

Hillsborough County Public Schools

Young Middle Magnet 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 | 19 |
| V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence | 0 |
| VI. Title I Requirements | 19 |
| VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus | 0 |

Young Middle Magnet School

1807 E DR MARTIN LUTHER KING JR BLVD, Tampa, FL 33610

[no web address on file]

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.

Young Middle Magnet Creative Science Center will create an equitable environment that enriches the educational experience through, collaboration, diversity, respect and innovation.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Young Middle Magnet Creative Science Center will prepare students to become global citizens through an innovative S.T.E.A.M integrated approach to learning.

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 |
|--------------------|---------------------------|---|
| Berry, Henrissa | Principal | Oversees the daily instructional and operational functions of the school. |
| Jones, Mark | Assistant Principal | Oversee curriculum and instruction, supervise content area leaders and creates school's master schedule. |
| Glenn, Nichelle | Magnet Coordinator | Performs marketing and recruitment activities related to the school's theme. Works with teachers to integrate the theme into all content areas across campus. |
| Padgett, Jonathan | SAC Member | SAC Chair |
| Hargrove, Valencia | Parent Engagement Liaison | Facilitates parent and family engagement activities within the school and community. |
| | Assistant Principal | Karla Clayton |

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.

We met with our stakeholders through leadership team meetings, parent night events and individual meetings with our community partners. During these meetings we asked what they wanted to see

happen in the school and community as a result of our efforts. With this information we built our schoolwide goals and actions steps within the SIP.

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 quarterly evaluations. We will conduct data reviews to determine the progress made and develop plans for addressing deficits noticed in the data. As a result of the data reviewed we will meet with the leadership team and other stakeholders to devise a plan that outlines their specific roles and develop new actions steps to meet the specified goals. Additionally, we will collaborate with the school district resource personnel to ensure implementation with fidelity is supported throughout all areas.

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 | 96% |
| 2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate | 100% |
| Charter School | No |
| RAISE School | No |
| ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024 | ATSI |
| Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) | No |
| 2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Students With Disabilities (SWD)* English Language Learners (ELL) 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: C 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 | 32 | 38 | 37 | 107 | |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 43 | 46 | 100 | |
| Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 6 | |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 4 | |
| Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 42 | 42 | 69 | 153 | |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 25 | 32 | 43 | 100 | |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C. | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 72 | 70 | 109 | 251 | |

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 | 22 | 47 | 42 | 111 |

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 | 1 | 1 | 2 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 |

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 | 21 | 39 | 38 | 98 | |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 53 | 49 | 115 | |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | |
| Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 36 | 64 | 56 | 156 | |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 43 | 59 | 29 | 131 | |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C. | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 36 | 64 | 56 | 156 | |

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 | 5 | 20 | 24 | 49 |

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 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 3 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14 | 29 | 34 | 77 |

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 | 21 | 39 | 38 | 98 | |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 53 | 49 | 115 | |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | |
| Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 36 | 64 | 56 | 156 | |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 43 | 59 | 29 | 131 | |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C. | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 36 | 64 | 56 | 156 | |

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 | 5 | 20 | 24 | 49 |

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 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 3 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14 | 29 | 34 | 77 |

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* | 33 | 49 | 49 | 31 | 50 | 50 | 27 | | |
| ELA Learning Gains | | | | 41 | | | 30 | | |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | 42 | | | 35 | | |
| Math Achievement* | 45 | 57 | 56 | 35 | 36 | 36 | 21 | | |
| Math Learning Gains | | | | 60 | | | 24 | | |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | 72 | | | 30 | | |
| Science Achievement* | 23 | 44 | 49 | 24 | 52 | 53 | 18 | | |
| Social Studies Achievement* | 43 | 66 | 68 | 52 | 58 | 58 | 34 | | |
| Middle School Acceleration | 76 | 84 | 73 | 88 | 51 | 49 | 62 | | |
| Graduation Rate | | | | | 46 | 49 | | | |
| College and Career Acceleration | | | | | 74 | 70 | | | |
| ELP Progress | | 39 | 40 | 48 | 86 | 76 | 46 | | |

** 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 | 44 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students | No |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 2 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 220 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 5 |

