

Seminole County Public Schools

MARKHAM WOODS 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 6
 - D. Demographic Data 7
 - E. Early Warning Systems 8
- II. Needs Assessment/Data Review 11
 - A. ESSA School, District, State Comparison 12
 - B. ESSA School-Level Data Review 13
 - C. ESSA Subgroup Data Review 14
 - D. Accountability Components by Subgroup 17
 - E. Grade Level Data Review 20
- III. Planning for Improvement 21
- IV. Positive Culture and Environment 34
- V. Title I Requirements (optional) 38
- VI. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review 40
- VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus 41

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

Engage. Empower. Educate.
Every Mustang.
Every Day.

Provide the school's vision statement

Through a culture of collaboration, curiosity, and continuous growth, we will increase the achievement of ALL Mustangs in a safe and supportive learning environment with the explicit intent of closing the achievement gap.

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. Jason McDonald

Position Title

Principal

Job Duties and Responsibilities

Operations of the School, School Improvement Plan, School Budget, Instructional Rounds, Professional Development, Human Resources, Literacy Plan, Behavior Coaching Academy

Leadership Team Member #2

Employee's Name

Dr. Eric Basilo

Position Title

Assistant Principal

Job Duties and Responsibilities

Mathematics, Biomechatronics, Arts, e-Pathways, Spanish, Master Schedule, School Improvement Plan, Literacy Plan, Title IX, Professional Development, Certification

Leadership Team Member #3

Employee's Name

Yvonne Bradley

Position Title

Assistant Principal

Job Duties and Responsibilities

ELA, Reading, ESE, ESOL, School Improvement Plan, Literacy Plan, SAC

Leadership Team Member #4

Employee's Name

Allisyn Brown

Position Title

Assistant Principal

Job Duties and Responsibilities

Science, Social Studies, PE, Custodial, Facilities, School Improvement Plan, Literacy Plan, Testing, PBIS, Emergency Response Team Coordinator

Leadership Team Member #5

Employee's Name

Presley Dershimer

Position Title

Dean

Job Duties and Responsibilities

Discipline, Supervision Schedule, School Improvement Plan, Literacy Plan, Bullying/HOPE, Mentor Coordinator, PBIS, Conditions for Learning, Behavior Coaching Academy, Mental Health Training

Leadership Team Member #6

Employee's Name

Dr. Raiza Agosto

Position Title

Dean

Job Duties and Responsibilities

Discipline, Supervision Schedule, School Improvement Plan, Literacy Plan, AIP, Restorative Practices Lead, MTSS, Behavior Coaching Academy

Leadership Team Member #7

Employee's Name

Hollie Rogers

Position Title

Instructional/Reading Coach

Job Duties and Responsibilities

Professional Development, Literacy Plan, iReady, Reading Placements, Write Score, Media Center, Behavior Coaching Academy, NEST Lead. Create and monitor school-wide literacy initiatives/ activities as well as monitor classroom implementation of literacy strategies such as K-W-L charts, read alouds, graphic organizers/Frayer model, reciprocal teaching, Cornell notes, elaborative interrogation, Venn diagrams, quick-write revisions, and problem-solving tasks.

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.

School Leaders work in partnership with the School Advisory Committee, PTSA, community surveys, student school safety surveys, and parent snapshot surveys to identify strengths and areas of growth to build relevant action plans and steps in support of the school.

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))

The SIP will be monitored monthly by administrators during leadership meetings where we will review our goals and action steps and check in to see if monitoring is happening with fidelity. After progress monitoring assessments and 9 weeks benchmark assessments, results will be shared with Curriculum Leaders to get a gauge on how implementation of the plan is working and what we need to do in the future to maximize student learning.

