

South Sumter Middle School



Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	11
III. Planning for Improvement	16
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	29
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	0
VI. Title I Requirements	29
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	30

South Sumter Middle School

773 NW 10TH AVE, Webster, FL 33597

[no web address on file]

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Sumter County School Board on 11/14/2023.

SIP Authority

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

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

Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)

A school not identified for CSI or TSI, but has one or more subgroups with a Federal Index below 41%.

Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)

A school not identified as CSI that has at least one consistently underperforming subgroup with a Federal Index below 32% for three consecutive years.

Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)

A school can be identified as CSI in any of the following four ways:

1. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%;
2. Have a graduation rate at or below 67%;
3. Have a school grade of D or F; or
4. Have a Federal Index below 41% in the same subgroup(s) for 6 consecutive years.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

I. School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

South Sumter Middle School will teach with commitment and conviction to provide all students with opportunities to achieve college and career success in a global community through rigorous instruction, forward thinking, and research based strategies that will equip each student with the skills necessary for college, careers, and life.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Inspiring all students to persevere and achieve lifelong success.

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
Shea, Melynda	Principal	As per the Sumter County School District, the duties of the principal include but are not limited to: maintain an effective learning climate in the schools, utilizing available resources effectively. Schedule classes within established guides to meet student needs, supervise the guidance program to enhance individual student education and development, establish guides for proper student conduct and maintaining discipline according to due process to the rights of the student, supervise and direct instructional staff in the development and implementation of approved curriculum, and recommend the employment, assignment, termination, evaluation of the total school staff.
Woythaler, Amanda	Assistant Principal	As per the Sumter County School District, the duties of the assistant principal include: serves as the principal in the absence of the regular principal, assist the principal in the overall administration of the school, perform such other duties as may be assigned by the Superintendent or Assigned Designee.
Palazzo, Katherine	Assistant Principal	As per the Sumter County School District, the duties of the assistant principal include: serves as the principal in the absence of the regular principal, assist the principal in the overall administration of the school, perform such other duties as may be assigned by the Superintendent or Assigned Designee.
Grant, Gaylyn	Reading Coach	As per the Sumter County School District, the duties of the reading coach include but are not limited to: plans and administers remedial reading program focusing on student academic growth, recommends adoption and use of varied instructional materials, including textbooks, reference works, trade books, audiovisual aids and the like, organizes and leads staff development programs which are needs-based and focused on the accomplishments of the established reading benchmarks, interprets, as appropriate, test results and statistical data concerning reading to the administration staff and public at large.
Shirley, Desa-Rae	Other	As per the Sumter County School District, the duties of the MTSS Coordinator includes but are not limited to: process and document all requests for PS/RTI program assistance in a timely manner, research scientific based and evidence based interventions to provide options for Standard Protocol Development and TIPS Teams, meet with teacher/interventionist and complete the required documentation for Tier 2 Standard Protocol with teacher/interventionist, enter individual students PS/RTI data in Skyward. Document parent contact throughout the process, and obtain consent for small group counseling, behavioral specialist and other services.
Worrell, Cortny	Other	To provide an educational atmosphere in which students will move forward the fulfillment of their potential for intellectual, emotional, physical, and psychological growth and maturation in accordance with the District philosophy, goals and objectives.

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Epperson, Christopher	Assistant Principal	As per the Sumter County School District, the duties of the assistant principal include: serves as the principal in the absence of the regular principal, assist the principal in the overall administration of the school, perform such other duties as may be assigned by the Superintendent or Assigned Designee.

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 first step in the process is to present student achievement data to the staff. This data provides valuable insights into the current state of student learning and helps identify areas that require improvement. Following the presentation of the student achievement data, collaborative discussions take place with the staff. The aim of these discussions is to involve the expertise and perspectives of the staff in the planning process. The goals and action steps for the school improvement plan are planned through team leader and department Professional Learning Communities (PLCs). Once the goals and action steps are developed, the school improvement plan is presented to the School Advisory Council (SAC). The SAC is composed of students, staff, parents, and community partners who play a vital role in providing feedback and shaping the plan. Feedback is solicited from the SAC regarding the presented school improvement plan. This feedback is carefully considered and used to update and refine the plan. By involving diverse stakeholders, the plan becomes representative of the needs and interests of the entire school community. The final version of the school improvement plan, incorporating the feedback received from the SAC, is presented to the public. This ensures transparency in the planning process and allows for broader engagement and involvement of community members. The final version of the school improvement plan, incorporating the feedback received from the SAC, is presented to the public. This ensures transparency in the planning process and allows for broader engagement and involvement of community members.

