# Taylor County Middle School

**2023-24**
**Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)**

## Table of Contents

# Taylor County Middle School

601 E LAFAYETTE ST, Perry, FL 32347

https://www.edline.net/pages/taylor_county_middle_school

## School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Taylor County School Board on 9/7/2023.

## SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes (F.S.), requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a new, amended, or continuation SIP for each school in the district which has a school grade of D or F; has a significant gap in achievement on statewide, standardized assessments administered pursuant to s. 1008.22 by one or more student subgroups, as defined in the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), 20 U.S.C. s. 6311(b)(2)(C)(v)(II); has not significantly increased the percentage of students passing statewide, standardized assessments; has not significantly increased the percentage of students demonstrating Learning Gains, as defined in s. 1008.34, and as calculated under s. 1008.34(3)(b), who passed statewide, standardized assessments; has been identified as requiring instructional supports under the Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE) program established in s. 1008.365; or has significantly lower graduation rates for a subgroup when compared to the state's graduation rate. Rule 6A-1.098813, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.), requires district school boards to approve a SIP for each Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) school in the district rated as Unsatisfactory.

Below are the criteria for identification of traditional public and public charter schools pursuant to the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) State plan:

| Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI) |
| --- |
| A school not identified for CSI or TSI, but has one or more subgroups with a Federal Index below 41%. |

| Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI) |
| --- |
| A school not identified as CSI that has at least one consistently underperforming subgroup with a Federal Index below 32% for three consecutive years. |

| Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI) |
| --- |
| A school can be identified as CSI in any of the following four ways:<br><br>1. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%;<br>2. Have a graduation rate at or below 67%;<br>3. Have a school grade of D or F; or<br>4. Have a Federal Index below 41% in the same subgroup(s) for 6 consecutive years. |

ESEA sections 1111(d) requires that each school identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI develop a support and improvement plan created in partnership with stakeholders (including principals and other school leaders, teachers and parent), is informed by all indicators in the State's accountability system, includes evidence-based interventions, is based on a school-level needs assessment, and identifies resource inequities to be

addressed through implementation of the plan. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as TSI, ATSI and non-Title I CSI must be approved and monitored by the school district. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as Title I, CSI must be approved by the school district and Department. The Department must monitor and periodically review implementation of each CSI plan after approval.

The Department's SIP template in the Florida Continuous Improvement Management System (CIMS), https://www.floridacims.org, meets all state and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all ESSA components for a support and improvement plan required for traditional public and public charter schools identified as CSI, TSI and ATSI, and eligible schools applying for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) funds.

Districts may allow schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions to develop a SIP using the template in CIMS.

The responses to the corresponding sections in the Department's SIP template may address the requirements for: 1) Title I schools operating a schoolwide program (SWD), pursuant to ESSA, as amended, Section 1114(b); and 2) charter schools that receive a school grade of D or F or three consecutive grades below C, pursuant to Rule 6A-1.099827, F.A.C. The chart below lists the applicable requirements.

| SIP Sections | Title I Schoolwide Program | Charter Schools |
|---|---|---|
| I-A: School Mission/Vision | | 6A-1.099827(4)(a)(1) |
| I-B-C: School Leadership, Stakeholder Involvement & SIP Monitoring | ESSA 1114(b)(2-3) | |
| I-E: Early Warning System | ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III) | 6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2) |
| II-A-C: Data Review | | 6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2) |
| II-F: Progress Monitoring | ESSA 1114(b)(3) | |
| III-A: Data Analysis/Reflection | ESSA 1114(b)(6) | 6A-1.099827(4)(a)(4) |
| III-B: Area(s) of Focus | ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(i-iii) | |
| III-C: Other SI Priorities | | 6A-1.099827(4)(a)(5-9) |
| VI: Title I Requirements | ESSA 1114(b)(2, 4-5), (7)(A)(iii)(I-V)-(B) ESSA 1116(b-g) | |

Note: Charter schools that are also Title I must comply with the requirements in both columns.

