Raymond B. Stewart Middle School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

<div style="text-align:center">

Raymond B. Stewart Middle School

38505 10TH AVE, Zephyrhills, FL 33542

https://rbsms.pasco.k12.fl.us

</div>

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.

To create a legacy of excellence with the support of our families and communities.

Provide the school's vision statement.

To empower ALL BULLDOGS to become productive and compassionate members of society.

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
Borders, Joshua	Principal	Administration: Provides a common vision for the use of data-based decision-making, ensures that the school-based team is implementing MTSS, assesses MTSS skills of staff, ensures implementation of intervention support and documentation including our PBIS system, provides professional development to support MTSS implementation, and communicates MTSS activities within the school to parents. Select General Education Teachers: Participates in data collection and data analysis and the development of Tier I instruction/intervention, collaborates with other staff to implement, integrate, and analyze the effectiveness of Tier I, II and III interventions. Learning Design Coaches and Assistant Principals: Identifies and analyzes existing literature on scientifically-based curriculum/behavior assessment and intervention approaches. Develops, leads, and evaluates school data analysis processes. Identifies patterns of student need and assists with school-wide identification of "at-risk" students for early intervention services. Assists in the design and implementation for progress- monitoring, data collection and analysis, and provides support for our data tracker system, assessment and implementation monitoring. School Psychologist: Participates in discussion and interpretation of data; facilitates development of intervention plan/problem-solving worksheets (PSW); provides support for intervention fidelity and documentation; facilitates data-based decision-making activities. School Counselor(s) and Social Worker: Participates in the collection, interpretation, and analysis of data; facilitates the development of intervention plans and PSW's; provides support for intervention fidelity and documentation; facilitates data-based decision-making activities. Provides expertise on program design and individualized student services. Provides connection between the school and families by supporting the student's academic, emotional, and behavioral success.
Rodriguez, Jesyriam	Assistant Principal	
Collin, Deborah	Assistant Principal	
Yingling, Charles	Assistant Principal	
Drury, Amy	Instructional Coach	
Poulsen, Amanda	Teacher, K-12	
Bianchi, Elizabeth	Teacher, K-12	
Vandeberg, Charla	Teacher, K-12	

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Butto, Ginger	Teacher, K-12	
Pellegrino, Mike	Teacher, K-12	
Ballman, Samantha	Teacher, K-12	
McKinnies, Brian	Teacher, K-12	
Dean, Brittany	School Counselor	
Mathews, Shannon	Graduation Coach	
Simon, Shannon	Teacher, ESE	
Hawk, Amanda	Teacher, K-12	
Pickett, Deborah	Math Coach	
Williams, Marisa	Teacher, K-12	
Erdmann, Jennifer	Teacher, K-12	
Meyer, Lori	Teacher, K-12	
Mathis, Greg	Teacher, K-12	
Schmidt, Stephanie	Teacher, K-12	
Thomas, Joshua	Teacher, K-12	
Brown, Rebecca	Teacher, K-12	
Baez, Vincent	Teacher, K-12	
Martin, Barbara	Instructional Coach	
Schmidt, Brian	Teacher, K-12	
Richter, Celeste	Science Coach	

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.

RBSMS is a community where we involve our stakeholders in developing the SIP. Every year during the 2nd semester the leadership team meets various times to determine the needs of our school, analyze the school's Title I and UniSIG budget, and ultimately develop our focus areas for the SIP. In addition, administration, instructional coaches, and select teachers attend the BSI summer institute to analyze the school's data to determine the needs of the school and develop the schools System for Monitoring Instruction Planning Tool. These Areas of Focus then guide the school's work for the upcoming school year. Once the SIP is developed it it shared with the School's Advisory Council.

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 regularly monitored through effective implementation o the Look fors for the 3 Instructional Priorities, Common Formative Assessment Data, Core Action Walkthrough Data, SharePoint, myStudent, NWEA data, and Evaluation Summary/Trends. The school will revise the plan as needed and ensure that all educators understand how to utilize the PLC planning document ensure that differentiated instruction and interventions are provided for struggling students. In addition, educators will plan and implement rigorous lessons that are aligned to the Florida Standards, reflect shifts in instruction, and how MTSS is implemented with fidelity to ensure high impact instruction and learning is taking place in order for student proficiency levels to increase.

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	49%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	78%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	CSI
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	Yes
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: D 2019-20: C 2018-19: C 2017-18: C
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	84	36	56	176
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	105	102	91	298
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	37	50	97
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	29	12	23	64
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	162	129	160	451
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	121	100	127	348
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	249	205	235	689

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	39	44	59	142

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	11	11
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	104	137	111	352
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	51	55	52	158
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	13	47	69
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5	9	21
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	151	148	150	449
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	170	124	150	444
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	3	1	4

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	221	251	248	720

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	2	2
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	104	137	111	352
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	51	55	52	158
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	13	47	69
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5	9	21
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	151	148	150	449
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	170	124	150	444
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	3	1	4