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index

| | |
|-----------------|----|
| Percent Tested | 99 |
| Graduation Rate | |

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index

| | |
|--|------|
| ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI) | ATSI |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students | 49 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students | No |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 2 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 493 |
| 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 | 23 | Yes | 4 | 1 |
| ELL | 30 | Yes | 1 | 1 |
| AMI | | | | |
| ASN | | | | |
| BLK | 42 | | | |
| HSP | 51 | | | |
| MUL | 73 | | | |
| PAC | | | | |
| WHT | 43 | | | |
| FRL | 41 | | | |

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 | 33 | Yes | 3 | |
| ELL | 50 | | | |
| AMI | | | | |
| ASN | | | | |
| BLK | 48 | | | |
| HSP | 48 | | | |
| MUL | 40 | Yes | 1 | |
| PAC | | | | |
| WHT | 54 | | | |
| FRL | 49 | | | |

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 | 33 | | | 45 | | | 23 | 43 | 76 | | | |
| SWD | 22 | | | 23 | | | 14 | 33 | | | 4 | |
| ELL | 21 | | | 31 | | | 20 | 47 | | | 4 | |
| AMI | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ASN | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| BLK | 30 | | | 42 | | | 20 | 41 | 75 | | 5 | |
| HSP | 38 | | | 46 | | | 39 | 45 | 85 | | 5 | |
| MUL | 64 | | | 82 | | | | | | | 2 | |
| PAC | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 43 | | | 43 | | | | | | | 2 | |
| FRL | 30 | | | 42 | | | 20 | 42 | 73 | | 5 | |

| 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 | 31 | 41 | 42 | 35 | 60 | 72 | 24 | 52 | 88 | | | 48 |
| SWD | 25 | 29 | 26 | 25 | 43 | 52 | 6 | 56 | | | | |
| ELL | 27 | 48 | 53 | 35 | 57 | 90 | 25 | 70 | | | | 48 |
| AMI | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ASN | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| BLK | 29 | 40 | 44 | 31 | 61 | 71 | 24 | 45 | 90 | | | |
| HSP | 39 | 49 | 44 | 45 | 58 | 73 | 14 | 72 | | | | 42 |
| MUL | 27 | | | 42 | 50 | | | | | | | |
| PAC | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 54 | 42 | | 69 | 50 | | | | | | | |
| FRL | 30 | 41 | 43 | 34 | 59 | 73 | 22 | 51 | 85 | | | 50 |

| 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 | 27 | 30 | 35 | 21 | 24 | 30 | 18 | 34 | 62 | | | 46 |
| SWD | 23 | 28 | 29 | 21 | 20 | 27 | 16 | 31 | | | | |
| ELL | 31 | 38 | 33 | 24 | 37 | 54 | 0 | 38 | | | | 46 |
| AMI | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ASN | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| BLK | 23 | 29 | 36 | 17 | 21 | 29 | 13 | 33 | 66 | | | |
| HSP | 47 | 38 | 42 | 34 | 32 | 50 | 33 | 33 | 45 | | | 56 |
| MUL | 20 | 21 | | 38 | 40 | | | | | | | |
| PAC | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 40 | 40 | | | | | | | | | | |
| FRL | 26 | 30 | 34 | 20 | 23 | 28 | 16 | 33 | 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 | 33% | 47% | -14% | 47% | -14% |
| 08 | 2023 - Spring | 28% | 44% | -16% | 47% | -19% |
| 06 | 2023 - Spring | 31% | 47% | -16% | 47% | -16% |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|-------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 06 | 2023 - Spring | 45% | 53% | -8% | 54% | -9% |
| 07 | 2023 - Spring | 23% | 36% | -13% | 48% | -25% |
| 08 | 2023 - Spring | 49% | 57% | -8% | 55% | -6% |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
|---------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 08 | 2023 - Spring | 21% | 41% | -20% | 44% | -23% |

| ALGEBRA | | | | | | |
|---------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| N/A | 2023 - Spring | 83% | 55% | 28% | 50% | 33% |

| GEOMETRY | | | | | | |
|----------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| N/A | 2023 - Spring | * | 49% | * | 48% | * |

| CIVICS | | | | | | |
|--------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| N/A | 2023 - Spring | 41% | 64% | -23% | 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.