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	59.0%
2023-24 ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED (FRL) RATE	51.3%
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: B 2022-23: B* 2021-22: B 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							44	62	65	171
One or more suspensions							140	115	86	341
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)							36	33	16	85
Course failure in Math							31	25	1	57
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment							42	65	60	167
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment							32	47	40	119
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							108	62	50	220

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							28	27	0	55
Students retained two or more times							0	0	0	0

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							71	47	54	172
One or more suspensions							30	31	30	91
Course failure in ELA							22	12	9	43
Course failure in Math							25	13	16	54
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment							80	71	74	225
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment							117	46	42	205
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							107	57	60	224

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							36	17		53
Students retained two or more times							11	3		14

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 *	57	57	53	53	54	49	55	59	50
ELA Grade 3 Achievement **			21						
ELA Learning Gains	58	56	56				49		
ELA Learning Gains Lowest 25%	51	50	50				38		
Math Achievement *	66	65	60	63	61	56	63	37	36
Math Learning Gains	68	65	62				66		
Math Learning Gains Lowest 25%	60	60	60				55		
Science Achievement *	56	56	51	57	56	49	59	62	53
Social Studies Achievement *	66	73	70	67	72	68	73	62	58
Graduation Rate								59	49
Middle School Acceleration	87	77	74	85	76	73	87	51	49
College and Career Readiness								76	70
ELP Progress	61	65	49	42	50	40	65	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	63%
OVERALL FPPI Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the FPPI	630
Total Components for the FPPI	10
Percent Tested	98%
Graduation Rate	

ESSA OVERALL FPPI HISTORY						
2023-24	2022-23	2021-22	2020-21	2019-20*	2018-19	2017-18
63%	64%	61%	57%		61%	59%

* 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	39%	Yes	5	
English Language Learners	45%	No		
Asian Students	84%	No		
Black/African American Students	42%	No		
Hispanic Students	57%	No		
Multiracial Students	72%	No		
White Students	74%	No		
Economically Disadvantaged Students	52%	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	23%	Yes	4	3
English Language Learners	42%	No		
Asian Students	88%	No		
Black/African American Students	40%	Yes	1	
Hispanic Students	56%	No		
Multiracial Students	65%	No		
White Students	79%	No		
Economically Disadvantaged Students	49%	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	25%	Yes	3	2
English Language Learners	51%	No		
Native American Students				
Asian Students	81%	No		
Black/African American Students	44%	No		
Hispanic Students	61%	No		
Multiracial Students	61%	No		
Pacific Islander Students				
White Students	67%	No		
Economically Disadvantaged Students	53%	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	57%		58%	51%	66%	68%	60%	56%	66%	87%			61%
Students With Disabilities	23%		43%	46%	25%	52%	55%	27%	26%	56%			
English Language Learners	34%		58%	56%	36%	54%	54%	27%	29%				61%
Asian Students	78%		68%		93%	80%		88%	84%	95%			
Black/African American Students	33%		45%	45%	31%	52%	55%	24%	42%	53%			
Hispanic Students	47%		57%	48%	57%	62%	58%	43%	55%	80%			59%
Multiracial Students	60%		59%	60%	72%	81%		70%	82%	95%			
White Students	73%		65%	59%	85%	76%	66%	72%	82%	91%			
Economically Disadvantaged Students	40%		49%	47%	46%	59%	58%	36%	45%	73%			63%

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	53%				63%			57%	67%	85%			42%
Students With Disabilities	19%				27%			10%	36%				
English Language Learners	29%				41%			23%	62%				56%
Asian Students	64%				88%				100%	100%			
Black/African American Students	33%				32%			30%	40%	67%			
Hispanic Students	41%				54%			46%	55%	80%			57%
Multiracial Students	63%				70%			46%	79%				
White Students	68%				81%			78%	81%	88%			
Economically Disadvantaged Students	34%				43%			40%	46%	78%			50%

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	55%		49%	38%	63%	66%	55%	59%	73%	87%			65%
Students With Disabilities	15%		29%	24%	20%	42%	37%	12%	24%				
English Language Learners	33%		55%	59%	47%	71%	65%	24%	40%				65%
Native American Students													
Asian Students	78%		62%		85%	81%		86%		91%			
Black/African American Students	29%		39%	30%	33%	53%	46%	22%	56%	88%			
Hispanic Students	50%		48%	47%	56%	64%	65%	55%	68%	85%			67%
Multiracial Students	51%		50%		65%	71%	60%	73%	55%				
Pacific Islander Students													
White Students	66%		51%	42%	76%	70%	57%	68%	83%	86%			
Economically Disadvantaged Students	40%		45%	39%	45%	58%	52%	43%	58%	82%			63%

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.