**Purpose and Outline of the SIP**

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Department encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

# I. School Information

## School Mission and Vision

**Provide the school's mission statement.**

The mission of Taylor County Middle School is to provide a positive, safe, healthy, nurturing, and respectful environment, in which all students can learn and have the opportunity to become productive members of society.

**Provide the school's vision statement.**

The vision is to equip and inspire students to think, create, perform, and advocate.

## 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 |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Roberts, Kasey | Principal | Oversee schoolwide implementation of the SIP |
| Bean, Keri | Assistant Principal | Focuses on the lesson planning, curriculum and data |
| Frostick, Angie | Assistant Principal | Oversee students discipline, referrals and wellness program |
| Heartsfield, Yvonne | Reading Coach | Analyze data following each progress monitoring and will meet with teachers |
| Amman, Jennifer | Math Coach | Analyze data following each progress monitoring and will meet with teachers |

### 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.

The School Improvement Plan is developed and approved by the School Advisory Council, which consists of the school leadership team, staff, parents, community leaders, and students.

**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))

Following each progress monitoring assessment, the data is analyzed and shared with stakeholders. Any necessary revisions are made to ensure that we are meeting the state's academic standards and closing the achievement gap for identified students.

## Demographic Data
Only ESSA identification and school grade history updated 3/11/2024

| | |
|---|---|
| **2023-24 Status**<br>(per MSID File) | Active |
| **School Type and Grades Served**<br>(per MSID File) | Middle School<br>6-8 |
| **Primary Service Type**<br>(per MSID File) | K-12 General Education |
| **2022-23 Title I School Status** | No |
| **2022-23 Minority Rate** | 36% |
| **2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** | 100% |
| **Charter School** | No |
| **RAISE School** | No |
| **ESSA Identification**<br>*updated as of 3/11/2024 | ATSI |
| **Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)** | No |
| **2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented**<br>(subgroups with 10 or more students)<br>(subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Students With Disabilities (SWD)*<br>Black/African American Students (BLK)*<br>Hispanic Students (HSP)<br>Multiracial Students (MUL)<br>White Students (WHT)<br>Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL) |
| **School Grades History**<br>*2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline. | 2021-22: C<br>2019-20: B<br>2018-19: B<br>2017-18: B |
| **School Improvement Rating History** | |
| **DJJ Accountability Rating History** | |

## Early Warning Systems

**Using 2022-23 data, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:**

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | |
| Absent 10% or more days | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 60 | 87 | 94 | 241 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 46 | 84 | 86 | 216 |
| Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 36 | 24 | 67 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 32 | 24 | 25 | 81 |
| Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 51 | 79 | 88 | 218 |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 42 | 101 | 73 | 216 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C. | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 40 | 0 | 0 | 40 |

**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 | 61 | 100 | 97 | 258 |

**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 | 2 | 1 | 5 | 8 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 6 | 15 | 30 |

**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 | 56 | 65 | 60 | 181 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 30 | 30 | 20 | 80 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 17 | 14 | 43 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 22 | 11 | 17 | 50 |
| Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 95 | 72 | 62 | 229 |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 103 | 69 | 55 | 227 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C. | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 54 | 28 | 40 | 122 |

**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 | 62 | 59 | 47 | 168 |

**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 | 2 | 3 | 7 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 17 | 14 | 38 |

### 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 | 56 | 65 | 60 | 181 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 30 | 30 | 20 | 80 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 17 | 14 | 43 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 22 | 11 | 17 | 50 |
| Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 95 | 72 | 62 | 229 |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 103 | 69 | 55 | 227 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C. | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 54 | 28 | 40 | 122 |

**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 | 62 | 59 | 47 | 168 |

**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 | 2 | 3 | 7 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 17 | 14 | 38 |

