

Seminole County Public Schools

SANFORD MIDDLE SCHOOL



2024-25 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

- SIP Authority 1
- I. School Information 3
 - A. School Mission and Vision 3
 - B. School Leadership Team 3
 - C. Stakeholder Involvement and Monitoring 9
 - D. Demographic Data 11
 - E. Early Warning Systems 12
- II. Needs Assessment/Data Review 15
 - A. ESSA School, District, State Comparison 16
 - B. ESSA School-Level Data Review 17
 - C. ESSA Subgroup Data Review 18
 - D. Accountability Components by Subgroup 21
 - E. Grade Level Data Review 24
- III. Planning for Improvement 25
- IV. Positive Culture and Environment 33
- V. Title I Requirements (optional) 37
- VI. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review 39
- VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus 40

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Seminole County School Board on 10/8/24.

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)
<p>A school can be identified as CSI in any of the following four ways:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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 parents), 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://cims2.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)	
I.E: Early Warning System	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II.A-E: Data Review		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
III.A: Data Analysis/Reflection	ESSA 1114(b)(6)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(4)
III.B, IV: Area(s) of Focus	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(i-iii)	
V: 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. The printed version in CIMS represents the SIP as of the "Printed" date listed in the footer.

I. School Information

A. School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement

At Sanford Middle School, our mission is to develop a more widely and diversely populated pipeline of students, with future ready skills, interested in STEM careers in an innovative, safe, and supportive learning environment. Where every student can think critically, and connect and apply STEM principles in order to solve real-world problems, through rigorous and relevant learning experiences across all disciplines.

Provide the school's vision statement

Sanford Middle School is a school where every student is a STEM student and every teacher is a STEM teacher. Our positive school culture and environment reflects: a supportive and fulfilling environment, learning conditions that meet the needs of all students, people who are sure of their roles and relationships in student learning, and a culture that values trust, respect, and high expectations. At Sanford Middle, we believe in the importance of continually consulting with various stakeholder groups. This practice is critical in formulating school improvement strategies that impact a positive school culture and environment.

B. School Leadership Team

School Leadership Team

For each member of the school leadership team, enter the employee name, and identify the position title and job duties/responsibilities as they relate to SIP implementation for each member of the school leadership team.

Leadership Team Member #1

Employee's Name

Dr. Mia Coleman

Position Title

Principal

Job Duties and Responsibilities

Support the Superintendent's vision for teaching and learning by ensuring that every student achieves academic success and remains safe.

Leadership Team Member #2

Employee's Name

Dr. Berna Munoz

Position Title

Assistant Principal & Principal Designee

Job Duties and Responsibilities

Support the Principal's vision for the school by aligning efforts and initiatives with the outlined strategic goals and objectives.

Leadership Team Member #3

Employee's Name

Cindy Brennan

Position Title

Assistant Principal

Job Duties and Responsibilities

Support the Principal's vision for the school by aligning efforts and initiatives with the outlined strategic goals and objectives.

Leadership Team Member #4

Employee's Name

Jennifer Coursin

Position Title

Assistant Principal

Job Duties and Responsibilities

Support the Principal's vision for the school by aligning efforts and initiatives with the outlined strategic goals and objectives.

Leadership Team Member #5

Employee's Name

Stephanie Lyons

Position Title

Assistant Principal

Job Duties and Responsibilities

Support the Principal's vision for the school by aligning efforts and initiatives with the outlined strategic goals and objectives.

Leadership Team Member #6

Employee's Name

Dr. Ronald Diltz

Position Title

Dean of Students

Job Duties and Responsibilities

Support the Principal's vision for the school by aligning efforts and initiatives with the outlined strategic goals and objectives.

Leadership Team Member #7

Employee's Name

Kiafa Moye

Position Title

Dean of Students

Job Duties and Responsibilities

Support the Principal's vision for the school by aligning efforts and initiatives with the outlined strategic goals and objectives.

Leadership Team Member #8

Employee's Name

Lori Crumpton

Position Title

Literacy Coach

Job Duties and Responsibilities

Identify and implement effective strategies to enhance content area literacy and create opportunities to unify and promote literacy across the entire school.

Leadership Team Member #9

Employee's Name

Leonie Campbell

Position Title

Reading Instructional Lead

Job Duties and Responsibilities

Identify and implement effective strategies to enhance content area literacy and create opportunities to unify and promote literacy across the entire school.

Leadership Team Member #10

Employee's Name

Natasha James

Position Title

Science Instructional Co-Lead

Job Duties and Responsibilities

Identify and implement effective strategies to enhance content area literacy and create opportunities to unify and promote literacy across the entire school.

Leadership Team Member #11

Employee's Name

Kim Coleman

Position Title

Science Instructional Co-Leader

Job Duties and Responsibilities

Identify and implement effective strategies to enhance content area literacy and create opportunities to unify and promote literacy across the entire school.

Leadership Team Member #12

Employee's Name

Elizabeth Kelsey

Position Title

NEST Teacher Leader

Job Duties and Responsibilities

Identify and implement effective strategies to enhance content area literacy and create opportunities to unify and promote literacy across the entire school.