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	221	251	248	720

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	2	2
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*	31	48	49	29	46	50	31		
ELA Learning Gains				39			32		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				34			24		
Math Achievement*	36	58	56	34	34	36	34		
Math Learning Gains				47			36		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				48			35		
Science Achievement*	32	46	49	33	54	53	37		
Social Studies Achievement*	60	70	68	56	59	58	58		
Middle School Acceleration	29	60	73	36	50	49	28		
Graduation Rate					47	49			
College and Career Acceleration					72	70			
ELP Progress	29	35	40	38	65	76	55		

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)	CSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	36
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	Yes
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	7
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	217
Total Components for the Federal Index	6
Percent Tested	96
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	CSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	39
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	Yes
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	6
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	394
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	17	Yes	4	2
ELL	27	Yes	4	1
AMI				
ASN	64			
BLK	37	Yes	3	
HSP	35	Yes	2	
MUL	37	Yes	2	
PAC				

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%
WHT	40	Yes	1	
FRL	32	Yes	2	

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	23	Yes	3	1
ELL	39	Yes	3	
AMI				
ASN	55			
BLK	38	Yes	2	
HSP	36	Yes	1	
MUL	36	Yes	1	
PAC				
WHT	43			
FRL	35	Yes	1	

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	31			36			32	60	29			29
SWD	11			11			6	38			5	20
ELL	15			19			13	61			5	29
AMI												
ASN	55			73							2	
BLK	31			29			20	67	36		5	
HSP	28			33			23	60	33		6	30

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
MUL	23			33			38	53			4	
PAC												
WHT	33			40			38	60	27		5	
FRL	28			33			26	55	26		6	26

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	29	39	34	34	47	48	33	56	36			38
SWD	3	23	22	14	40	40	8	34				
ELL	16	42	48	27	44	43	28	65				38
AMI												
ASN	67	50		58	45							
BLK	26	39	31	23	46	52	21	62				
HSP	24	40	40	29	44	42	26	46	26			40
MUL	30	38		26	39	46	23	50				
PAC												
WHT	31	39	30	39	51	53	40	60	41			
FRL	25	36	31	29	43	45	28	53	29			33

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	31	32	24	34	36	35	37	58	28			55
SWD	9	19	18	13	24	27	10	47				
ELL	15	38	47	21	35	43	22	47				55
AMI												
ASN	69			64								
BLK	25	24	14	21	30	31	22	44				
HSP	22	31	32	25	37	40	32	52	37			54
MUL	33	26	9	24	27	23	20	64				
PAC												
WHT	36	35	24	42	38	35	44	63	26			

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
FRL	29	30	22	31	35	33	35	54	24			50

Grade Level Data Review– State Assessments (pre-populated)
The data are raw data and include ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data. The percentages shown here represent ALL students who received a score of 3 or higher on the statewide assessments.

An asterisk (*) in any cell indicates the data has been suppressed due to fewer than 10 students tested, or all tested students scoring the same.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
07	2023 - Spring	30%	48%	-18%	47%	-17%
08	2023 - Spring	28%	46%	-18%	47%	-19%
09	2023 - Spring	*	48%	*	48%	*
06	2023 - Spring	27%	46%	-19%	47%	-20%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	36%	54%	-18%	54%	-18%
07	2023 - Spring	33%	48%	-15%	48%	-15%
08	2023 - Spring	43%	67%	-24%	55%	-12%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	30%	46%	-16%	44%	-14%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	80%	50%	30%	50%	30%

BIOLOGY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	*	65%	*	63%	*

CIVICS						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	56%	70%	-14%	66%	-10%

III. Planning for Improvement

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

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

ELA achievement showed the lowest performance at 29% in 2023 compared to achievement for math, science, and social studies. Student disengagement and the lack of instructional practices were the main contributing factor to this need for improvement.

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

Science declined the most in 2023 compared to 2022. Student disengagement, the lack of instructional practices, and progression of knowledge from 6th grade to 8th grade were the main contributing factors to this decline.

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, 8th grade ELA, 6th grade Math, and 7th grade ELA had the greatest gaps (greater than a 15% gap) at 20%, 19%, 18%, and 17%respectively, compared to the state.

6th Grade math- 10% of matched 6th grade students in grade level math scored a level 3 or higher in grade 5 (compared with 90% of matched 6th grade accelerated students). Although we doubled the percentage of matched 6th grade students scoring a level 3 or higher in grade level math to 20%, when combined with 92% of matched 6th grade accelerated math students scoring a level 3 or higher, our total percent of 6th graders-grade level and accelerated is only at 36%. This is 18% behind the state, and may also include accelerated grade 5 students at the elementary level.

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

Math- The percent of level 3 students increased from 34% in 2022 to 38% in 2023.

Strengthening Tier 1 instruction through alignment to benchmarks and strategies, increasing student engagement/discourse, improving instructional practices, and re-establishing tier 2 supports.

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

Number of students that are level 1 on statewide ELA assessment.

Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C

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

*Maintain Personnel through the year and across years (impact last year in 6th and 7th)
*Implement tiered supports for teachers
*Differentiation in 50% of units (next step, especially in 6th grade with consistent implementation of priorities last year).
* Increase and refine the implementation of AVID strategies to continue to strengthen tier 1
*Monthly PD on collecting, analyzing, and responding to evidence of learning across lessons in Tier 1.

