	85				
PAC												
WHT	78	61	40	74	48	35	64	88	72			
FRL	60	54	41	54	38	31	55	76	58			48

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	70%	43%	27%	47%	23%
08	2023 - Spring	68%	45%	23%	47%	21%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	62%	45%	17%	47%	15%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	68%	59%	9%	54%	14%
07	2023 - Spring	78%	58%	20%	48%	30%
08	2023 - Spring	37%	41%	-4%	55%	-18%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	67%	45%	22%	44%	23%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	82%	58%	24%	50%	32%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	100%	56%	44%	48%	52%

CIVICS						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	91%	69%	22%	66%	25%

III. Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis/Reflection

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

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

Our Students with Disabilities subgroup was our lowest performing subgroup at 32% on the Federal Index based on the 21-22 FSA. This was a slight decline from 35% based on the 20-21 FSA. The team feels that a change in our student population was the main contributing factor to this decline. Our SWD population increased from 60 to 65 students from 20-21 to 21-22, and there was an increase in students qualifying for services on higher levels on the Matrix of Services. Many of the new 6th grade students had significantly higher needs than in previous years, and some opted out of Tier 3 interventions. Staffing may have also been a contributing factor in that we had a new ESE teacher and two new paraprofessionals that supported our inclusion model in 21-22.

Although the data is projected, we are encouraged to see that the preliminary Federal Index based on the 22-23 FAST reflects that all of our subgroups showed improvement, and all subgroups are above the 41% threshold, including our SWD subgroup.

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

The component with the greatest decline was our SWD ELA learning gains which went from 47% in 20-21 to 22% in 21-22. Once again, the team feels the most significant contributing factor for this decline is the change in our student population and the increased needs of our students. Again, in looking at the preliminary data, we are confident that this subgroup improved performance on the 22-23 FAST.

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.

RMA traditionally outperforms the state and the district in most academic achievement components with the exception of 8th Grade Math. RMA follows the School District of Manatee County's student progression plan which includes enrolling students who earn a 3, 4, 5 on the most current state assessment in Math into Algebra 1. This means that only students who scored level 1 or 2 are enrolled in 8th Grade Pre-Algebra and take the 8th grade FAST. The team presumes that the state likely also enrolls some students who earn level 3 into 8th Grade Pre-Algebra and take the 8th grade FAST which would likely inflate the state's scores on the 8th Grade FAST.

In analyzing all data components from the 21-22 school year, our students with disabilities learning gains and SWD bottom quartile learning gains components were significantly lower than the state in both ELA and Math. It is evident that our SWD subgroup underperformed in most areas compared to the state as well as compared to previous years SWD subgroups.

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

When comparing 20-21 data to 21-22, our overall Math learning gains showed the most improvement with a 20% overall increase. Specifically, Math learning gains for our Hispanic students increased by 28% followed by Math learning gains for ELLs students with a 22% increase and Economically Disadvantaged with a 21% increase.

In 20-21 we implemented a new Intensive Math program for our Tier 3 students using Corrective Math. This class has a full time certified teacher and a full time paraprofessional who deliver direct instruction coupled with small group instruction using the program Corrective Math. In addition, RMA offers free after school tutoring to all students in all academic areas, and in 21-22, we implemented an additional math tutoring opportunity specifically for ELL students. The team feels these initiatives were the most impactful on increasing Math learning gains.

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

Our two areas of potential concern are:

Students that earned a Level 1 on FSA Reading

Students that earned a Level 1 on FSA Math

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

In reviewing the preliminary 22-23 data, all subgroups showed improvement, and all subgroups are above the 41% threshold. Our SWD subgroup, however, is once again our lowest performing subgroup at 41%. Based on this preliminary data as well as data from the 21-22 Federal Index, our highest priorities are:

ELA and Math Proficiency for SWD subgroup

ELA and Math Learning Gains in SWD subgroup

ELA and Math Learning Gains in L25 subgroup

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.

Our Students with Disabilities subgroups did not meet the 41% threshold on the 21-22 Federal Index with 32%.

Measurable Outcome:

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

At the end of the 23-24 school year, our Federal Index for our SWD subgroup will increase from 32% in 21-22 (41% preliminarily in 22-23) to 45% based on the 23-24 FAST PM3.

Monitoring:

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

Assessments used for progress monitoring include: FAST PM1 and PM 2, Program Mastery Tests, Easy CBM, DIBELS and MAST tests.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Rebecca Dean (deanr@manateeschools.net)

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.)

Students identified as needing Tier 2 interventions in Reading will receive interventions every other day during their double block of ELA and content area classes. These interventions will be provided weekly for a total of 45 minutes and will take place in a group smaller than the normal class size. In addition to Tier 2 interventions, students who are identified as needing Tier 3 interventions will also be enrolled in an Intensive Reading class. Intensive Reading classes will meet for a double block every other day. During this time, students will receive direct instruction as well as targeted small group support from a full time teacher and a full time paraprofessional using in the Corrective Reading and REWARDS Reading Programs.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Corrective Reading is a powerful Direct Instruction remedial reading program that solves a wide range of problems for struggling older readers. Corrective Reading will be used to address student issues with misidentified words, confusion of similar words, word omissions or insertions, lack of attention to punctuation, poor recall, and poor comprehension. With a high success rate, frequent teacher feedback, and built-in opportunities to earn reinforcement throughout each lesson, even students with histories of failure remain motivated and on task. Explicit, step-by-step lessons are organized around two major strands, Decoding and Comprehension, which will both be used within the Intensive Reading block. Once students demonstrate success in the Corrective Reading Program, they will move to the REWARDS Program. REWARDS is a fast paced intervention program that provides strategies for decoding and comprehending multisyllabic words, builds academic and content vocabulary, and helps students access higher level informational text.

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.

- Training and ongoing coaching for the Intensive Reading teacher and paraprofessional.
- Secure instructional materials
- Assess student needs using placement tests
- Schedule students into intensive classes
- Monitor student progress
- Report progress and problem solve with MTSS team

Person Responsible: Lindsey Rousan (rousanl@rowlettmiddleacademy.org)

By When: Ongoing

#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.

At RMA, we believe that a positive school culture leads to improved academic performance.

Measurable Outcome:

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

100% of RMA students will have at least one staff member they feel they can turn to for support.

Monitoring:

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

Student Climate Survey
Parent Climate Survey
Discipline and Attendance Data

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Lindsey Rousan (rousanl@rowlettmiddleacademy.org)

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.)

HERO PBIS program
Daily iLead (focused homeroom) classes with instruction to include 7 Habits of Highly Effective People
Mentoring Program
Check In, Check Out
Small Group Counseling

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

HERO K12 is an educational software platform that focuses on Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports (PBIS) in schools. The program is designed to promote and reinforce positive behaviors among students and provide interventions for students who may need additional support.

The 7 Habits of Highly Effective People focuses on seven habits to help individuals enhance their effectiveness in both personal and professional settings, leading to a more fulfilling and balanced life.

Mentoring, Check-In, Check-Out, and Small Group Counseling connect students with a supportive adult to reinforce and encourage positive behaviors and decision making.

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.

- Secure HERO K12 subscription
- Contract with School Psychologist
- Create counseling groups and create a schedule
- Match students with adults
- Monitor progress
- Professional Development

Person Responsible: Lindsey Rousan (rousanl@rowlettmiddleacademy.org)

By When: Ongoing

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)).

Semi-monthly Budget and Finance Meetings
Semi-monthly Board Meetings boards meetings
3 annual SAC meetings
Early warning system interventions
PBIS System, HERO
Differentiated, scaffolded, and intensive instruction
Inclusion model
MTSS process