Science teacher vacancy and lack of ability to use and conduct labs.

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

Civics, scheduling guidelines, and the district changed who went into the course the previous year.

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.

Science, the students struggled with the way the curriculum is designed when considering nature of science standards.

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

Math, effective PLC's, data analysis and ongoing formative assessments.

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

Attendance, students are inconsistent in reporting to school daily.

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

Improving instruction
Improving climate and culture
Increasing student attendance

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.

Benchmark aligned instruction was identified as a crucial need due to the fact that approximately 70 percent of our students performed below satisfactory or inadequate on the FAST ELA Assessment. Additionally, 58 percent of our students performed below satisfactory or inadequate in Math. Of the students who scored a level 1 or 2 in ELA, 31% are ESE and 16% are ELL. These subgroups will benefit greatly from this area being a schoolwide focus instructional practice, specifically as it relates to standards-aligned instruction.

Measurable Outcome:

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

To increase the percentage of students making gains and scoring satisfactory and above will increase to 60 and 40 percent, respectively across all reporting categories as a result of refining instructional practices specifically related to planning and preparation, small group instruction, conducting and utilizing assessment data to inform instruction.

Monitoring:

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

This area of focus will be monitored through consistent use of progress monitoring assessments. The data from these assessments will be reviewed as the assessments are completed. Likewise, we will conduct walkthroughs consistently, providing feedback to teachers around the performance goals created as a result of the data reviews. Finally, we will work together in PLCs to share strategies for impacting the data and continue this cycle of continuous improvement throughout the year.

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.)

Professional Learning Communities

Use of Formative Assessments and Checks for Understanding

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The rationale for choosing PLC and Assessment as our evidence-based intervention is because these two support the idea of improving instructional practice which is needed to address the deficits our students have in reading and math. By focusing on strategic planning, collaborating to enhance instructional strategies/practices and assessing to understand students' level of acquisition of the standards ALL students will benefit. As it relates to our subgroups, these interventions will ensure they are considered, and that differentiation is well-planned to meet their individual needs.

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.

1- Strengthen PLC Structures and Utilize Protocols to Guide the PLC Process

- Build Common Planning into Master Schedule
- Schedule after-school meetings twice per month for required content training, professional development and planning

Person Responsible: Henrissa Berry (henrissa.berry@hcps.net)

By When: Ongoing

2- Analyzing Student Data

- Teachers will identify trends, opportunities to adjust their instructional practice and create actionable next steps.
- Teachers will review common assessment data in PLCs and devise plans to address the data
- Teachers will bring samples of student work to PLCs for analysis
- Review specific data for SWD and ELL students to identify trends and actionable next steps.

Person Responsible: Henrissa Berry (henrissa.berry@hcps.net)

By When: Ongoing

#2. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Early Warning System**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.

This was identified as a crucial need because approximately 1/3 of our student population received one or more suspensions and were absent more than 10% of the time. As a result, of these instances students were out of class for a considerable amount of time. In an effort to increase the amount of instructional time these students receive, we felt it was important to focus on EWS indicators to improve those outcomes.

Measurable Outcome:

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

- Increase overall attendance from 91.3% to 94%. And decrease the number of students missing 10% or more days of school by 20% from 107 to 87.
- Decrease the number of days students are suspended by 50%. And decrease the number of students with one or more suspensions by 50% from 100 to 50.

Monitoring:

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

This area of focus will be monitored by the PSLT. The team will meet monthly to discuss and review attendance and discipline data. The team will identify strategies, interventions and incentives that impact the overall goals/outcomes.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jonathan Padgett (jonathan.padgett@hcps.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.)

Attendance Incentives (monthly, quarterly), Attendance Plans
PBIS (schoolwide expectations, school currency, school store, preferred activities)
Quarterly Incentives (Schoolwide, grade-level)

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

We believe that by setting the expectation, monitoring those expectations and providing students incentives for meeting the expectations we will see the number of students attending school on a regular basis will improve. Likewise, by reinforcing positive behavior through the use of our school currency and incentive program the incidents of student misbehavior resulting in suspension and negative outcomes will decrease.