Area of Focus
(Identified key Area of Focus that addresses the school's highest priority based on any/all relevant data sources)

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Benchmark-aligned Instruction

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.

Instructional Priority #1: Strengthen Tier 1 instructional practices through clear alignment between student activities/tasks/content and learning targets.

Look Fors
Teacher Actions
- Teacher posts learning goal and standard visibly in the classroom and refer to it/them throughout the lesson

- Teacher connects for/with students how the activities relate to the goal

- Teacher provides time for students to reflect on whether they met the learning goal

Student Actions
- Students can identify the learning goal

- Students asked can state how activities relate to the learning goal

- Students will practice and reflect on how well they met the learning goal

Rationale: End of unit, walkthrough, district, and state data indicate the need for explicit, intentional, instruction aligned to the intended learning outcomes for grade-level standards.

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

Teacher Practice: By April 2024, 80% of classrooms will be "yes" for teacher and student actions.

Student Practice: By May 2024, 60% of students will score 70% or higher on CFAs.

Coaching Practice: By April 2024, 80% of our teachers will be receiving only Tier 1 supports.

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

What actions will need to be completed? What actions will need to be adjusted or changed?

Planning

Action Step:
Facilitate the planning protocol with teachers

•District provides SLN resources for teachers to use when planning benchmark-aligned instruction

•Admin and Coaches leverage the teacher actions in the look-fors during common planning (learning targets, purpose of activities, ways students can reflect, etc.), to position teachers to implement teacher actions

•Teachers align activities/tasks/content to learning targets

2023: Emphasize that everyone is a coach with a goal to improve teacher capacity to improve student outcomes

Coaching

Action Step:

-Share the process for collecting and responding to data for instructional monitoring ("Look Fors") with instructional staff

- Admin and Coaches create a Schedule/Calendar for class visits to collect data and provide supports

•Admin shares the logistics of instructional monitoring (area of focus, rationale, priority, outcomes, look-fors, and logistics) with the leadership team & teachers

•Admin and Coaches collect data in classrooms

•Admin and Coaches share data detail results with leadership team & teachers

•Admin Coaches and Teachers make adjustments (planning, coaching and PD) based on evidence

2023: Tiered coaching supports for teachers

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Joshua Borders (jjborder@pasco.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.)

What evidence will be collected to ensure implementation is occurring as expected/designed?

Planning
Evidence:
Training resources
Meeting agendas
PLC teacher team common planning documents and products

How will you collect this evidence?
RBSMS Sharepoint –upload weekly

2023: Before-During-After Document -hone in on the "before" so that teachers come to PLC meetings prepared

Coaching
Evidence:
Schedule/Calendar
Data
1 pager- with all 3 priority Look-Fors areas in print for teachers
Meeting agendas

How will you collect this evidence?
Electronic data tool (Microsoft form)

2023
Tiering Document
Teacher Support Logs

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

What evidence will be collected to ensure the impact is occurring as expected/designed?

Planning
Impact:
Trends over time showing:

Increased number of teachers showing evidence of aligned instruction in grade-level classrooms

Increased number of classrooms with students identifying the learning goal and describing how the activities align to the learning goal

How will you collect this evidence?
Weekly walkthrough data collected with Microsoft forms

2023
- PLC notes increased participation in following through with PLC roles

-Individual teacher data spreadsheets with feedback

Coaching
Impact:
Teachers: Yes (all 3 indicators), yes but (2 of the indicators), no (0 or 1 of the indicators)

Students: Yes (all 3 indicators), yes but (2 of the indicators), no (0 or 1 of the indicators)

By April, 80% of classrooms will be " yes" for teacher and student actions.

By April, 80% of students will be approaching or higher on CFAs.

By April, 80% of our teachers will be receiving only Tier 1 supports.

How will you collect this evidence?
- Data Summary Artifacts (Electronic Forms)
- GradeCam (CFA)/Grades (EWS)
- Calendar color-coded with Tier 1, Tier 2, and Tier 2 visits shown

2023
- School-wide Walkthrough Data with trends by teacher
- Tiered Data sheet showing student outcomes

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 3 - Promising Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

Yes

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.

After-school instructional planning:

RBSMS will continue after-school instructional planning from their 22-23 UniSIG plan. Coaches and teachers will collaborate to create lesson plans that include all 3 of the instructional priorities in the SIP. Teachers will take part in planning sessions for one hour a week for 36 weeks. Coaches will support teachers across multiple content areas which plan on different days. All planning will be specifically related to Benchmark-aligned Instruction.

Admin and coaches will collect and share the process for collecting and responding to data for instructional monitoring of aligned benchmark instruction with instructional staff.

Admin Coaches and Teachers make adjustments (planning, coaching and PD) based on evidence.

Person Responsible: Joshua Borders (jjborder@pasco.k12.fl.us)

By When: Through the school year and by the end of the school year.

Learning Design Coach:

Pre-approved - Emma Davis 4/28/2023
RBSMS will continue the Learning Design coach from their 22-23 UniSIG plan. The Learning Design Coach will focus on coaching Social Studies teachers. The coach will conduct coaching cycles, walkthroughs, data chats, and professional development to strengthen pedagogical practices.