SUBJECT	GRADE	2023-24 SPRING				
		SCHOOL	DISTRICT	SCHOOL - DISTRICT	STATE	SCHOOL - STATE
Ela	6	59%	59%	0%	54%	5%
Ela	7	54%	56%	-2%	50%	4%
Ela	8	51%	53%	-2%	51%	0%
Math	6	55%	67%	-12%	56%	-1%
Math	7	63%	69%	-6%	47%	16%
Math	8	25%	30%	-5%	54%	-29%
Science	8	54%	54%	0%	45%	9%
Civics		61%	72%	-11%	67%	-6%
Algebra		86%	53%	33%	50%	36%
Geometry		97%	55%	42%	52%	45%

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?

ELA lowest quartile learning gains increased by 13 points compared to the 21-22 school year and was the highest since 2014. Small group stations with targeted interventions and providing students with a viable curriculum contributed to the increase.

Lowest Performance

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

Students with disabilities had an ESSA finding and scored the lowest of all our subgroups, though they increased 16 points compared to the 22-23 school year. Lack of collaborative structures and intentional interventions, along with absenteeism, in support facilitated classes contributed to the low performance.

Greatest Decline

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

The greatest decline was in Civics proficiency with students with disabilities. New standards and not enough consistent, intentional interventions for students with disabilities.

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.

The greatest gap in proficiency compared to the state average was Civics proficiency. New standards and not enough consistent, intentional interventions for students with disabilities.

EWS Areas of Concern

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

Chronic absenteeism (172 students missed at least 10% of class) and students scoring a Level 1 on ELA (225) and Math (205) proficiency.

Highest Priorities

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

1. Decreasing chronic absenteeism
2. Increased proficiency and learning gains for students with disabilities
3. Increased proficiency in Civics
4. Providing consistent, intentional interventions for struggling students in ELA, Math, Civics, and Science
5. Closing the achievement gap between White students and traditionally underserved minorities (Black and Hispanic students)

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), Black/ African American Students (BLK), Hispanic Students (HSP), Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)

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.

Priority for the 24-25 school year is to close the achievement gap between subgroups (Black, Hispanic, SWD, FRL, and White students). ELA FAST PM 3 23-24 shows that there is an achievement gap between subgroups.

- Black students' proficiency rate is 16% lower than White students.
- Black students demonstrated 44% proficiency compared to White students who demonstrated 60% proficiency.
- Hispanic students' proficiency rate is 12% lower than White students.
- Hispanic students demonstrated 48% proficiency compared to White students who demonstrated 60% proficiency.
- Forty percent of SWD were proficient compared to 56 percent of students without disabilities.
- Forty-six percent of FRL students were proficient compared to 61 percent of students that did not receive FRL.

Student learning is impacted by students lacking mastery skills to comprehend benchmarks and apply knowledge. This is a crucial need because we need to maximize the learning of all our students.

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.

- To increase the number of Black students demonstrating proficiency by 6%
- To increase the number of Hispanic students demonstrating proficiency by 5%
- To increase the number of SWD students demonstrating proficiency by 7%
- To increase the number of FRL students demonstrating proficiency by 7%

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.