## 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* | 39 | 39 | 49 | 42 | 41 | 50 | 46 | | |
| ELA Learning Gains | | | | 39 | | | 49 | | |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | 26 | | | 40 | | |
| Math Achievement* | 46 | 46 | 56 | 51 | 26 | 36 | 49 | | |
| Math Learning Gains | | | | 53 | | | 46 | | |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | 54 | | | 44 | | |
| Science Achievement* | 47 | 47 | 49 | 35 | 50 | 53 | 36 | | |
| Social Studies Achievement* | 50 | 50 | 68 | 70 | 52 | 58 | 56 | | |
| Middle School Acceleration | 90 | 90 | 73 | 60 | 51 | 49 | 67 | | |
| Graduation Rate | | | | | 34 | 49 | | | |
| College and Career Acceleration | | | | | 68 | 70 | | | |
| ELP Progress | | | 40 | | 60 | 76 | | | |

*In cases where a school does not test 95% of students in a subject, the achievement component will be different in the Federal Percent of Points Index (FPPI) than in school grades calculation.*

See [Florida School Grades, School Improvement Ratings and DJJ Accountability Ratings](#).

## ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

| 2021-22 ESSA Federal Index | |
|---|---|
| ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI) | ATSI |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students | 54 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students | No |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 3 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 272 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 5 |
| Percent Tested | 96 |
| Graduation Rate | |

| 2021-22 ESSA Federal Index | |
|---|---|
| ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI) | ATSI |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students | 48 |

| 2021-22 ESSA Federal Index | |
|---|---|
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students | No |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 2 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 430 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 9 |
| Percent Tested | 97 |
| Graduation Rate | |

## ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

| 2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| ESSA Subgroup | Federal Percent of Points Index | Subgroup Below 41% | Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41% | Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32% |
| SWD | 25 | Yes | 2 | 1 |
| ELL | | | | |
| AMI | | | | |
| ASN | | | | |
| BLK | 44 | | | |
| HSP | 29 | Yes | 1 | 1 |
| MUL | 30 | Yes | 1 | 1 |
| PAC | | | | |
| WHT | 59 | | | |
| FRL | 48 | | | |

| 2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| ESSA Subgroup | Federal Percent of Points Index | Subgroup Below 41% | Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41% | Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32% |
| SWD | 39 | Yes | 1 | |
| ELL | | | | |
| AMI | | | | |
| ASN | | | | |
| BLK | 38 | Yes | 1 | |
| HSP | 60 | | | |

| 2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| ESSA Subgroup | Federal Percent of Points Index | Subgroup Below 41% | Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41% | Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32% |
| MUL | 50 | | | |
| PAC | | | | |
| WHT | 52 | | | |
| FRL | 43 | | | |

## 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 | 39 | | | 46 | | | 47 | 50 | 90 | | | |
| SWD | 21 | | | 25 | | | 23 | 31 | | | 4 | |
| ELL | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| AMI | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ASN | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| BLK | 29 | | | 32 | | | 35 | 38 | 86 | | 5 | |
| HSP | 33 | | | 25 | | | | | | | 2 | |
| MUL | 32 | | | 33 | | | | 25 | | | 3 | |
| PAC | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 44 | | | 54 | | | 52 | 58 | 89 | | 5 | |
| FRL | 33 | | | 39 | | | 40 | 44 | 85 | | 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 | 42 | 39 | 26 | 51 | 53 | 54 | 35 | 70 | 60 | | | |
| SWD | 25 | 31 | 19 | 34 | 48 | 44 | 32 | 50 | 64 | | | |
| ELL | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| AMI | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ASN | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| 2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Subgroups | ELA Ach. | ELA LG | ELA LG L25% | Math Ach. | Math LG | Math LG L25% | Sci Ach. | SS Ach. | MS Accel. | Grad Rate 2020-21 | C & C Accel 2020-21 | ELP Progress |
| BLK | 25 | 36 | 27 | 37 | 47 | 41 | 22 | 65 | 42 | | | |
| HSP | 50 | 60 | | 50 | 80 | | | | | | | |
| MUL | 49 | 46 | | 45 | 56 | | 43 | | 62 | | | |
| PAC | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 49 | 39 | 26 | 57 | 54 | 63 | 39 | 71 | 66 | | | |
| FRL | 37 | 37 | 21 | 43 | 48 | 50 | 35 | 62 | 51 | | | |