Admin and coaches will collect and share the process for collecting and responding to data for instructional monitoring of aligned benchmark instruction with instructional staff.

Admin Coaches and Teachers make adjustments (planning, coaching and PD) based on evidence.

Person Responsible: Charles Yingling (cyinglin@pasco.k12.fl.us)

By When: Through the school year and by the end of the school year.

RBSMS added an AVID classroom teacher to provide additional sections of this class to support their SIP goal for standards-aligned instruction by extending this program at their school. The AVID elective teacher will use CFA data weekly, MAPs data tri-annually, FAST data tri-annually, and quarterly District data to monitor AVID student outcomes. The AVID teacher will also be on the AVID site team and will conduct walk-through data to monitor an increase in teacher use of AVID strategies.

Admin and coaches will collect and share the process for collecting and responding to data for instructional monitoring of aligned benchmark instruction with instructional staff.

Admin Coaches and Teachers make adjustments (planning, coaching and PD) based on evidence.

Person Responsible: Jesyriam Rodriguez (jegarcia@pasco.k12.fl.us)

By When: Through the school year and by the end of the school year.

RBSMS will continue the 3 resource teachers from the 22-23 UniSIG plan. The resource teachers will monitor student's academic and behavioral achievement data to ensure students are achieving academic and behavioral success in accordance with District policies and state EOCs.

Admin and coaches will collect and share the process for collecting and responding to data for instructional monitoring of aligned benchmark instruction with instructional staff.

Admin Coaches and Teachers make adjustments (planning, coaching and PD) based on evidence.

Person Responsible: Deborah Collin (dcollin@pasco.k12.fl.us)

By When: Through the school year and by the end of the school year.

UniSIG funds will be utilized to assign mentors for teachers with unsatisfactory or needs improvement VAM. Mentors will work with mentees to ensure benchmark-aligned tasks and instruction and provide coaching on these items as needed.

Person Responsible: Joshua Borders (jjborder@pasco.k12.fl.us)

By When: Ongoing

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Benchmark-aligned Instruction

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.

Instructional Priority #2: Strengthen Tier 1 instructional practices through providing opportunities for student discussions.

Look Fors:
Teacher Actions
-Teacher provides many opportunities for students to talk about each other's thinking, asking questions of each other as needed.

Student Actions
-Most students are engaged in discourse with other students to share their thinking, asking questions of each other as needed.

-Most students are using appropriate academic vocabulary

Rationale: End of unit, walkthrough, district, and state data indicate the need for explicit, intentional, instruction aligned to the intended learning outcomes for grade-level standards.

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

Teacher Practice: By April 2024, 80% of classrooms will be "yes" for teacher and student actions.

Student Practice: By May 2024, 60% of students will score 70% or higher on CFAs.

Coaching Practice: By April 2024, 80% of our teachers will be receiving only Tier 1 supports.

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

What actions will need to be completed? What actions will need to be adjusted or changed?

Action Step:

- Professional development and resource supports around student discourse.
- Coaches will develop PD around student-to-student discourse (accountable talk, collaborative talk)
- Coaches will develop a discourse section in Playbook for teacher reference.
- Admin and Coaches leverage the teacher actions in the look-fors during common planning (opportunities for
student discussion), to position teachers to implement teacher actions
- Teachers use after school paid planning time to strategically plan for opportunities for students to engage in
discourse.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Joshua Borders (jjborder@pasco.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.)

Evidence:

- PD artifacts, sign-in sheets, and communications
- Checklist and one-pager
- Before-During-After Document
- Teacher-initiated discussion around discourse
- Walkthrough data using Microsoft Form

How will you collect this evidence?
- Electronic data tool (microsoft form)
- Sharepoint

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

What evidence will be collected to ensure impact is occurring as expected/designed?

Impact:
- Teachers: Yes (1 indicator), yes but (1 of the indicators-some opportunities, not many), no (0 of the indicators)

- Students: Yes (both indicators), yes but (1 of the indicators), no (0 of the indicators)

- By April, 80% of classrooms will be "yes" for teacher and student actions.

- By April, 60% of students will be approaching or higher on CFAs.

- By April, 80% of our teachers will be receiving only Tier 1 supports.

How will you collect this evidence?
- Data Summary Artifacts (Electronic Forms)
- GradeCam (CFA)/Grades (EWS)
- Calendar color-coded with Tier 1, Tier 2, and Tier 2 visits shown.

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 3 - Promising 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.

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Benchmark-aligned Instruction

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.

Instructional Priority #3: Strengthen Tier 1 instructional practices through providing checks for understanding Throughout the lesson and making needed adjustments, based on evidence collected

Look Fors:
Teacher Actions
- Teacher deliberately checks for understanding throughout the lesson to collect evidence of learning and opportunities for growth

Student Actions
- Most students are engaged in opportunities to demonstrate understanding

Rationale: End of unit, walkthrough, district and state data indicate the need for explicit, intentional, instruction aligned to the intended learning outcomes for grade level standards.

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

Teacher Practice: By April 2024, 80% of classrooms will be "yes" for teacher and student actions.