Area of focus will be monitored through actionable feedback to teachers, data, classroom instruction, activities aligned with benchmarks, and ongoing informal/formal assessments, and engaging PLCs. By monitoring this area of focus students will increase their understanding of content.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome

Yvonne Bradley

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:

• Kagan Strategies • Assessing Prior Knowledge • Differentiated Instruction • Processing Information • Small Group Instruction • Collaborative Learning • Khan Academy • iReady

Rationale:

Best practice according to research.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention:

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 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

Monitoring PLCs

Person Monitoring:

Yvonne Bradley

By When/Frequency:

Weekly

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

Ms. Bradley will attend PLCs to ensure teachers have a plan for the students who are not proficient in a benchmark and that intentional interventions are put into place using a station rotation model.

Action Step #2

Collaborative Structures

Person Monitoring:

Yvonne Bradley

By When/Frequency:

Weekly

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

step:

General Education and Support Facilitation teachers will plan together and deliver content in ways that serve the various needs of the students in their class. With the help of a district instructional coach for students with disabilities, the two teachers in the room will effectively deliver content and provide remedial support in a small group setting.

Action Step #3

Instructional Coach Support

Person Monitoring:

Hollie Rogers

By When/Frequency:

Weekly

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

step:

Ms. Rogers will meet with new teachers to make sure they have structures in place to allow students to focus on learning. She will provide feedback on the alignment of lessons to ELA benchmarks to ensure the students are getting a viable curriculum.

Action Step #4

Support Facilitation

Person Monitoring:

Yvonne Bradley

By When/Frequency:

Weekly

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

step:

Support facilitators will follow their schedule with fidelity to ensure they are providing services to SWD in ELA classes. They will work with their general education teacher partner to deliver lessons and pull small groups to address specific learning needs.

Action Step #5

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

Area of Focus #2

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

ESSA Subgroups specifically relating to Students With Disabilities (SWD), Black/ African American Students (BLK), Hispanic Students (HSP), Economically

Disadvantaged Students (FRL)

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.

The 23-24 Grade 8 Science assessment shows Black students have a proficiency rate 48% lower than White students and Hispanic students have a 31% lower proficiency rate than White students. The lack of consistent differentiation and interventions within the classroom has had a negative impact on learning. Based on the 23-24 Science assessment, the proficiency gap for students of color when compared to White peers is over 30%. These students deserve the same opportunity for success as their peers, and we will implement corrective action to ensure their proficiency rates increase.

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.

- To increase the percentage of Black students demonstrating proficiency by 5%
- To increase the percentage of Hispanic students demonstrating proficiency by 5%
- To increase the percentage of students with disabilities demonstrating proficiency by 5%

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.

Area of focus will be monitored through actionable feedback to teachers, data, classroom instruction, activities aligned with benchmarks, and ongoing informal/formal assessments, and engaging PLCs. By monitoring this area of focus students will increase their understanding of content.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome

Allisyn Brown

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:

• Kagan Strategies • Assessing Prior Knowledge • Differentiated Instruction • Processing Information • Small Group Instruction • Khan Academy • Quizizz

Rationale:

Best practice according to research.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention:

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 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

Monitoring PLCs

Person Monitoring:

Allisyn Brown

By When/Frequency:

Weekly

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

Ms. Brown will attend PLCs to ensure teachers have a plan for the students who are not proficient in a benchmark and that intentional interventions are put into place using a station rotation model.

Action Step #2

Nature of Science

Person Monitoring:

Allisyn Brown

By When/Frequency:

Quarterly

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

Ms. Brown will work with the district teacher on assignment for science to provide resources to our teachers on the Nature of Science benchmark. Students will need to track their data on all benchmarks and Ms. Brown will analyze data to see if interventions are working as evidenced by growth scores on formative and summative assessments.

Area of Focus #3

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

ESSA Subgroups specifically relating to Students With Disabilities (SWD), Black/ African American Students (BLK), Hispanic Students (HSP)**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.