| 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 | 46 | 49 | 40 | 49 | 46 | 44 | 36 | 56 | 67 | | | |
| SWD | 29 | 44 | 40 | 36 | 45 | 43 | 32 | 32 | | | | |
| ELL | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| AMI | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ASN | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| BLK | 30 | 41 | 33 | 34 | 43 | 43 | 14 | 47 | 62 | | | |
| HSP | 63 | 63 | | 53 | 47 | | | | | | | |
| MUL | 46 | 58 | | 57 | 48 | | 36 | 44 | | | | |
| PAC | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 51 | 51 | 41 | 54 | 47 | 49 | 44 | 61 | 69 | | | |
| FRL | 40 | 47 | 39 | 42 | 44 | 43 | 27 | 52 | 59 | | | |

**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% | 30% | 0% | 47% | -17% |
| 08 | 2023 - Spring | 50% | 50% | 0% | 47% | 3% |

| ELA | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 06 | 2023 - Spring | 28% | 28% | 0% | 47% | -19% |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 06 | 2023 - Spring | 36% | 36% | 0% | 54% | -18% |
| 07 | 2023 - Spring | 37% | 37% | 0% | 48% | -11% |
| 08 | 2023 - Spring | 51% | 51% | 0% | 55% | -4% |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 08 | 2023 - Spring | 47% | 47% | 0% | 44% | 3% |

| ALGEBRA | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| N/A | 2023 - Spring | 91% | 56% | 35% | 50% | 41% |

| CIVICS | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| N/A | 2023 - Spring | 48% | 48% | 0% | 66% | -18% |

## III. Planning for Improvement

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

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

The lowest performing component was ELA on FAST PM3 scores. Our 6th grade students came in at 82% below proficiency. These students were 3rd graders during the Covid pandemic and have struggled consistently.

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

Civics EOC data showed the greatest decline. During 21-22, we had approximately 70% of our students showing as proficient. During the 22-23 school year, we declined to 47% proficient. Multiple teacher changes throughout the school year contributed to the 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.**

Our greatest gap is in Social Studies (Civics). The state average was 67% and we are at 47%, which a gap of 20 percentage points. Multiple teachers changes this school year contributed to the gap.

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

Science is our area of most improvement. During the school year, we moved experience teachers into the 8th grade science positions.

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

Two areas of concern are ELA Level 1 on the FAST and Math Level 1 on the FAST.

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

1. Discipline
2. Attendance
3. ELA FAST Achievement
4. Math FAST Achievement
5. Civics Achievement

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

## #1. 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.

In the prior school year, TCMS had 216 students with one or more suspensions, 2007 discipline referrals, and 241 students with attendance below 90%. We are implementing a structured program which includes breathing and relaxation techniques, restorative circles that include state resiliency standards, and an increased number of restorative practices incorporated into our discipline matrix.

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

Students with one or more referrals, total number of discipline referrals, and students with attendance below 90% will all decrease by at least 3%.

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

This will be monitored by generating and reviewing a monthly EWS report via FOCUS.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Kasey Roberts (kasey.roberts@taylor.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.)

Restorative practices and resiliency standards are the evidence-based interventions that will target this area of focus.

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

These strategies are evidence-based and have been associated with improved school culture as well as a reduction in discipline referrals and student suspension rates.

**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 2 - Moderate 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.

Create and implement a restorative practice plan that includes preventive measures such as daily Box Breathing and Wellness Wednesday. Reactive restorative practice measures will be included in this plan.