Student Practice: By May 2024, 60% of students will score 70% or higher on CFAs.

Coaching Practice: By April 2024, 80% of our teachers will be receiving only Tier 1 supports.

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

What actions will need to be completed? What actions will need to be adjusted or changed?

- Create a multi-tiered system of supports for teachers

- Admin and Coaches create a Schedule/Calendar for class visits to collect data and provide supports

- Admin shares the logistics of instructional monitoring (area of focus, rationale, priority, outcomes, look-fors, and logistics) with leadership team & teachers

- Admin and Coaches collect data and provide supports in classrooms weekly and debrief

- Admin and Coaches share data detail results with leadership team & teachers

- Admin Coaches and Teachers make adjustments (planning, coaching and PD) based on evidence

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:
Joshua Borders (jjborder@pasco.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.)

What evidence will be collected to ensure implementation is occurring as expected/designed?

Evidence:

- Schedule/Calendar
- - Data
1 pager- with all 3 priority Look-Fors areas in print for teachers
- Meeting agendas (leadership/faculty/coach & Admin meetings/management)
- Teacher Tiered Support Template

How will you collect this evidence?
- Electronic data tool (Microsoft form)
- Sharepoint

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

What evidence will be collected to ensure impact is occurring as expected/designed?

Impact:

Teachers: Yes (1 indicator), no (no indicator)

Students: Yes (1 indicator), no (no indicator)

By April, 80% of classrooms will be "yes" for teacher and student actions.

By April, 60% of students will be approaching or higher on CFAs.

By April, 80% of our teachers will be receiving only Tier 1 supports.

How will you collect this evidence?
- Data Summary Artifacts (Electronic Forms)
- GradeCam (CFA)/Grades (EWS)
- Calendar color-coded with Tier 1, Tier 2, and Tier 2 visits shown.

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 3 - Promising 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.

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

#4. 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.

Create a collaborative culture that increases staff and student engagement through positive behavior intervention systems and community involvement opportunities.

Rationale:
1. Faculty and staff members want more opportunities to build and strengthen relationships with their colleagues.
2. Using Positive Behavior Intervention Systems effectively, maximizes student engagement, thus increase academic achievement.
3. Data from the Gallup Survey reveals that many students are not engaged academically.

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

1. By April 2024, as evidenced by walkthrough data, 80% of teachers will consistently meet all 3 Instructional Priorities by continuing to protect planning time and provide opportunities for collaborative planning and discourse around the standards/benchmarks (what) and strategies (how) utilizing district/school/department resources.
2. Increase student and staff recognition to include weekly, monthly, and quarterly intervals.
3. Student Congress will be facilitated by the administration to address school-wide initiatives and programs.

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

This area will be monitored through: EWS Data, Surveys, myStudent, SharePoint, Walkthrough Data

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

[no one identified]

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.)

1. Protected meeting time
2. Professional Development
3. Community Connection Nights
4. Positive Behavior Intervention Support
5. Common planning time for like content and grade level teachers

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

1. A positive school culture creates a more effective learning environment.
2. Recognition and incentives through PBIS increase student and teacher motivation to work hard and succeed.
3. Effective data monitoring throughout the year allows for determining progress toward meeting the goal of improving student and staff engagement through PLCs and MTSS infrastructures.

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 3 - Promising 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.

1. Grade level teams and PLCs will continue to enhance staff and student engagement to and increase overall school culture.
2. Students and faculty will be recognized frequently through multiple sources for achievement or improvement in academics, behavior, and attendance.
3. Teacher to teacher PD will occur across grade levels and subject areas to increase collaboration, knowledge, and skill.
4. Include more opportunities for stakeholder (parents, faculty, businesses, students) collaboration to increase recognition and cohesiveness.
5. The school will host a Community Connections family night during each quarter to create a home/ school partnership.
6. Use the Gallup results to develop learners' attitudes, beliefs, and skills needed for success.
7. Use of Gallup Strength Finders to increase teacher-to-teacher collaboration and pedagogy.
8. Optimize RBSMS' teacher-student mentoring program.
9. Student Congress will be facilitated by the administration to address school-wide initiatives and programs

Person Responsible: Deborah Collin (dcollin@pasco.k12.fl.us)

By When: By May 2024 and ongoing

#5. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Intervention

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.

Data Driven Decisions: Utilize data to inform educational decisions.

Rationale:
1. Student achievement has not shown adequate gains.
2. Analyzing data allows room for improvement.
3. Analysis of student data drives curriculum, planning, and classroom instruction

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

• Teachers will increase their response to student CFA data with an emphasis on differentiating in Tier 1, developing interventions for Tier 2, and Problem Solving around Tier 3. As a result, by April 2024, teachers/PLCs will implement Differentiation, Intervention, and Extensions for 50% of their unit plans.
• Strengthen the TBIT process to problem solve student academic achievement and behavior.
• The School Intervention Team (SIT) will analyze EWS data and SIT form to develop and monitor school-wide Tier III structures for behavior, academics, and attendance.

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

This area will be monitored by using Common Assessment Data, Meeting Minutes, EWS Data, NWEA MAPs Data, State Assessment Data, myProgress, myStudent, SharePoint

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:
Joshua Borders (jjborder@pasco.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.)