Leadership Team Member #13

Employee's Name

Tisha Futrell

Position Title

Math Co-Instructional Leader

Job Duties and Responsibilities

Identify and implement effective strategies to enhance content area literacy and create opportunities to unify and promote literacy across the entire school.

Leadership Team Member #14

Employee's Name

Joni Hudson

Position Title

Math Co-Instructional Leader

Job Duties and Responsibilities

Identify and implement effective strategies to enhance content area literacy and create opportunities to unify and promote literacy across the entire school.

Leadership Team Member #15

Employee's Name

Courtney Friedman

Position Title

STEM/Elective Curriculum Leader

Job Duties and Responsibilities

Identify and implement effective strategies to enhance content area literacy and create opportunities to unify and promote literacy across the entire school.

Leadership Team Member #16

Employee's Name

Jamie Taylor

Position Title

STEM/Elective Curriculum Leader

Job Duties and Responsibilities

Identify and implement effective strategies to enhance content area literacy and create opportunities to unify and promote literacy across the entire school.

Leadership Team Member #17

Employee's Name

Meghan Schwartz

Position Title

Social Studies Coach

Job Duties and Responsibilities

Identify and implement effective strategies to enhance content area literacy and create opportunities to unify and promote literacy across the entire school.

Leadership Team Member #18

Employee's Name

David Salviejo

Position Title

Social Studies Co-Instructional Leader

Job Duties and Responsibilities

Identify and implement effective strategies to enhance content area literacy and create opportunities to unify and promote literacy across the entire school.

Leadership Team Member #19

Employee's Name

Mike Travis

Position Title

Social Studies Co-Instructional Leader

Job Duties and Responsibilities

Identify and implement effective strategies to enhance content area literacy and create opportunities to unify and promote literacy across the entire school.

C. Stakeholder Involvement and Monitoring

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. (ESEA 1114(b)(2))

Note: If a School Advisory Council is used to fulfill these requirements, it must include all required stakeholders.

Sanford Middle School encourages and seeks ongoing staff, parent, and community participation in the decisions impacting the school. During the 2023-2024 school year, parents and members of the school community provided feedback on the SIP plan and goals. The School Advisory Council (SAC) and curriculum leadership team, in addition to other groups, provided recommendations and considerations to be included in the 2024-2025 SIP. Additionally, the School Improvement Plan will be shared both as a whole through the SCPS main website as well as incrementally through varied weekly focuses within the principal's "Brave Connections" communication email. Throughout the year, the "Brave Connections" provides the opportunity to share portions of the SIP during relevant times and in a parent-friendly language.

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 academic standards, particularly for those students with the greatest achievement gap. Describe how the school will revise the plan with stakeholder feedback, as necessary, to ensure continuous improvement. (ESEA 1114(b)(3))

Sanford Middle School has taken a proactive approach by allocating time to thoroughly review the latest performance data. Teachers were asked to analyze this data to identify emerging trends, provide insightful feedback, and propose targeted solutions for improvement, especially in areas where performance is declining or stagnant.

Collaborative teams will work together to determine key data points that require ongoing monitoring and review. These points will be a central focus during staff/teacher weekly meetings, ensuring that instruction stays aligned and responsive to the needs of our students. Teachers will also have the opportunity to share and discuss effective and meaningful strategies during professional development sessions throughout the year, fostering a culture of continuous improvement and professional growth.

The progress we make will be consistently communicated to the School Advisory Council (SAC), which comprises parents, teachers, and community members. This inclusive approach ensures that a

diverse range of perspectives is considered, and all input is highly valued. By maintaining this open line of communication, we aim to drive our instructional practices forward, ultimately meeting the diverse needs of all students at Sanford Middle School.

D. Demographic Data

2024-25 STATUS (PER MSID FILE)	ACTIVE
SCHOOL TYPE AND GRADES SERVED (PER MSID FILE)	MIDDLE/JR. HIGH 6-8
PRIMARY SERVICE TYPE (PER MSID FILE)	K-12 GENERAL EDUCATION
2023-24 TITLE I SCHOOL STATUS	NO
2023-24 MINORITY RATE	71.7%
2023-24 ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED (FRL) RATE	47.4%
CHARTER SCHOOL	NO
RAISE SCHOOL	NO
2023-24 ESSA IDENTIFICATION *UPDATED AS OF 7/25/2024	ATSI
ELIGIBLE FOR UNIFIED SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT GRANT (UNISIG)	
2023-24 ESSA SUBGROUPS REPRESENTED (SUBGROUPS WITH 10 OR MORE STUDENTS) (SUBGROUPS BELOW THE FEDERAL THRESHOLD ARE IDENTIFIED WITH AN ASTERISK)	STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES (SWD)* ENGLISH LANGUAGE LEARNERS (ELL) ASIAN STUDENTS (ASN) BLACK/AFRICAN AMERICAN STUDENTS (BLK) HISPANIC STUDENTS (HSP) MULTIRACIAL STUDENTS (MUL) WHITE STUDENTS (WHT) ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED STUDENTS (FRL)
SCHOOL GRADES HISTORY <i>*2022-23 SCHOOL GRADES WILL SERVE AS AN INFORMATIONAL BASELINE.</i>	2023-24: A 2022-23: A* 2021-22: A 2020-21: 2019-20:

