**Seminole County Public Schools** 

# MILLENNIUM MIDDLE SCHOOL



2025-26 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

# **Table of Contents**

| SIP Authority   | 1  |
|---|----|
| I. School Information   | 2  |
| A. School Mission and Vision  | 2  |
| B. School Leadership Team, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring | 2  |
| C. Demographic Data   | 8  |
| D. Early Warning Systems  | 9  |
| II. Needs Assessment/Data Review                                      | 12 |
| A. ESSA School, District, State Comparison                            | 13 |
| B. ESSA School-Level Data Review                                      | 14 |
| C. ESSA Subgroup Data Review  | 15 |
| D. Accountability Components by Subgroup                              | 16 |
| E. Grade Level Data Review  | 19 |
| III. Planning for Improvement   | 20 |
| IV. Positive Learning Environment                                     | 27 |
| V. Title I Requirements (optional)                                    | 30 |
| VI. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review                                 | 35 |
| VII Budget to Support Areas of Focus                                  | 36 |

### **School Board Approval**

A "Record School Board Approval Date" tracking event has not been added this plan. Add this tracking event with the board approval date in the notes field to update this section.

### **SIP Authority**

Section (s.) 1001.42(18)(a), 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, F.S., by one or more student subgroups, as defined in the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), 20 U.S. Code (U.S.C.) § 6311(c)(2); 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, F.S., and as calculated under s. 1008.34(3)(b), F.S., 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, F.S.; or has significantly lower graduation rates for a subgroup when compared to the state's graduation rate.

# SIP Template in Florida Continuous Improvement Management System Version 2 (CIMS2)

The Department's SIP template meets:

- 1. All state and rule requirements for public district and charter schools.
- ESEA components for targeted or comprehensive support and improvement plans required for public district and charter schools identified as Additional Targeted Support and Improvement (ATSI), Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI), and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI).
- 3. Application requirements for eligible schools applying for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) funds.

# 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.

Printed: 10/09/2025 Page 1 of 37

#### I. School Information

#### A. School Mission and Vision

#### Provide the school's mission statement

The mission of Millennium Middle School Fine Arts & Communication Magnet is to develop well rounded individuals by fostering an academic environment that promotes critical thinking, creativity, and good global citizenship.

#### Provide the school's vision statement

Millennium Middle School Fine Arts & Communication Magnet will create a safe learning environment that promotes individual responsibility, academic growth, and positive social relationships.

# B. School Leadership Team, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring

#### 1. School Leadership Membership

#### **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**

Crystal Higgs

higgscd@myscps.us

#### **Position Title**

Principal

#### **Job Duties and Responsibilities**

Provides strategic direction and leadership for the school, overseeing the day-to-day operations, and fostering a positive learning environment while managing staff, campus operations, implementing

Printed: 10/09/2025 Page 2 of 37

educational programs, and ensuring adherence to educational standards.

#### **Leadership Team Member #2**

#### **Employee's Name**

**Daniel Thompson** 

#### **Position Title**

**Assistant Principal** 

#### Job Duties and Responsibilities

Assist the principal in overseeing student behavior, managing disciplinary actions, administrative tasks, curriculum development, staff supervision and collaborating with teachers, parents, and students to ensure a positive and safe learning environment

#### **Leadership Team Member #3**

#### **Employee's Name**

Jamie Barnes

#### **Position Title**

**Assistant Principal** 

#### Job Duties and Responsibilities

Assist the principal in overseeing student behavior, managing disciplinary actions, administrative tasks, curriculum development, staff supervision and collaborating with teachers, parents, and students to ensure a positive and safe learning environment

#### **Leadership Team Member #4**

#### **Employee's Name**

Lynette Gonzalez

#### **Position Title**

**Assistant Principal** 

#### Job Duties and Responsibilities

Assist the principal in overseeing student behavior, managing disciplinary actions, administrative

Printed: 10/09/2025 Page 3 of 37

tasks, curriculum development, staff supervision and collaborating with teachers, parents, and students to ensure a positive and safe learning environment

#### **Leadership Team Member #5**

#### **Employee's Name**

Giovanny Vargas

#### **Position Title**

School Administration Manager

#### Job Duties and Responsibilities

Assist the principal in overseeing student behavior, managing disciplinary actions, administrative tasks, curriculum development, staff supervision and collaborating with teachers, parents, and students to ensure a positive and safe learning environment

#### **Leadership Team Member #6**

#### **Employee's Name**

Jania Fuller

#### **Position Title**

School Administration Manager

#### **Job Duties and Responsibilities**

Assist the principal with overseeing the day-to-day operations of the school, including administrative tasks, staff management, budgeting, facilities management while working closely with parents, the local community, and the principal to ensure that the school is meeting its academic and operational goals