1. SSAP Teacher
2. MTSS Committee
3. Early Warning System Data
4. Instructional Design Coaches
5. School-Based Problem Solving Team
6. Positive Behavior Intervention Support Program

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Providing a tiered system of differentiated academic and behavioral support for students increases positive educational outcomes.

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 3 - Promising 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.

1. Use data tracking software to monitor and respond to Common Formative Assessment (CFA) results.
2. RBSMS will utilize the TBIT process to problem solve student academic achievement and behavior.
3. The School Intervention Team (SIT) will analyze EWS data and SIT form to develop and monitor school-wide Tier III structures for academic achievement and behavior.
4. Teachers will use a variety of data sources to identify all students in need and differentiate in Tier 1 and intervene in Tier 2, as needed (Additional focus on subgroups to ensure meeting all students' needs)
5. RBSMS will monitor current attendance processes to identify and address student attendance concerns.
6. Utilize NWEA MAP's Assessment Data to monitor and respond to student performance.

Person Responsible: Charles Yingling (cyinglin@pasco.k12.fl.us)

By When: May 2024 and 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).

As a system, the Pasco district is engaging in a continuous improvement process always, and annually, we have a more focused reflection to look forward to the next coming school year. During the year, each school reflects and responds to data at the minimum quarterly, and the system engages in regular Calibration Meetings throughout the school year. Additionally, after reflecting on current mid-year data, the system engages in Comprehensive Needs Assessment (CNA). During this time, each school enters a needs assessment process that sets the stage for future planning and includes analysis of student performance, analysis of stakeholder feedback, self-assessment, and site visits. Subsequently, this analysis from each school drives the district planning process and the annual approach to Planning Forward to respond our schools, as well as the allocation of resources in an intentional manner based on the needs identified for each school.

Student Performance is analyzed by reviewing current and trend data by subgroup and school. Data sources include Florida BEST assessments, Statewide Science Assessment, district developed quarterly check results where applicable, and NWEA MAP Growth data. Stakeholder feedback is analyzed by reviewing results from both the student and staff Gallup polls, staff and parent surveys and focus groups.

Multiple tools are used to conduct a self-assessment. Each school and the district use the Cognia Standards

for systems accreditation and each school and the district reviews and evaluates its progress toward goals set using the Best Practices in Inclusive Education (BPIE). Instructional Practice Observations, Professional Learning Community (PLC) rubrics, and Tiers of Support rubrics are also completed by each school to gain insight into instructional and support practices.

An Assistant Superintendent, Multi-Tiered System of Support (MTSS) Specialist, and District personnel engage in individual site visits with school leadership at each school after the school team has completed the first part of their analysis to gain insight into the school's unique needs as well as identify foci for school improvement efforts and needs for implementing the plan.

The conclusion of the CNA results in the identification of the root causes of barriers, the development of a school improvement plan to overcome/reduce barriers to improvement, the allocation of supports needed to implement each school's improvement plan and serves as the foundation for Planning Forward. Schools analyze their plans and basic allocations that will be provided based on district formulas to determine needs for additional allocations, resources and supports. With the school assistant superintendent and the school support team, each school then carefully aligns the additional available funds through Title 1 and/or UniSIG to specific strategies for improvement aimed at reducing barriers to achievement and closing learning gaps for underperforming student groups. This plan for use of additional funding is regularly monitored by the district support team, and is adjusted based on data, including student progress monitoring results, as applicable through the year, with the support of the state BSI team and the Department.

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.

This will be disseminated via our School Advisory Council, Bulldog bark Newsletter, and during Community Connection night at the school.

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))

Raymond B. Stewart Middle School takes into account and includes all stakeholders in the decision-making process. This year Raymond B. Stewart Middle school will continue to create the Bulldog Legacy of excellence with the support of our families and communities. Educators at Raymond B. Stewart middle school have core values, beliefs, norms, and traditions that integrate a healthy dialogue among students, parents, and faculty in order to understand everyone's needs and expectations. Not all schools have the same core values and beliefs, nor do they have the same culture; however our school's main goal is to build and establish strong and lasting relationships among all stakeholders. We ensure that students, teachers, parents, and all stakeholders feel respected and supported by their school administrators.

Communication, consistency, problem-solving, trust, and inclusion are at the heart of how our school builds a positive school culture and environment in order to involve all stakeholders. When trust is a vital component of the school's culture, then all stakeholders feel more vested in the success of the school as a whole.

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))

Raymond B. Stewart Middle School will continue to strengthen our 3 Key Instructional Priorities to ensure we are increasing the amount and quality of learning time and help provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum.

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))

Every year during the 2nd semester the leadership team meets various times to determine the needs of our school, analyze the school's Title I and UniSIG budget, and ultimately develop our focus areas for the SIP. In addition, administration, instructional coaches, and select teachers attend the BSI summer institute to analyze the school's data to determine the needs of the school and develop the schools System for Monitoring Instruction Planning Tool. These Areas of Focus then guide the school's work for the upcoming school year.

Budget to Support Areas of Focus

Part VII: Budget to Support Areas of Focus

The approved budget does not reflect any amendments submitted for this project.