E. Early Warning Systems

1. Grades K-8

Current Year 2024-25

Using 2023-24 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 school days							51	71	45	167
One or more suspensions							98	111	123	332
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)							18	22	18	58
Course failure in Math							23	22	33	78
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment							96	73	58	227
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment							87	57	50	194
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.053, F.A.C. (only applies to grades K-3)										0
Number of students with a substantial mathematics defined by Rule 6A-6.0533, F.A.C. (only applies to grades K-4)										0

Current Year 2024-25

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							105	98	78	281

Current Year 2024-25

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students retained:

INDICATOR	GRADE LEVEL								TOTAL	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		8
Retained students: current year							36	55	16	107
Students retained two or more times							5	2	9	16

Prior Year (2023-24) As Last 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 school days							73	57	58	188
One or more suspensions							33	54	36	123
Course failure in ELA							11	8	3	22
Course failure in Math							14	4	11	29
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment							89	103	89	281
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment							99	63	48	210
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.053, F.A.C. (only applies to grades K-3)										0

Prior Year (2023-24) As Last Reported (pre-populated)

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							85	78	66	229

Prior Year (2023-24) As Last Reported (pre-populated)

The number of students retained:

INDICATOR	GRADE LEVEL								TOTAL	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		8
Retained students: current year							26	23		49
Students retained two or more times							5	2		7

2. Grades 9-12 (optional)

This section intentionally left blank because it addresses grades not taught at this school or the school opted not to include data for these grades.

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review (ESEA Section 1114(b)(6))

A. ESSA School, District, State Comparison

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.

Data for 2023-24 had not been fully loaded to CIMIS at time of printing.

ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENT	2024			2023			2022**		
	SCHOOL	DISTRICT†	STATE†	SCHOOL	DISTRICT†	STATE†	SCHOOL	DISTRICT†	STATE†
ELA Achievement *	62	57	53	59	54	49	66	59	50
ELA Grade 3 Achievement **			21						
ELA Learning Gains	58	56	56				58		
ELA Learning Gains Lowest 25%	54	50	50				41		
Math Achievement *	75	65	60	69	61	56	69	37	36
Math Learning Gains	72	65	62				67		
Math Learning Gains Lowest 25%	58	60	60				50		
Science Achievement *	61	56	51	66	56	49	68	62	53
Social Studies Achievement *	74	73	70	71	72	68	82	62	58
Graduation Rate								59	49
Middle School Acceleration	84	77	74	83	76	73	83	51	49
College and Career Readiness								76	70
ELP Progress	78	65	49	42	50	40	44	80	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 (FPI) than in school grades calculation.

**Grade 3 ELA Achievement was added beginning with the 2023 calculation.

† District and State data presented here are for schools of the same type: elementary, middle, high school, or combination.

B. ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2023-24 ESSA FPPI	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL FPPI – All Students	68%
OVERALL FPPI Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the FPPI	676
Total Components for the FPPI	10
Percent Tested	97%
Graduation Rate	

ESSA OVERALL FPPI HISTORY						
2023-24	2022-23	2021-22	2020-21	2019-20*	2018-19	2017-18
68%	65%	63%	54%		62%	62%

* Pursuant to Florida Department of Education Emergency Order No. 2020-EO-1 (PDF), spring K-12 statewide assessment test administrations for the 2019-20 school year were canceled and accountability measures reliant on such data were not calculated for the 2019-20 school year. In April 2020, the U.S. Department of Education provided all states a waiver to keep the same school identifications for 2019-20 as determined in 2018-19 due to the COVID-19 pandemic.

C. ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

2023-24 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%
Students With Disabilities	38%	Yes	5	
English Language Learners	54%	No		
Asian Students	85%	No		
Black/African American Students	47%	No		
Hispanic Students	58%	No		
Multiracial Students	69%	No		
White Students	71%	No		
Economically Disadvantaged Students	54%	No		

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%
Students With Disabilities	32%	Yes	4	
English Language Learners	42%	No		
Asian Students	92%	No		
Black/African American Students	43%	No		
Hispanic Students	52%	No		
Multiracial Students	70%	No		
White Students	75%	No		
Economically Disadvantaged Students	48%	No		

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%
Students With Disabilities	33%	Yes	3	
English Language Learners	49%	No		
Native American Students				
Asian Students	84%	No		
Black/African American Students	48%	No		
Hispanic Students	53%	No		
Multiracial Students	72%	No		
Pacific Islander Students				
White Students	68%	No		
Economically Disadvantaged Students	52%	No		

D. 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)

2023-24 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS													
	ELA ACH.	GRADE 3 ELA ACH.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	MATH ACH.	MATH LG	MATH LG L25%	SCI ACH.	SS ACH.	MS ACCEL.	GRAD RATE 2022-23	C&C ACCEL 2022-23	ELP PROGRESS
All Students	62%		58%	54%	75%	72%	58%	61%	74%	84%			78%
Students With Disabilities	20%		43%	45%	34%	54%	45%	19%	26%	38%			60%
English Language Learners	38%		52%	46%	60%	71%	62%	27%	41%	63%			78%
Asian Students	83%		69%	69%	96%	88%	75%	89%	96%	98%			
Black/African American Students	37%		46%	44%	47%	54%	52%	33%	51%	61%			
Hispanic Students	50%		56%	54%	61%	66%	55%	43%	58%	61%			75%
Multiracial Students	57%		49%	50%	77%	74%	85%	67%	75%	90%			
White Students	65%		58%	64%	84%	70%	60%	70%	82%	83%			
Economically Disadvantaged Students	41%		48%	49%	57%	60%	54%	38%	55%	65%			75%