The 23-24 Civics EOC shows Black students have a proficiency rate 41% lower than White students and Hispanic students have a 30% lower proficiency rate than White students. Additionally, students with disabilities' proficiency on the Civics EOC declined by 10 percentage points in 23-24 as compared to 22-23. The lack of consistent differentiation and interventions within the classroom has

had a negative impact on learning. Student learning is impacted by students lacking mastery skills to comprehend benchmarks and apply knowledge. Based on the 23-24 Civics EOC, the proficiency gap for students of color when compared to White peers is over 29%. These students deserve the same opportunity for success as their peers, and we will implement corrective action to ensure their proficiency rates increase.

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.

- To increase the percentage of Black students demonstrating proficiency by 5%
- To increase the percentage of Hispanic students demonstrating proficiency by 5%
- To increase the percentage of students with disabilities demonstrating proficiency by 10%

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.

Area of focus will be monitored through actionable feedback to teachers, data, classroom instruction, activities aligned with benchmarks, and ongoing informal/formal assessments, and engaging PLCs. By monitoring this area of focus students will increase their understanding of content.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome

Allisyn Brown

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:

• CAR-PD • Kagan Strategies • Assessing Prior Knowledge • Differentiated Instruction • Processing Information • Small Group Instruction • DBQ Project

Rationale:

Best practice according to research.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention:

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 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

Monitoring PLCs

Person Monitoring:

Allisyn Brown

By When/Frequency:

Weekly

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

Ms. Brown will attend PLCs to ensure teachers have a plan for the students who are not proficient in a benchmark and that intentional interventions are put into place using a station rotation model.

Action Step #2

Small Group Intervention

Person Monitoring:

Allisyn Brown

By When/Frequency:

Weekly

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

After formative and summative assessments, students will track their data to see how they are performing on tested benchmarks. The teacher will evaluate student assessment data to determine which interventions are need for specific students on each benchmark and provide remediation through small groups in a station rotation model.

Area of Focus #4

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

ESSA Subgroups specifically relating to Students With Disabilities (SWD), Black/ African American Students (BLK), Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)

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.

In 2023-24, the difference in percent of students who were proficient in the FAST Math PM3 between Black (32%) and White (84%) students increased to 52% (+22%). In 2023-24, the difference in percent of students who were proficient in the FAST Math PM3 between students with disabilities (25%) and those without (74%) was 49%. In 2023-24, the difference in percent of students who were proficient in the FAST Math PM3 between students who receive Free and Reduced Lunch (46%) and those who do not (84%) was 38%. In 2023-24, 26% of Pre-Algebra students were proficient in the FAST Math PM3 (no change). To address the above concerns, students have been deliberately placed in courses based on the results in the 2024 FAST PM3 Math. Teachers will evaluate the data and work on PLC Action plans to address the listed issues.

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.

The goal is to reduce the achievement gap in all groups by at 10%, while raising scores 5% across all tested math subjects.

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.

Area of focus will be monitored through actionable feedback to teachers, data, classroom instruction, activities aligned with benchmarks, and ongoing informal/formal assessments, and engaging PLCs. By monitoring this area of focus students will increase their understanding of content.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome

Eric Basilo

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:

• Kagan Strategies • Assessing Prior Knowledge • Differentiated Instruction • Processing Information • Small Group Instruction • Collaborative Learning • Khan Academy • iReady

Rationale:

Best practice in education research.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention:

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 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

Monitoring PLCs

Person Monitoring:

Eric Basilo

By When/Frequency:

Weekly

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

Dr. Basilo will attend PLCs to ensure teachers have a plan for the students who are not proficient in a benchmark and that intentional interventions are put into place using a station rotation model.

Action Step #2

Tier 2 and 3 Instruction

Person Monitoring:

Eric Basilo

By When/Frequency:

Weekly

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

Teachers will use Khan Academy and iReady to provide differentiated instruction to specific students based on data from formative and summative assessments.

Area of Focus #5

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.