**Person Responsible:** Angie Frostick (angie.frostick@taylor.k12.fl.us)

**By When:** Plan will be created and presented to teachers prior to the first day of school. Continuous monitoring will occur throughout the school year.

| **#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities** |
|---|

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed.
One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

The Federal Percents of Points Index indicates that our Students with Disabilities are at 39%.

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

We will focus on this subgroup in an effort to raise the index to 41% or higher, an increase of at least 2 percentage points.

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

Progress monitoring assessments will occur three times throughout the year for ELA, Math, Science, and Civics. Data analysis will occur following each assessment.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Keri Bean (keri.bean@taylor.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-based interventions are ExactPath and Study Island by Edmentum for ELA and Math, as well as Study Island for Science and Civics. Read180 and Math180 are additional interventions that target lowest-performing students.

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

These strategies were chosen due to their high ESSA tier rating.

**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 2 - Moderate 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.

Analyzing prior year student data for placement in correct courses to match the interventions.

**Person Responsible:** Yvonne Heartsfield (yvonne.heartsfield@taylor.k12.fl.us)

**By When:** Prior to the beginning of the school year.

Providing professional learning to teachers on implementing the necessary interventions and strategies.

**Person Responsible:** Yvonne Heartsfield (yvonne.heartsfield@taylor.k12.fl.us)

**By When:** Ongoing throughout the school year during weekly content area PLC's.

Data analysis following each progress monitoring assessment.

**Person Responsible:** Yvonne Heartsfield (yvonne.heartsfield@taylor.k12.fl.us)

**By When:** Following each progress monitoring assessment.

**#3. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Black/African-American**

**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.

The Federal Percents of Points Index indicates that our Students with Disabilities are at 38%.

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

We will focus on this subgroup in an effort to raise the index to 41% or higher, an increase of at least 3 percentage points.

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

Progress monitoring assessments will occur three times throughout the year for ELA, Math, Science, and Civics. Data analysis will occur following each assessment.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Keri Bean (keri.bean@taylor.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-based interventions are ExactPath and Study Island by Edmentum for ELA and Math, as well as Study Island for Science and Civics. Read180 and Math180 are additional interventions that target lowest-performing students.

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

These strategies were chosen due to their high ESSA tier rating.

**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 2 - Moderate 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.

Analyzing prior year student data for placement in correct courses to match the interventions.

**Person Responsible:** Yvonne Heartsfield (yvonne.heartsfield@taylor.k12.fl.us)

**By When:** Prior to the beginning of the school year.

Providing professional learning to teachers on implementing the necessary interventions and strategies.

**Person Responsible:** Yvonne Heartsfield (yvonne.heartsfield@taylor.k12.fl.us)

**By When:** Ongoing throughout the school year during weekly content area PLC's.

Data analysis following each progress monitoring assessment.

**Person Responsible:** Yvonne Heartsfield (yvonne.heartsfield@taylor.k12.fl.us)

**By When:** Following each progress monitoring assessment.

Analyzing prior year student data for placement in correct courses to match the interventions.

**Person Responsible:** Yvonne Heartsfield (yvonne.heartsfield@taylor.k12.fl.us)

**By When:** Prior to the beginning of the school year.

Providing professional learning to teachers on implementing the necessary interventions and strategies.

**Person Responsible:** Yvonne Heartsfield (yvonne.heartsfield@taylor.k12.fl.us)

**By When:** Ongoing throughout the school year during weekly content area PLC's.

Data analysis following each progress monitoring assessment.

**Person Responsible:** Yvonne Heartsfield (yvonne.heartsfield@taylor.k12.fl.us)

**By When:** Following each progress monitoring assessment.

## 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 school leadership team, in conjunction with the School Advisory Council, and district administration, analyzes per-pupil expenditures, instructional time, early interventions, teacher quality, school leadership quality, facilities and availability of rigorous content/courses, as well as the need for specialized instructional support personnel.