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS													
	ELA ACH.	GRADE 3 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	59%				69%			66%	71%	83%			42%
Students With Disabilities	22%				27%			23%	34%	58%			27%
English Language Learners	30%				43%			30%	41%	70%			39%
Asian Students	86%				93%			89%	94%	97%			
Black/African American Students	32%				42%			35%	49%	56%			
Hispanic Students	42%				54%			52%	50%	71%			41%
Multiracial Students	57%				68%			69%	73%	81%			
White Students	66%				75%			76%	78%	79%			
Economically Disadvantaged Students	38%				48%			47%	52%	65%			39%

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS

	ELA ACH.	GRADE 3 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	66%		58%	41%	69%	67%	50%	68%	82%	83%			44%
Students With Disabilities	24%		42%	36%	26%	41%	35%	28%	38%	50%			9%
English Language Learners	42%		50%	38%	47%	52%	37%	45%	57%	73%			44%
Native American Students													
Asian Students	89%		75%	60%	93%	87%	65%	94%	98%	96%			
Black/African American Students	37%		47%	36%	41%	56%	55%	41%	60%	63%			
Hispanic Students	54%		51%	36%	52%	51%	41%	59%	70%	71%			42%
Multiracial Students	73%		57%		75%	72%		71%	80%	75%			
Pacific Islander Students													
White Students	70%		56%	51%	77%	66%	49%	72%	91%	82%			
Economically Disadvantaged Students	46%		50%	39%	49%	55%	48%	53%	64%	72%			41%

E. 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.

2023-24 SPRING						
SUBJECT	GRADE	SCHOOL	DISTRICT	SCHOOL - DISTRICT	STATE	SCHOOL - STATE
Ela	6	64%	59%	5%	54%	10%
Ela	7	61%	56%	5%	50%	11%
Ela	8	54%	53%	1%	51%	3%
Math	6	65%	67%	-2%	56%	9%
Math	7	76%	69%	7%	47%	29%
Math	8	35%	30%	5%	54%	-19%
Science	8	56%	54%	2%	45%	11%
Civics		72%	72%	0%	67%	5%
Biology		100%	70%	30%	67%	33%
Algebra		83%	53%	30%	50%	33%
Geometry		99%	55%	44%	52%	47%
2023-24 WINTER						
SUBJECT	GRADE	SCHOOL	DISTRICT	SCHOOL - DISTRICT	STATE	SCHOOL - STATE
Biology						<i>* data suppressed due to fewer than 10 students or all tested students scoring the same.</i>
Algebra						<i>* data suppressed due to fewer than 10 students or all tested students scoring the same.</i>
2023-24 FALL						
SUBJECT	GRADE	SCHOOL	DISTRICT	SCHOOL - DISTRICT	STATE	SCHOOL - STATE
Algebra						<i>* data suppressed due to fewer than 10 students or all tested students scoring the same.</i>

III. Planning for Improvement

A. Data Analysis/Reflection (ESEA Section 1114(b)(6))

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

Most Improvement

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

Math achievement at Sanford Middle School improved significantly, rising from 69% proficiency to 75%. This 6-point increase can be attributed to our focused efforts on tier 2 instruction, the introduction of two intensive math classes, and a strong emphasis on tier 1 instruction. Additionally, pre-algebra class numbers were kept low, averaging 18 students per class. This allowed pre-algebra teachers to focus on a more individualized approach in their instruction based on student needs.

Lowest Performance

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

Eighth-grade math proficiency was our lowest area of performance at 35%. Trend data identifies an increase from 21% to 35%, reflecting significant progress. To continue improving outcomes, we will enhance core instruction and allocate time for small group scaffolding during centers, helping to bridge gaps between current standards and foundational concepts.

Students struggling in math will receive targeted Tier 2 instruction weekly. Their progress will be closely monitored by their teacher, the math grade level COL, and the administration during our regular data discussions. This comprehensive approach ensures we are closing gaps and supporting continued growth.

Greatest Decline

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

Science experienced the greatest decline from the prior year, with proficiency decreasing from 66% to 61%. This drop is primarily attributed to teacher turnover, which has impacted the continuity and effectiveness of instruction. Addressing this issue will be crucial in reversing the trend and improving science achievement.

Greatest Gap

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.

8th grade math showed the greatest gap compared to the state average. Contributing factors to this gap include the enrollment of all our Students with Disabilities (SWD), Free or Reduced Lunch (FRL) students, students of various ethnicities, and English Language Learners (ELLs) in pre-algebra. However, it is noteworthy that our 8th graders who take Geometry along with our 7th and 8th graders who take Algebra 1 demonstrate high proficiency levels.