1	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Benchmark-aligned Instruction				$427,603.25
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2023-24
	5100	120	0102 - Raymond B. Stewart Middle Schl	UniSIG	1.0	$49,547.00
			Notes: Pre-approved – Emma Davis 4/28/2023 RBSMS will add an AVID classroom teacher to provide additional sections of this class to support their SIP goal for standards aligned instruction by extending this program at their school. The AVID elective teacher will use CFA data weekly, MAPs data tri-annually, FAST data tri-annually and quarterly District data to monitor AVID student outcomes. The AVID teacher will also be on the AVID site team and will conduct walk through data to monitor an increase in teacher use of AVID strategies. This position will run August 3, 2023 - May 29, 2024. The position is a 7.5 hour day and will make approximately $35 per hour.			
	5100	210	0102 - Raymond B. Stewart Middle Schl	UniSIG		$6,724.00
			Notes: AVID Teacher - Retirement 13.57%			
	5100	220	0102 - Raymond B. Stewart Middle Schl	UniSIG		$3,790.75
			Notes: AVID Teacher - FICA 7.65%			

	5100	230	0102 - Raymond B. Stewart Middle Schl	UniSIG		$8,125.00
			Notes: AVID Teacher - Group Insurance			
	5100	240	0102 - Raymond B. Stewart Middle Schl	UniSIG		$620.00
			Notes: AVID Teacher - Worker's Compensation 1.25%			
	5100	250	0102 - Raymond B. Stewart Middle Schl	UniSIG		$50.00
			Notes: AVID Teacher - Unemployment Compensation 0.10%			
	5100	510	0102 - Raymond B. Stewart Middle Schl	UniSIG		$300.00
			Notes: AVID Teacher - Classroom Supply Funds			
	6400	130	0102 - Raymond B. Stewart Middle Schl	UniSIG	0.1	$4,800.00
			Notes: Mentor Supplements - RBSMS will continue to provide additional coaching for teachers on an SI plan based on Unsatisfactory or Needs Improvement VAM. These funds will provide a mentor supplement of $199 per semester per mentee to the teachers and coaches that provide this support. These funds are allocated based on the number of teachers on an SI plan for the 22/23 school year (RBSMS had 12 teachers on an SI plan for 22-23 school year). If teachers will an Unsatisfactory or Needs Improvement VAM left RBSMS, the number of supplements needed will decrease and funds will be reallocated utilizing the amendment processing.			
	6400	210	0102 - Raymond B. Stewart Middle Schl	UniSIG		$652.00
			Notes: Mentor Supplements - Retirement 13.57%			
	6400	220	0102 - Raymond B. Stewart Middle Schl	UniSIG		$368.00
			Notes: Mentor Supplements - FICA 7.65%			
	6400	240	0102 - Raymond B. Stewart Middle Schl	UniSIG		$60.00
			Notes: Mentor Supplements - Worker's Compensation 1.25%			
	6400	250	0102 - Raymond B. Stewart Middle Schl	UniSIG		$5.00
			Notes: Mentor Supplements - Unemployment Compensation 0.10%			
	6500	130	0102 - Raymond B. Stewart Middle Schl	UniSIG	1.0	$58,606.00
			Notes: Pre-approved – Emma Davis 4/28/2023 RBSMS will continue the Learning Design coach from their 22-23 UniSIG plan. The Learning Design Coach will focus on coaching Social Studies teachers. The coach will conduct coaching cycles, walkthroughs, data chats, and professional development to strengthen pedagogical practices. As a learning design coach, this position will run from August 3, 2023 - May 29, 2024. The position is a 7.5-hour day and will make approximately $37 per hour.			
	6500	210	0102 - Raymond B. Stewart Middle Schl	UniSIG		$12,384.00
			Notes: LDC - Retirement 21.13% Employee in DROP			
	6500	220	0102 - Raymond B. Stewart Middle Schl	UniSIG		$4,484.00
			Notes: LDC - FICA 7.65%			