Teachers will provide rigorous lessons aligned to their benchmarks in the core subjects of ELA, Math, Social Studies, and Science. After two weeks of content, students will be given the most difficult question and will work collaboratively with peers to engage in a productive struggle to obtain the best answer. This is a crucial need as Markham Woods did not score in the top four of middle schools in Seminole County for core subject proficiency.

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.

First, students will increase proficiency in ELA from 57% on the FAST PM3 2024 to 62% on FAST PM3 2025. Second, students will increase proficiency in Math from 66% on the FAST PM3 2024 to 71% on FAST PM3 2025. Third, students will increase proficiency in Civics from 66% on the EOC in 2024 to 76% on the Civics EOC in 2025. Finally, students will increase proficiency in Science from 56% on the Grade 8 Science assessment in 2024 to 66% on the Grade 8 Science assessment in 2025.

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.

Assistant Principals will analyze data with their teams to track the progress of students on formative and summative assessments from the classroom, district, and state levels. By monitoring the progress of students, Assistant Principals and teachers will be able to see which students are

struggling on specific benchmarks and develop intervention plans in the classroom using small groups and station rotation to intentionally address the needs of students.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome

Jason McDonald

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:

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

Instructional Coach Support

Person Monitoring:

Hollie Rogers

By When/Frequency:

Weekly

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

Ms. Rogers will meet with new teachers to make sure they have structures in place to allow students to focus on learning. She will provide feedback on the alignment of lessons to ELA benchmarks to ensure the students are getting a viable curriculum. Ms. Rogers will also push into reading classes to ensure lessons are being presented properly and students are working towards standards mastery.

Action Step #2

Support Facilitation

Person Monitoring:

Yvonne Bradley

By When/Frequency:

Weekly

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

Support facilitators will follow their schedule with fidelity to ensure they are providing services to SWD in ELA and Math classes. They will work with their general education teacher partner to deliver lessons and pull small groups to address specific learning needs.

Action Step #3

Teachers and Students Owning Their Data

Person Monitoring:

Jason McDonald

By When/Frequency:

Monthly

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

The Principal will consult with Assistant Principals to ensure that data tracking is happening in teachers' classrooms and students can articulate which benchmarks they still need support with.

Area of Focus #6

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

Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math**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.

Increasing the learning gains of all students in Math and the learning gains of the lowest quartile students in Math. Level 1 and 2 students need accelerated learning in Math classes so they can achieve a Level 3 or higher on the Algebra EOC in order to meet high school graduation requirements. This is a priority need as 119 students scored a Level 1 on their statewide Math assessment.

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.

119 students scored a Level 1 on their statewide math assessment in 2024. We will decrease the amount of students scoring a Level 1 by 20% in 2025.

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.

Area of focus will be monitored through actionable feedback to teachers, data, classroom instruction, activities aligned with benchmarks, and ongoing informal/formal assessments, and engaging PLCs. By monitoring this area of focus students will increase their understanding of content.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome

Eric Basilo

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:

- Kagan Strategies • Assessing Prior Knowledge • Differentiated Instruction • Processing Information • Small Group Instruction • Collaborative Learning • Khan Academy • iReady

Rationale:

Best practice in education research.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention:

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 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

Teachers and Students Owning Their Data

Person Monitoring:

Eric Basilo

By When/Frequency:

Weekly

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

Teachers will have students track their data and students will know which benchmarks they still need support with. Teachers will provide in class interventions in small groups with the support facilitator and use a station rotation model to address specific student needs.

Action Step #2

Collaborative Learning

Person Monitoring:

Eric Basilo

By When/Frequency:

Weekly

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

After direct instruction from the teacher, students will work with partners on a new problem to find the best solution while the teacher circulates around the room monitoring the thought process of Level 1 and 2 students. The teacher will then address misconceptions to the group and/or the whole class.

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.