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.

Conduct monthly PSLT meetings to review and respond to attendance and discipline data.

Person Responsible: Jonathan Padgett (jonathan.padgett@hcps.net)

By When: Monthly/Ongoing

Implement monthly and quarterly Behavior/attendance incentives.

Person Responsible: Jonathan Padgett (jonathan.padgett@hcps.net)

By When: Start 8/10 and continue Ongoing throughout the year.

CSI, TSI and ATSI Resource Review

Describe the process to review school improvement funding allocations and ensure resources are allocated based on needs. This section must be completed if the school is identified as ATSI, TSI or CSI in addition to completing an Area(s) of Focus identifying interventions and activities within the SIP (ESSA 1111(d)(1)(B)(4) and (d)(2)(C)).

The comprehensive needs assessment is completed to identify the areas of need within the school. Based on this assessment specific goals are developed, for each goal, action steps are identified. Once the action steps are identified we determine what resources are needed to ensure the actions steps can be carried out. These resource needs are categorized into those that require funding and those that do not. The funded resource needs are then prioritized. The available funding from the Title 1 budget is reviewed and shared with stakeholder, all items are assigned funding within the priority structure. Any priority that does not receive funding is looked at and we determine alternative ways to accomplish that action/priority (i.e. business partners, parents, other external stakeholders, grants, etc.).

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.

We will generate a brief summary of our SIP documents along with the and provide the full SIP within the two weeks of school to our teachers, staff and SAC committee. Once feedback is received and the document is finalized, we will place copies of the SIP in the office for distribution to any interested stakeholders. Additionally, the document will be shared via our school website, newsletter, on campus parent nights and at our annual title 1 meeting. Spanish translators will be available at all in person meetings.

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))

We plan to engage our families and community through two-way communication strategies. Parents are provided with our resource map which allows them to connect with all staff as needed. Additionally, we send regular parentlinks, newsletters, conduct one-on-one phone calls, text messages and conferences to engage families and community with the school. Finally, we host a variety of events that support family and community engagement to support families and students, contributing to their overall success (i.e. conference night, donuts with dads, muffins for moms, grandparents breakfast, family STEM night, open house, etc.).

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))

We intend to strengthen the academic progress of our students by focusing on planning, small group instruction, and assessment to improve instruction. Teachers will participate in small group instruction around these topics to enhance their individual practice, thereby improving outcomes for all students.

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))

N/A

Optional Component(s) of the Schoolwide Program Plan

Include descriptions for any additional strategies that will be incorporated into the plan.

Describe how the school ensures counseling, school-based mental health services, specialized support services, mentoring services, and other strategies to improve students' skills outside the academic subject areas. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(I))

School counselor and social worker on staff full time. They triage students and provide services as appropriate. We engage students in programming throughout the year to raise awareness about mental health and instruct students on how to access services. i.e. classroom guides, social skills groups, antibullying, Start With Hello.

Describe the preparation for and awareness of postsecondary opportunities and the workforce, which may include career and technical education programs and broadening secondary school students' access to coursework to earn postsecondary credit while still in high school. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(II))

N/A

Describe the implementation of a schoolwide tiered model to prevent and address problem behavior, and early intervening services, coordinated with similar activities and services carried out under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. 20 U.S.C. 1400 et seq. and ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(III).

We have a 6 step process to deal with behavior problems in school.

- 1 Re-direct student and re-teach desired behavior
- 2 Conference (or phone call) with parent and student, and record in student notes
- 3 Initiate classroom intervention, and record in student notes
- 4 Notify team leader and parent conference with the student and team, and record in student notes

5 Refer student to Student Services and record in student notes

6 Refer student to Admin on a discipline referral with documentation of interventions

Describe the professional learning and other activities for teachers, paraprofessionals, and other school personnel to improve instruction and use of data from academic assessments, and to recruit and retain effective teachers, particularly in high need subjects. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(IV))

PLCs (Team and Content Area), PSLT (student services), ILT (Instructional Leadership Team)

Describe the strategies the school employs to assist preschool children in the transition from early childhood education programs to local elementary school programs. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(V))

N/A