	6500	230		0102 - Raymond B. Stewart Middle Schl	UniSIG		$8,125.00
				Notes: LDC - Group Insurance			
	6500	240		0102 - Raymond B. Stewart Middle Schl	UniSIG		$733.00
				Notes: LDC - Worker's Compensation 1.25%			
	6500	250		0102 - Raymond B. Stewart Middle Schl	UniSIG		$59.00
				Notes: LDC - Unemployment Compensation 0.10%			
	6300	120		0102 - Raymond B. Stewart Middle Schl	UniSIG	0.59	$28,575.00
				Notes: Pre-approved – BSI 7/27/2023 RBSMS will continue after-school instructional planning from their 22-23 UniSIG plan. Coaches and teachers will collaborate to create lesson plans that include all 3 of the instructional priorities in the SIP. 25 teachers will take part in planning sessions for one hour a week for 36 weeks. Teachers will be paid their hourly rate of approximately $35 per hour. Coaches will support teachers across multiple teachers and content areas which plan on different days therefore, coaches will plan for 2.5 hours per week for 36 weeks. Coaches will be paid their hourly rate of approximately $37 per hour.			
	6300	130		0102 - Raymond B. Stewart Middle Schl	UniSIG	0.23	$11,734.50
				Notes: Pre-approved – BSI 7/27/2023 RBSMS will continue after-school instructional planning from their 22-23 UniSIG plan. Coaches and teachers will collaborate to create lesson plans that include all 3 of the instructional priorities in the SIP. 25 teachers will take part in planning sessions for one hour a week for 36 weeks. Teachers will be paid their hourly rate of approximately $35 per hour. Coaches will support teachers across multiple teachers and content areas which plan on different days therefore, coaches will plan for 2.5 hours per week for 36 weeks. Coaches will be paid their hourly rate of approximately $37 per hour.			
	6300	210		0102 - Raymond B. Stewart Middle Schl	UniSIG		$5,470.00
				Notes: Planning Hours - Retirement 13.57%			
	6300	220		0102 - Raymond B. Stewart Middle Schl	UniSIG		$3,084.00
				Notes: Planning Hours - FICA 7.65%			
	6300	240		0102 - Raymond B. Stewart Middle Schl	UniSIG		$505.00
				Notes: Planning Hours - Worker's Compensation 1.25%			
	6300	250		0102 - Raymond B. Stewart Middle Schl	UniSIG		$41.00
				Notes: Planning Hours - Unemployment Compensation 0.10%			
	6300	130		0102 - Raymond B. Stewart Middle Schl	UniSIG	3.0	$155,082.00
				Notes: -approved – Emma Davis 4/28/2023 RBSMS will continue the 3 resource teachers from the 22-23 UniSIG plan. The resource teachers will monitor student's academic and behavioral achievement data to ensure students are achieving academic and behavioral success in accordance with District policies and state EOCs. These positions will run from August 3, 2023 - May 29, 2024. The position is a 7.5 hour day and will make approximately $35 per hour.			
	6300	210		0102 - Raymond B. Stewart Middle Schl	UniSIG		$21,045.00

			Notes: Resource Teachers - Retirement 13.57%			
	6300	220	0102 - Raymond B. Stewart Middle Schl	UniSIG		$11,864.00
			Notes: Resource Teachers - FICA 7.65%			
	6300	230	0102 - Raymond B. Stewart Middle Schl	UniSIG		$24,375.00
			Notes: Resource Teachers - Group Insurance			
	6300	240	0102 - Raymond B. Stewart Middle Schl	UniSIG		$1,939.00
			Notes: Resource Teachers - Worker's Compensation 1.25%			
	6300	250	0102 - Raymond B. Stewart Middle Schl	UniSIG		$156.00
			Notes: Resource Teachers - Unemployment Compensation 0.10%			
	6300	644	0102 - Raymond B. Stewart Middle Schl	UniSIG		$2,310.00
			Notes: Pre-approved – BSI 7/27/2023 Resource Teacher Computers - RBSMS will purchase 5 computers, one each for the learning design coach, 3 resource teachers, and 1 AVID teacher funded out of UniSIG funds. Since these employees' salaries are grant funded the computer assigned to them will also be purchased with grant funds. Computers are budgeted at $770 per device with a $90 technician fee. The technician fee will be used to support set-up and continued maintenance of the devices.			
	5100	644	0102 - Raymond B. Stewart Middle Schl	UniSIG		$770.00
			Notes: Pre-approved – BSI 7/27/2023 AVID Teacher Computer - RBSMS will purchase 5 computers, one each for the learning design coach, 3 resource teachers, and 1 AVID teacher funded out of UniSIG funds. Since these employees' salaries are grant funded the computer assigned to them will also be purchased with grant funds. Computers are budgeted at $770 per device with a $90 technician fee. The technician fee will be used to support set-up and continued maintenance of the devices.			
	6500	644	0102 - Raymond B. Stewart Middle Schl	UniSIG		$770.00
			Notes: Pre-approved – BSI 7/27/2023 LDC Computer - RBSMS will purchase 5 computers, one each for the learning design coach, 3 resource teachers, and 1 AVID teacher funded out of UniSIG funds. Since these employees' salaries are grant funded the computer assigned to them will also be purchased with grant funds. Computers are budgeted at $770 per device with a $90 technician fee. The technician fee will be used to support set-up and continued maintenance of the devices.			
	6500	399	0102 - Raymond B. Stewart Middle Schl	UniSIG		$450.00
			Notes: Pre-approved – BSI 7/27/2023 Technician Fees - RBSMS will purchase 5 computers, one each for the learning design coach, 3 resource teachers, and 1 AVID teacher funded out of UniSIG funds. Since these employees' salaries are grant funded the computer assigned to them will also be purchased with grant funds. Computers are budgeted at $770 per device with a $90 technician fee. The technician fee will be used to support set-up and continued maintenance of the devices.			
2	**III.B.**	**Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Benchmark-aligned Instruction**				**$0.00**
3	**III.B.**	**Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Benchmark-aligned Instruction**				**$0.00**
4	**III.B.**	**Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Other**				**$0.00**
5	**III.B.**	**Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Intervention**				**$0.00**
					Total:	**$427,603.25**

Budget Approval

Check if this school is eligible and opting out of UniSIG funds for the 2023-24 school year.

No