EWS Areas of Concern

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

Areas of concern include high rates of absences and the number of Level 1 scores on statewide assessments. Addressing these issues is critical for improving overall student performance and achieving our educational goals.

Highest Priorities

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

- Encouraging students to monitor and set their own goals
- Increasing overall attendance rates
- Reducing the number of repeat offenders for suspension
- Enhancing literacy across all content areas
- Strengthening Tier 1 instruction

B. Area(s) of Focus (Instructional Practices)

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

Area of Focus #1

Address the school's highest priorities based on any/all relevant data sources.

ESSA Subgroups specifically relating to Students With Disabilities (SWD)

Area of Focus Description and Rationale

Include a description of your Area of Focus, how it affects student learning, and a rationale explaining how it was identified as a crucial need from the prior year data reviewed.

For the 2024-2025 school year, students with disabilities (SWD) have been identified as a key area of focus. This subgroup has required consistent support over the past several years. By specifically identifying and focusing on their needs, we can develop more intense and differentiated interventions and support strategies to help them close the learning gap. These students need a solid foundation upon which to build future knowledge. Through strategic planning, we can scaffold and enrich lessons to enhance their comprehension, which will ultimately implement best practices beneficial for all students and classes.

By acknowledging the unique challenges faced by SWD, we can tailor our approaches to better meet their needs. This ensures that we provide the necessary support to help them achieve academic success. In doing so, we not only address their individual learning requirements but also improve the overall quality of education within our school. Our commitment to SWD reflects our dedication to fostering an inclusive learning environment where every student has the opportunity to thrive. By implementing these best practices, we are taking meaningful steps towards closing the achievement gap and ensuring that all students receive the high-quality education they deserve.

Measurable Outcome

Include prior year data and state the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each relevant grade level. This should be a data-based, objective outcome.

With our commitment to recognizing and honoring the current abilities of students with disabilities (SWD), we anticipate notable increases in proficiency across various subjects. For 6th grade ELA, we expect proficiency to rise from 22% to 60%, for 7th grade ELA from 19% to 60%, and for 8th grade ELA from 15% to 60%. In math, we foresee proficiency improvements in 6th grade from 33% to 60%, in 7th grade from 38% to 65%, and in 8th grade from 24% to 60%.

Monitoring

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

how ongoing monitoring will impact student achievement outcomes.

Effective monitoring of students with disabilities (SWD) involves setting clear, measurable goals and using tracking progress regularly. By analyzing data from formative, summative, and standardized assessments, educators can adjust instruction and interventions to meet each student's needs. Engaging students in self-monitoring and maintaining strong communication with all stakeholders further supports targeted support and timely adjustments. This ongoing, data-driven approach enhances personalized instruction, accountability, and ultimately improves student achievement.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome

Administration, coaches, and teachers will all be responsible for monitoring outcomes.

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention (practices/programs) being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each relevant grade level, explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy, and describe how the identified interventions will be monitored for this Area of Focus (ESEA Section 8101(21)(B)).

Description of Intervention #1:

The Multi-Tiered Support System (MTSS) process is a team-based approach that relies on a strong collaboration between families and professionals from a variety of disciplines regardless of the level implemented. MTSS provides a positive and effective means to support student learning, attendance and behavior. Schools should have evidence of a strong Tier 1 framework of support in all of these areas.

Rationale:

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention:

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement:

List the action steps that will be taken to address this Area of Focus or implement this intervention. Identify 2-3 action steps and the person responsible for each step.

Action Step #1

Periodic data chats, intentional interventions, and fluid responses to intervention

Person Monitoring:

Administration, coaches, and teachers will all be responsible for monitoring outcomes.

By When/Frequency:

May 2025

Describe the Action to Be Taken and how the school will monitor the impact of this action step:

Administration will maintain a close partnership with coaches and teachers to ensure fidelity checks are performed on data conversations, meaningful interventions, and best practices for Tier 1 instruction. We will regularly conduct rigor walks to observe and evaluate classroom practices. These walks will be complemented by ongoing discussions about which strategies and methods are proving effective and which require refinement. This collaborative and iterative process will help us

continuously improve our instructional practices and ensure that we are meeting the needs of all students.

Action Step #2

Person Monitoring:

By When/Frequency:

Describe the Action to Be Taken and how the school will monitor the impact of this action step:

Area of Focus #2

Address the school's highest priorities based on any/all relevant data sources.

Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA, Math, Science, Social Studies

Area of Focus Description and Rationale

Include a description of your Area of Focus, how it affects student learning, and a rationale explaining how it was identified as a crucial need from the prior year data reviewed.

Additionally, a focus for this year is addressing the ascension and regression in student proficiency across English Language Arts (ELA) and Math. In ELA, 21.7% of students went from below a level 3 to a level 3 or higher, whereas 12.8% of students went from a level 3 or higher to below a level 3. Additionally, in Math, 35.7% of students went from nonproficient to proficient and 7.4% of students who were previously proficient fell below the proficiency threshold.