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 continuously monitored to ensure progress is being made towards meeting specific goals. This may result in additions and/or changes to action steps or goals to meet student needs based on stakeholder feedback. Updates, progress, and/or changes will be shared at SAC meetings, communicated with parents, and discussed with appropriate staff for ongoing feedback and implementation. The District will monitor the implementation of the SIP through monthly calls with the Bureau of School Improvement. All goals will be reviewed with staff monthly for reflection and improvement purposes, as per the Superintendent. This reflection data will be shared during staff meetings and included on meeting agendas.

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	36%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	97%
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: B 2018-19: B 2017-18: B
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

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

Indicator	Grade Level										Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	125	137	120	382	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	45	45	28	118	
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	3	1	12	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	4	2	15	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	57	83	74	214	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	49	46	28	123	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	57	83	73	213	

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	60	68	8	136

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	15	16	6	37	
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	91	104	82	277	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	23	111	88	222	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	65	37	43	145	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	37	55	39	131	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	61	66	63	190	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	69	56	44	169	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	49	116	102	267

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	17	2	19
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	2

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	91	104	82	277	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	23	111	88	222	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	65	37	43	145	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	37	55	39	131	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	61	66	63	190	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	69	56	44	169	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		

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

Indicator	Grade Level										Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	49	116	102	267	

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	17	2	19
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	2

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*	52	53	49	51	51	50	55		
ELA Learning Gains				50			50		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				37			34		
Math Achievement*	57	58	56	51	37	36	56		
Math Learning Gains				45			39		

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				39			33		
Science Achievement*	48	48	49	52	51	53	54		
Social Studies Achievement*	62	61	68	57	45	58	73		
Middle School Acceleration	66	66	73	66	40	49	67		
Graduation Rate					53	49			
College and Career Acceleration					56	70			
ELP Progress		40	40	45	65	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	57
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	285
Total Components for the Federal Index	5
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	3
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	493
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	98

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index

Graduation Rate

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY

ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	30	Yes	3	2
ELL	36	Yes	2	
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	49			
HSP	52			
MUL	52			
PAC				
WHT	59			
FRL	51			

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	26	Yes	2	1
ELL	31	Yes	1	1
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	34	Yes	1	
HSP	47			
MUL	42			
PAC				
WHT	52			
FRL	45			

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	52			57			48	62	66			
SWD	28			31			25	34			4	
ELL	29			39				40			3	
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	41			47			29	64	62		5	
HSP	42			50			40	61	67		5	
MUL	52			56			42	57			4	
PAC												
WHT	56			60			52	62	67		5	
FRL	46			51			40	58	58		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	51	50	37	51	45	39	52	57	66			45
SWD	21	31	31	20	33	35	17	29	20			
ELL	23	34	22	28	44	59	25	0				45
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	32	42	33	30	32	32	11	60				
HSP	51	52	29	52	42	43	49	45	63			45
MUL	44	39	27	35	46	60	38	44				
PAC												
WHT	54	51	42	54	47	38	58	60	67			
FRL	44	45	37	43	43	39	46	51	57			

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	55	50	34	56	39	33	54	73	67			
SWD	27	35	26	32	25	22	32	44	47			
ELL	38	39	22	38	28	29		57				
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	28	38	28	37	34	29	19	47	42			
HSP	56	52	29	54	38	29	48	73	68			
MUL	48	46		51	40		75	57	67			
PAC												
WHT	59	51	38	60	40	33	59	76	68			
FRL	49	46	34	51	39	31	47	66	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	44%	50%	-6%	47%	-3%
08	2023 - Spring	49%	54%	-5%	47%	2%
06	2023 - Spring	60%	60%	0%	47%	13%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	57%	69%	-12%	54%	3%
07	2023 - Spring	59%	62%	-3%	48%	11%
08	2023 - Spring	59%	54%	5%	55%	4%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	47%	49%	-2%	44%	3%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	69%	49%	20%	50%	19%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	97%	67%	30%	48%	49%

CIVICS						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	61%	66%	-5%	66%	-5%

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.

Seventh grade ELA demonstrated a proficiency level of 44%. Factors that contributed to low performance include attendance and staffing concerns.

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

Algebra I proficiency demonstrated the greatest decline with 21-22 proficiency at 83% dropping to 69% in 22-23. Contributing factors to this decline include new staff and implementation of new core curriculum.