Markham Woods had 172 students who missed at least 10% of class in the 23-24 school year. This affected student learning as students missed valuable classroom instruction which impacted their learning negatively. To increase the proficiency of our lowest subgroups (SWD, FRL, Black, and Hispanic students), students need to attend school on a regular basis so they do not lose out on critical instruction and are able to receive targeted interventions to address their academic needs.

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.

The number of students who miss 10% or more of class will be reduced by 20%. Since we had 172 students who missed this much instruction last year, our goal is to decrease this number where a maximum of 137 students are missing 10% or more of instructional time.

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 Attendance/Truancy team will monitor student absences and send communication home to parents in an attempt to improve attendance. With students attending school on a regular basis, academic gains will be realized with regard to learning gains and proficiency.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome

Jason McDonald

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:

Rationale:

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention:

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement:

Action Step #1

Consistent Parent Communication

Person Monitoring:

Charlene Kee

By When/Frequency:

Weekly

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

Ms. Kee will mail 5-, 10-, and 15-day truancy letters for student with unexcused absences.

Action Step #2

Intentionally Inviting Campus Atmosphere

Person Monitoring:

Jason McDonald

By When/Frequency:

Daily

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

Dr. McDonald will ensure the campus stays clean and adults act intentionally inviting to all students when they are on campus. Through attendance data trends and student school safety surveys, the school will be able to determine if students are viewing school positively by attending school more regularly.

Area of Focus #2

Positive Behavior and Intervention System (PBIS)

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.

According to PBIS.org, "PBIS is a framework for creating safe, positive, equitable schools, where every student can *feel valued, connected to the school community and supported by caring adults.*" By creating a welcoming atmosphere, we expect to have increased academic achievement and reduced exclusionary discipline. Referrals were reduced by 34% in 23-24 as compared to 22-23, so we want to continue this positive trend where students are in class and learning. Additionally, while the total number of out of school suspensions (OSS) decreased by 25% in 23-24 as compared to 22-23, the percentage of Black students receiving OSS increased by 6%, while the percentage of SWD receiving OSS in increased by 7.5%.

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.

The total number of out of school suspensions (OSS) decreased by 25% in 23-24 as compared to 22-23, the percentage of Black students receiving OSS increased by 6%, while the percentage of SWD receiving OSS in increased by 7.5%. By focusing on PBIS and creating a more positive campus environment, the percentage of Black students and SWD receiving OSS will decrease by 8% in 24-25.

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.

Weekly discipline reports with comparison data will be presented by the discipline team to the administrative team. With more students in school learning and not serving OSS, we expect academic achievement to increase.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome

Raiza Agosto

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:

Rationale:

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention:

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement:

Action Step #1

Create PBIS DREAM Lounge

Person Monitoring:

Raiza Agosto

By When/Frequency:

End of September

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

Dr. Agosto will create a PBIS Dream Lounge in the cafeteria where students can redeem their DREAM Dollars for various rewards and prizes.

Action Step #2

DREAM Cart

Person Monitoring:

Raiza Agosto

By When/Frequency:

Twice a month

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

DREAM Cart with rewards will be made available to students twice a month where they can redeem Dream Dollars for various rewards and prizes.

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.

In collaboration with the Assistant Superintendent, school leaders identify and align resources to meet the needs of all students and maximize desired student outcomes. Evaluation of student achievement data and related early warning factors such as attendance and discipline referrals are at the core of this work. Principals review data with the school leadership team, staff, and other relevant stakeholders, then develop or modify goals and strategies to align with the school needs presented. These goals and strategies are then operationalized through action items within the annual School Improvement Plan. These specific interventions or activities are noted within the SIP, and funding resources are assigned.

Specifics to Address the Need

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

In the area of literacy, performance data from benchmark assessments are used to progress monitor whether core instruction is meeting the needs of students. A benchmark of 80% of students being at or above the 26th percentile is used to monitor whether further supports are needed. This data along with the data from district leadership walkthroughs in ELA classrooms are used by Assistant Superintendents to help school leaders problem solve after the administration of these assessments.

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