When analyzing proficiency across different performance levels, significant disparities emerged, particularly in Civics, where 73% of students were proficient overall. However, while 93% of advanced students reached proficiency, only 38% of standard students did so. This gap highlights the need for more targeted data tracking, trend analysis, and tiered instruction in class to ensure all students have access to the content in varied and meaningful ways throughout the year.

In ELA, the performance across grade levels will also be an area of focus. In 6th grade, 57% of advanced students met proficiency, with none scoring at the lowest level, while only 16% of standard students and 10% of reading support students did so, with ESOL students achieving 0% proficiency. Similar trends were seen in 7th and 8th grades, where the percentage of proficient students varied significantly between advanced, standard, and ESOL groups.

In Math, proficiency rates were notably higher among advanced students across grades, with 6th-grade advanced and RAMP students achieving 94% and 100% proficiency, respectively, compared to just 22% of standard students. In 7th grade, the trend continued, with 93% of advanced students proficient, whereas only 27% of standard students met the mark. Pre-Algebra and Algebra courses also showed discrepancies, with 36% and 48% proficiency rates, respectively, compared to a much higher 97% proficiency in Algebra Honors.

Addressing the needs of our lowest quartile students in both reading and math remains a top priority. Last year, our lowest quartile in ELA achieved a proficiency of 54%, while in math, the proficiency was 58%. We are committed to closely monitoring these students throughout the year. Their progress will be consistently reviewed during COLs, PLCs, and data chats with the administration.

To ensure they receive the support they need, our lowest quartile students will participate in weekly tiered interventions, with their progress being tracked and discussed. With targeted Tier 2 interventions and small group sessions within our block schedule, we will continue to provide the necessary support to help these students stay on track and achieve learning gains as we approach Progress Monitoring 3.

Measurable Outcome

Include prior year data and state the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each relevant grade level. This should be a data-based, objective outcome.

Sanford Middle School aims to see science proficiency increase from 19% to 60% and social studies proficiency reach 65%. These attainable goals underscore our dedication to elevating SWD through personalized support and comprehensive instructional strategies. By meeting students where they are and guiding them toward their academic targets, we are confident in our ability to foster substantial growth and enhance overall proficiency, ensuring that all students receive the quality education they deserve.

The school's action plan to improve ELA and Math proficiency focuses on a multifaceted approach that includes rigorous progress monitoring, enhanced data tracking, structured PLC (Professional Learning Community) communication, and targeted intervention plans.

The school will implement a more frequent and detailed progress monitoring system to track student performance in real-time. Benchmark assessments data will be analyzed to identify trends, strengths, and areas for improvement. Teachers will use formative assessments weekly to gauge student understanding and adjust instruction accordingly. This data will be collected and reviewed on a regular basis, allowing for continuous monitoring of student progress toward the established proficiency goals.

COL teams will meet weekly to review student data, discuss instructional strategies, building content vocabulary, and share best practices. These meetings will be structured to ensure that every student's progress is discussed, and interventions are planned for those not meeting benchmarks. Data from progress monitoring will guide these discussions, helping to identify which students need additional support and what types of instructional adjustments are necessary. COLs will also focus on

aligning curriculum and assessments to ensure consistency across grade levels and subjects.

For students identified as lowest quartile, at-risk, or regressing, the school will implement targeted intervention plans. The intervention strategies will be data-driven, using the information gathered from progress monitoring to tailor support that addresses the individual learning gaps. The school will also increase collaboration between classroom teachers, special education staff, and support personnel to provide a cohesive support system for these students. By leveraging a FIN training that highlights the collaborative teacher model, all classroom and special education staff will gain a clear understanding of their roles, ensuring that active learning is effectively facilitated throughout the classroom.

The use of meaningful data tracking will be central to all decision-making processes. The school will utilize data forms to visualize student progress and ensure that all stakeholders, including teachers, administrators, and parents, have access to up-to-date information. This transparency will foster a collaborative environment where everyone is working toward the same goals.

The action plan will be reviewed and adjusted as needed throughout the year. Based on data analysis, the school will be flexible in its approach, making necessary adjustments to instructional strategies, intervention plans, and resource allocation to ensure that the set goals are met.

By combining these strategies, the school aims to create a structured and responsive environment that supports student growth, addresses learning gaps, and ultimately leads to increased proficiency rates in ELA and Math across all grade levels.

Monitoring

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome. Include a description of how ongoing monitoring will impact student achievement outcomes.

Our focus area will be monitored throughout the school year, with strategic check-in points following key assessments including unit assessments, progress monitoring, and common nine-week evaluations. These checkpoints will enable our teams to analyze the data, identify trends, and gain insights, allowing for informed discussions on the best next steps.

This approach ensures we take proactive measures when students encounter difficulties, planning effective interventions and spiral reviews. By exposing students to concepts multiple times through varied checkpoints, we aim to reinforce learning and ensure comprehensive understanding. This continuous monitoring and strategic intervention process is designed to support every student in achieving success.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome

Administration, coaches, and teachers will all be responsible for monitoring outcomes.

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention (practices/programs) being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each relevant grade level, explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy, and describe how the identified interventions will be monitored for this Area of Focus (ESEA Section 8101(21)(B)).