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.

Seventh grade ELA Data demonstrated the biggest gap in proficiency when compared to the state for the 22-23 school year. State proficiency was 47% and South Sumter Middle School seventh grade ELA was 44%. Factors that contributed to this gap were attendance and staffing concerns.

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

Geometry showed an 18% increase in proficiency when compared to the 21-22 school year. This improvement is due to consistency in staffing and student placement.

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

Based on EWS data, school-wide attendance is a concern. Increasing consistent student attendance will be a priority for the 23-24 school year.

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

- Increase schoolwide attendance.
- Increase and/or maintain academic proficiency in all content areas, specifically for our subgroups.
- Decrease discipline referrals through the use of PBIS initiatives.

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 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.

High levels of consistent student attendance is essential for academic growth and success for all learners. By fostering a school culture that incorporates our school-wide expectations:

Have respect

Own your outcomes

Work your hardest

Lead positively

students are empowered to be present daily and make an impact on our campus. This includes frequent monitoring, incentives, recognition, and/or corrective measures to increase daily student attendance for all students; including students with disabilities, English Language Learners, and African Americans.

Measurable Outcome:

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

South Sumter Middle School will see an overall daily attendance average of at least 92.5% for the 23-24 school year.

Monitoring:

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

South Sumter Middle School will follow the district attendance policy regarding unexcused absences. Weekly, monthly, and quarterly attendance monitoring will take place by the assistant principal intern and attendance clerk. Parents will be contacted regarding unexcused and frequent student absences. Student recognition and rewards will be utilized for reaching specific attendance targets.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Katherine Palazzo (katherine.palazzo@sumter.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.)

PBIS implementation that focuses on Level 1 instruction and intervention. Weekly and monthly monitoring of student attendance data to identify individual trends and excessive absences and/or tardies. Parents will be contacted via phone call to discuss attendance concerns. Positive reinforcement will be utilized to recognize students with high rates of consistent attendance. Additional interventions include counseling services, health resources and mentoring.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Ongoing attendance monitoring will allow for communication to parent and student regarding attendance concerns before attendance issues become excessive. Through monitoring and communication, barriers can be identified and addressed to remedy attendance concerns. Positive reinforcement/rewards for high attendance rates will support school culture initiatives and encourage schoolwide expectations.

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.

- Weekly monitoring of unexcused absences. Parent phone call for first identified unexcused absence; phone call with written documentation after 3rd unexcused absence is identified.
- Attendance incentives will be utilized to recognize and reward students with over 95% attendance each month.
- Parent letters will be sent home at the end of each month for students who missed more than 10% of school for that given month. Included with parent letter is an article identifying the importance of school attendance.

Person Responsible: Katherine Palazzo (katherine.palazzo@sumter.k12.fl.us)

By When: Upon first and third discovery of an individual student with unexcused absences or monthly.

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA**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.

For the 22-23 school year, 6th grade ELA students demonstrated a 10% increase in proficiency from 50% in 21-22 going up to 60% in 22-23. 7th grade ELA students demonstrated a 3% decrease in proficiency when compared to the 21-22 school year, with 47% proficient decreasing to 44% proficient. 8th grade ELA demonstrated a decrease in proficiency as well, with a 7% decrease from 56% proficient in 21-22 to 49% proficiency in 22-23.

At this time learning gain data is unavailable.

Measurable Outcome:

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

South Sumter Middle School will increase ELA proficiency in grades 6, 7 and 8 to 62% on the end of year FAST Assessment. All students (100%) will demonstrate learning gains after each FAST PM Assessment. There are three assessments in which we will be looking for learning gains; PM1, PM2, and PM3. 100% of the students in the bottom quartile will show learning gains after each FAST PM Assessment.

Monitoring:

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

Support provided by reading coach/interventionist, grade level data chats, monitoring through administrative walkthroughs and evidence submission checks.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Amanda Woythaler (amanda.woythaler@sumter.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 strategies to be utilized are: Explicit instruction, fidelity to HMH Reading Curriculum, fidelity to HMH Common Grade Level Assessments, fidelity to common assessments that align to Florida State Benchmarks, weekly Common Lit, quarterly writing assessments with evidence submission and PLC follow-up, monthly ELA department PLC's focused on high impact instructional strategies.

For Intensive Reading classes, instruction will primarily be small group for Level 1 and MTSS Tier 3 students. This includes using resources from iReady phonics program and the iReady Toolbox Lessons for grade level standards.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Utilizing state approved curriculum and an increase in small group focused instruction will ensure that students are provided with the resources and opportunity to make academic gains in ELA.

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.

Explicit Instruction

Fidelity to HMH Reading Curriculum

Fidelity to HMH and state benchmark common grade level assessments.

Weekly Common Lit.

Quarterly common writing assessments with evidence submission and PLC follow-up.

Monthly ELA department PLC's focused on high impact instructional strategies.

"Scouting Walks" during planning time.

Small group instruction focus in Intensive Reading classes.

FAST PM1 and PM2 Data Chats.

Additional targeted intervention for MTSS and acceleration students.

Vertical alignment by grade level.

Person Responsible: Amanda Woythaler (amanda.woythaler@sumter.k12.fl.us)

By When: Ongoing/as needed.

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math**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.

Based on end of year assessment data, Algebra I demonstrated the greatest decline in proficiency with a 14% decrease from the 21-22 to 22-23 school year.

Measurable Outcome:

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

For the 23-24 school year, South Sumter Middle School will demonstrate at least 80% proficiency in Algebra I. Math proficiency for 6th, 7th, and 8th grade students will be at least 62% on end of year FAST assessments for the 23-24 school year. 100% of students will show learning gains after each FAST PM Assessment. There are three assessments in which we will be looking for learning gains PM1, PM2, and PM 3.

Monitoring:

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

Data review following common assessments and FAST PM testing. Data chats with students to identify areas of strengths and weaknesses. Administrative walkthroughs, gradebook and lesson plan reviews.

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.)

Fidelity to utilizing explicit instruction, core curriculum (Savvas) and resources that directly align to FL BEST Math Standards. Monthly math department PLC's that focus on high impact instructional strategies. MTSS math interventions for Tier 3 students through additional small group instruction.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Utilizing state approved curriculum and targeted small group instruction will ensure that needs are met for all students.

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.

Explicit Instruction and fidelity to Savvas math curriculum. Utilization of common grade level assessments. Monthly Math Department PLC's which focus on high impact instructional strategies (WICOR). MTSS Math interventions: Tier 3 will receive additional pullout small group instruction. Advanced Math Block Small Group Instruction - Target Group is Level 3 students. Small group instruction provided by the classroom teacher. Math Block Push-In Small Group Instruction - Target Group is Level 2 and Level 3 students; support provided by classroom teacher, math interventionists, inclusion teacher, and/or inclusion

paras. Monthly grade level math department PLC's focused on standards, curriculum, and data. FAST PM 1 and PM 2 Data Chats (teacher to student and administrator to teacher). Additional iReady instructional program usage.

Person Responsible: Christopher Epperson (christopher.epperson@sumter.k12.fl.us)

By When: Ongoing/consistent monitoring and re-evaluation.

#4. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Social Studies**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.

For the 2022-2023 academic school year, the number of students proficient in Social Studies (Civics) increased to 62%, which is a 5% increase from the year prior.

Measurable Outcome:

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

A minimum of 66% of students will score a level 3 or higher on the Civics EOC exam.

Monitoring:

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

Monitored through administrative walkthroughs, gradebook checks, and lesson plan review/checks.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Melynda Shea (melynda.shea@sumter.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

The evidence-based strategies that will be utilized are explicit instruction and fidelity to the civics curriculum, fidelity to civics common grade level assessments, monthly social studies department PLC's which are focused on high impact instructional strategies.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Utilizing state approved curriculum will ensure that we target areas of need for our specific student populations.

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.

Explicit Instruction.

Fidelity to civics curriculum

Fidelity to common grade level assessments

Monthly social studies department PLC's focused on high impact instructional strategies

"Scouting walks" and department meetings to discuss application of instructional practices and outcomes.

Monthly grade social studies department meetings focuses on standards, curriculum, and data results associated with grade level assessments.

Develop a plan for remediation for students scoring below a 70 on chapter/unit assessments that utilizes small group instruction.

Common assessment data chats (teacher to student & admin to teacher)

Person Responsible: Melynda Shea (melynda.shea@sumter.k12.fl.us)

By When: Ongoing, monthly.

#5. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science**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.

For the 2022-2023 academic school year the number of students proficient in science decreased from 52% proficient to 47% proficient; a 5% decrease.

Measurable Outcome:

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

For the 2023-2024 academic school year, SSMS will have at least 55% proficiency for the end of year Florida Statewide Science Assessment for 8th grade students.