Description of Intervention #1:

The following evidence-based interventions are available to middle schools to help them support students based upon the area of need of the individual student in ELA: Content Area Reading (demonstrates a rationale), iReady (moderate evidence), Lexia (strong evidence), Corrective Reading (strong evidence), and Reading Mastery (promising evidence). The following evidence-based interventions are available to support students based upon the area of need of the individual student in Math: iReady, SAVVAS enVision Math Diagnostic and Intervention System, Seminole Numeracy Project.

Rationale:

The rationale for selecting this evidence-based intervention strategy is rooted in its ability to provide targeted support to students who need it most, while also enabling continuous improvement in teaching and learning. By frequently monitoring student progress and using data to guide decisions, the school can quickly identify students who are struggling and adjust instruction to meet their needs. Regular PLC meetings ensure that teachers collaborate and share effective practices, creating consistency across classrooms. The use of small-group instruction allows for personalized support, helping students overcome specific challenges. Overall, this approach is designed to be responsive, flexible, and data-driven, ensuring that every student has the best chance to succeed. ELA-A variety of interventions are available to the schools to allow them to meet the needs of individual students. This allows all the areas of reading to be addressed from foundations to comprehension across the K-12 continuum. Math-All the listed interventions have research-based evidence for efficacy.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention:**Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?**

No

Action Steps to Implement:

List the action steps that will be taken to address this Area of Focus or implement this intervention. Identify 2-3 action steps and the person responsible for each step.

Action Step #1

Periodic data chats, intentional interventions, and fluid responses to intervention.

Person Monitoring:

Administration, coaches, and teachers will all be responsible for monitoring outcomes

By When/Frequency:

May 2025

Describe the Action to Be Taken and how the school will monitor the impact of this action step:

In ELA and Math, teachers will implement a tracking sheet for students to take accountability for their data through data chats and self-reflection exercises. Intentional interventions will be tailored to meet the evolving needs of students. Additionally, our students with disabilities (SWD) will be actively involved in documenting their accommodations, fostering self-advocacy and enabling teachers to provide targeted support where gaps exist. Administration will maintain a close partnership with coaches and teachers to ensure fidelity checks are performed on data conversations, meaningful

interventions, and best practices for Tier 1 instruction. We will regularly conduct rigor walks to observe and evaluate classroom practices. These walks will be complemented by ongoing discussions about which strategies and methods are proving effective and which require refinement. This collaborative and iterative process will help us continuously improve our instructional practices and ensure that we are meeting the needs of all students.

Action Step #2

Literacy Training

Person Monitoring:

ELA Leaders

By When/Frequency:

Monthly

Describe the Action to Be Taken and how the school will monitor the impact of this action step:

Literacy coaches, classroom teachers, and school administrators will receive a variety of professional learning and targeted support through district-facilitated trainings throughout the school year. Literacy coaches will meet monthly with district curriculum specialists to analyze reading data based on Tier 3 intervention programs, review instructional strategies, and prepare professional learning to present to classroom teachers on their campuses. School administrators will meet with district curriculum specialists quarterly to review data points and benchmark-aligned instructional strategies. In addition, schools will receive targeted support from district curriculum specialists to facilitate the use of differentiated instructional techniques based on individual student needs. SCPS K-12 Comprehensive Reading Plan

IV. Positive Culture and Environment

Area of Focus #1

Student Attendance

Area of Focus Description and Rationale

Include a description of your Area of Focus for each relevant grade level, how it affects student learning, and a rationale explaining how it was identified as a crucial need from the prior year data reviewed.

Students who miss multiple days of school are less likely to be proficient on unit assessments, progress monitoring, or state assessments. Students with multiple absences become frustrated by the content they missed, leading to further absences or disciplinary issues as they try to avoid tasks they find challenging. By addressing attendance issues and early warning signs proactively, we can help prevent the cycle of absences and academic difficulties, creating a more supportive and effective learning environment.

Measurable Outcome

Include prior year data and state the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each relevant grade level. This should be a data-based, objective outcome.

Last year, 51 6th graders, 71 7th graders, and 45 8th graders were absent for 10% or more of the

school year. By monitoring students through MTSS on a regular basis, we expect to see a 10% decline in our absence numbers.

Monitoring

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome. Include a description of how ongoing monitoring will impact student achievement outcomes.

Our MTSS team meets weekly, bringing together guidance counselors, assistant principals, deans, the school social worker, and input from the AIP teacher. The team focuses on at-risk students, ensuring that teachers are initiating first contact with parents and documenting all communications in EdInsight. The MTSS team will discuss tailored strategies for each student, including the use of our campus safe person list to determine if a student has a trusted individual they connect with. If so, we leverage that relationship to facilitate in-school check-ins. Additionally, the school social worker provides support to specific students as needed, ensuring they receive the necessary care.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome

Administration, coaches, and teachers will all be responsible for monitoring outcomes.

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention (practices/programs) being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes, explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy, and describe how the identified interventions will be monitored for this Area of Focus (ESEA Section 8101(21)(B)).

Description of Intervention #1:

State statute requires that school teams shall be diligent in facilitating intervention services and make all reasonable efforts to resolve nonattendance behavior. Using the MTSS problem-solving model, teams are responsible for providing and monitoring appropriate interventions for individual students. To ensure students are provided with the necessary resources and interventions, schools should form comprehensive teams with clear roles and responsibilities.