Monitoring:

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

Monitored through administrative walkthroughs and gradebook checks.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Katherine Palazzo (katherine.palazzo@sumter.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 strategies that will be utilized include explicit instruction, fidelity to the science curriculum, fidelity to science common grade level assessments, and monthly science department PLC's that are focused on high impact instructional strategies.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Utilizing state approved curriculum and an increase in small group instruction will ensure the needs are met for all students.

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.

Explicit instruction

Fidelity to science curriculum

Fidelity to common grade level assessments

Monthly science department PLC's which focus on using high impact instructional strategies

Monthly grade level science department PLC's which focus on standards, curriculum, and data associated with grade level assessments.

Development of a plan for remediation for students who score below a 70 on chapter/unit assessments which includes small group instruction.

Person Responsible: Katherine Palazzo (katherine.palazzo@sumter.k12.fl.us)

By When: Ongoing, monthly.

#6. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups**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.

For the 22-23 academic school year, 6th grade math proficiency for students with disabilities were 38%, English language learners were 31%, and African American students were 40%. 7th grade math proficiency for students with disabilities were 24%, English language learners were 78% and African American students were 37%. 8th grade math proficiency for students with disabilities were 36%, English language learners were 25%, and African American students were 84%.

6th grade ELA proficiency for students with disabilities were 34%, English language learners were 31% and African American students were 50%. 7th grade ELA proficiency for students with disabilities were 24%, English language learners were 11%, and African American students were 42%. 8th grade ELA proficiency for students with disabilities were 24% and African American students were 20%

Measurable Outcome:

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

South Sumter Middle School will increase the percentage of students at proficiency in all subgroups for all content areas to 41% on the end of year FAST Test. 100% of students including those in the bottom quartile, will show learning gains after each PM Assessment.

Monitoring:

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

Supported by Math and ELA interventionists/support staff, grade level data chats, administrative walkthroughs, gradebook checks and lesson plan checks.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Melynda Shea (melynda.shea@sumter.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.)

Explicit instruction and fidelity to Math, ELA, Civics and Science curriculum. Increased small group instruction and additional online/computer-based intervention that is targeted toward specific student need.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Utilizing state approved curriculum and increasing small group instruction will ensure target areas are achieved to meet the needs of all students.

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.

Explicit Instruction

Administration walkthroughs.

Data chats between teachers and students and administration and teachers.

PLCs focused on meeting the needs of all learners; specifically subgroups

Data analysis following PM testing identifying areas of concern to specifically target.

Person Responsible: Melynda Shea (melynda.shea@sumter.k12.fl.us)

By When: Ongoing monitoring, monthly.

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).

School improvement funding allocations and proposed expenses will be reviewed by the School Advisory Council (SAC) to ensure they align to the needs as outlined in the Areas of Focus in the School Improvement Plan.

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.

The SIP, including progress and updates will be shared at School Advisory Council meetings and will be available to view on the schools webpage - <https://www.sumter.k12.fl.us/site/Default.aspx?PageID=17>. SIP goals and updates will be available through our monthly parent newsletter.

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))

South Sumter Middle School will emphasize, "Everyone, Everyday" to communicate the importance of consistent daily attendance. The school will utilize the Remind app to communicate monthly newsletters, important information and updates, and to share information on school/district wide events. Paper newsletters/flyers will be sent home regularly to communicate information in both English and Spanish. SAC meetings will occur quarterly with the dates to be posted on the school and district website for parent, student, and community participation. Back to school and orientation events will occur at the beginning of the school year to begin to foster positive relationships. SSMS will utilize a Comprehensive

Needs Assessment to identify areas of concern and areas of strength to specifically target the 23-24 school year.

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)

South Sumter Middle school will utilize state approved curriculum to teach core curriculum areas. Teachers will use high yielding instructional practices through the use of AVID. Teachers will use student data to make instructional decisions that align to goals and student specific needs. Grade level departments and teams will meet monthly at a minimum to discuss academic alignment and progression towards meeting academic goals. Programs such as i-Ready, IXL, AR, myON, Generation Genius, STAR and others will be integrated to support instruction and standards-based learning.

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

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: Positive Culture and Environment: Other	\$0.00
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	\$0.00
3	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math	\$0.00
4	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Social Studies	\$0.00
5	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Science	\$0.00
6	III.B.	Area of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00

Budget Approval

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

No