Rationale:

Through the use of evidence-based intervention supports, schools invest in fostering a culture that promotes engagement and attendance. However, some students struggle to attend school regularly. Unchecked absences can lead to lower achievement levels and gaps in knowledge that may prove challenging to overcome. It is critical for students and families to understand that absence due to arriving late, or missing full days, whether excused or unexcused can negatively affect learning. Efforts to curb tardiness, chronic absenteeism, and truancy can address the needs of students and families, mitigating student failure.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention:

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Description of Intervention #2:

Rationale:

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention:

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement:

Action Step #1

Person Monitoring:

By When/Frequency:

Describe the Action to Be Taken and how the school will monitor the impact of this action step:

Area of Focus #2

Multiple Early Warning Signs

Area of Focus Description and Rationale

Include a description of your Area of Focus for each relevant grade level, how it affects student learning, and a rationale explaining how it was identified as a crucial need from the prior year data reviewed.

This school year, we're prioritizing the identification and support of students with multiple early warning signs. Last year, we saw 105 sixth graders, 98 seventh graders, and 78 eighth graders flagged with two or more indicators. These students, often marked by frequent absences or suspensions, require targeted interventions and intentional support to help them succeed.

Measurable Outcome

Include prior year data and state the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each relevant grade level. This should be a data-based, objective outcome.

Last year, the total number of students with two or more early warning indicators was 281. Through the Multi-Tiered System of Supports (MTSS) our aim is to reduce the number of students with early warning indicators by 15%, ensuring they receive the support needed to improve their attendance and academic performance, ultimately setting them on a path to success.

Monitoring

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome. Include a description of how ongoing monitoring will impact student achievement outcomes.

The MTSS team will meet regularly to discuss students with multiple warning indicators, ensuring proper tier placement and timely data entry in EdInsight. We'll closely monitor the effectiveness of interventions, and if progress isn't observed, the team will decide whether to adjust the current strategy or escalate support with tier 3 interventions.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome

Administration, coaches, and teachers will all be responsible for monitoring outcomes.

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention (practices/programs) being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes, explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy, and describe how the identified interventions will be monitored for this Area of Focus (ESEA Section 8101(21)(B)).

Description of Intervention #1:

MTSS, or Multi-Tiered System of Supports, is a way schools provide different levels of help to students based on their individual needs. It ensures every child gets the right support, whether it's extra academic help, social-emotional support, or behavioral guidance.

Rationale:

MTSS is effective for students with multiple warning signs because it offers a personalized approach. By regularly monitoring each student's progress and adjusting support as needed, we can address challenges early on, helping students stay on track and succeed in school.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention:

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Description of Intervention #2:

Rationale:

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention:

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement:

Action Step #1

Person Monitoring:

By When/Frequency:

Describe the Action to Be Taken and how the school will monitor the impact of this action step:

V. Title I Requirements (optional)

A. Schoolwide Program Plan (SWP)

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 ESEA Section 1114(b). This section of the SIP is not required for non-Title I schools.

Dissemination Methods

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. (ESEA 1114(b)(4))

List the school's webpage where the SIP is made publicly available.

No Answer Entered

Positive Relationships With Parents, Families and other Community Stakeholders

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 Parental and Family Engagement Plan (PFEP) is made publicly available. (ESEA 1116(b-g))

No Answer Entered

Plans to Strengthen the Academic Program

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 II of the SIP. (ESEA Section 1114(b)(7)ii)

No Answer Entered

How Plan is Developed

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). (ESEA Sections 1114(b)(5) and 1116(e)(4))

No Answer Entered

B. Component(s) of the Schoolwide Program Plan

Components of the Schoolwide Program Plan, as applicable

Include descriptions for any additional, applicable strategies that address the needs of all children in the school, but particularly the needs of those at risk of not meeting the challenging state academic standards which may include the following:

Improving Student's Skills Outside the Academic Subject Areas

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. (ESEA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(I))

No Answer Entered

Preparing for Postsecondary Opportunities and the Workforce

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. (ESEA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(II))

No Answer Entered

Addressing Problem Behavior and Early Intervening Services

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 ESEA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(III)).

No Answer Entered

Professional Learning and Other Activities

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. (ESEA section 11149b)(7)(iii)(V)).

No Answer Entered

Strategies to Assist Preschool Children

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

No Answer Entered

VI. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review

This section must be completed if the school is identified as ATSI, TSI or CSI (ESEA Sections 1111(d)(1)(B)(4) and (d)(2)(C) and 1114(b)(6)).

Process to Review the Use of Resources

Describe the process to review the use of resources to meet the identified needs of students.

No Answer Entered

Specifics to Address the Need

Identify the specific resource(s), rationale (i.e., data) and plan to address the need(s) (i.e., timeline).

No Answer Entered

VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus

Check if this school is eligible for 2024-25 UniSIG funds but has chosen not to apply.

No

BUDGET	ACTIVITY	FUNCTION/ OBJECT	FUNDING SOURCE	FTE	AMOUNT
Plan Budget Total					0.00