#### **Leadership Team Member #7**

#### **Employee's Name**

Janna Foster

#### **Position Title**

Academic Dean

Printed: 10/09/2025 Page 4 of 37

#### **Job Duties and Responsibilities**

Oversees student behavior, managing disciplinary actions, and collaborating with teachers, parents, and students to ensure a positive and safe learning environment

#### **Leadership Team Member #8**

#### **Employee's Name**

Vernard Moore

#### **Position Title**

Academic Dean

#### Job Duties and Responsibilities

Oversees student behavior, managing disciplinary actions, and collaborating with teachers, parents, and students to ensure a positive and safe learning environment

#### **Leadership Team Member #9**

#### **Employee's Name**

Adrienne Roupe

#### **Position Title**

Literacy Coach

#### Job Duties and Responsibilities

Support instructional growth and development of teaching practices by working closely with teachers to provide guidance, resources, model effective teaching methods, analyze student data and facilitate professional development opportunities to improve instructional strategies and student learning outcomes.

#### **Leadership Team Member #10**

#### **Employee's Name**

Zuraima Bravo

#### **Position Title**

Math Instructional Coach

Printed: 10/09/2025 Page 5 of 37

#### Job Duties and Responsibilities

Support instructional growth and development of teaching practices by working closely with teachers to provide guidance, resources, model effective teaching methods, analyze student data and facilitate professional development opportunities to improve instructional strategies and student learning outcomes.

#### **Leadership Team Member #11**

#### **Employee's Name**

Antwon Hallman

#### **Position Title**

Behavior Interventionist

#### **Job Duties and Responsibilities**

Works closely with the principal, administration, students, teachers, and parents to address behavioral issues, develop intervention plans, and provide individualized support to help students succeed academically and socially.

#### 2. Stakeholder Involvement

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 (20 U.S.C. § 6314(b)(2), ESEA Section 1114(b)(2).

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

Stakeholders including teachers, parents, students, administrators, and community members, provided input for the school improvement plan through participation in the School Advisory Council. Stakeholders contributed to the improvement plan by sharing their perspectives, concerns, and ideas during the School Advisory Council meeting and feedback sessions focusing on. Stakeholder input covered areas such as student achievement, curriculum development, student support services, extracurricular activities, facilities improvement, and overall school climate.

Printed: 10/09/2025 Page 6 of 37

#### 3. 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 (20 U.S.C. § 6314(b)(3), ESEA Section 1114(b)(3)).

The school improvement plan will be monitored quarterly through a structured process that involves gathering and analyzing data on various aspects of the plan. This will include academic performance, student behavior, teacher professional development, and resource allocation. The data will be reviewed by the school leadership team to assess the progress and effectiveness of the implemented strategies. The findings and progress reports will be shared with an advisory committee, school staff, and district leadership to facilitate collaboration and transparency.

Printed: 10/09/2025 Page 7 of 37

# C. Demographic Data

| <b>5</b> 1  |  |
|---|--|
| 2025-26 STATUS<br>(PER MSID FILE)   | ACTIVE   |
| SCHOOL TYPE AND GRADES SERVED (PER MSID FILE)   | MIDDLE/JR. HIGH<br>6-8   |
| PRIMARY SERVICE TYPE (PER MSID FILE)  | K-12 GENERAL EDUCATION   |
| 2024-25 TITLE I SCHOOL STATUS   | YES  |
| 2024-25 ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED (FRL) RATE   | 70.0%  |
| CHARTER SCHOOL  | NO   |
| RAISE SCHOOL  | NO   |
| 2024-25 ESSA IDENTIFICATION *UPDATED AS OF 1  | CSI  |
| ELIGIBLE FOR UNIFIED SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT GRANT (UNISIG)  |  |
| 2024-25 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 *2022-23 SCHOOL GRADES WILL SERVE AS AN INFORMATIONAL BASELINE.   | 2024-25: C<br>2023-24: C<br>2022-23: C<br>2021-22: C<br>2020-21:   |

Printed: 10/09/2025 Page 8 of 37

# D. Early Warning Systems

#### 1. Grades K-8

#### Current Year 2025-26

Using 2024-25 data, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:

| INDICATOR   |   |   |   | GI | RAE | DE L | .EVEL |     |     | TOTAL |
|---|---|---|---|----|-----|------|-------|-----|-----|-------|
| INDICATOR   | K | 1 | 2 | 3  | 4   | 5    | 6     | 7   | 8   | TOTAL |
| School Enrollment   |   |   |   |    |     |      | 454   | 396 | 410 | 1,260 |
| Absent 10% or more school days  |   |   |   |    |     |      | 76    | 76  | 60  | 212   |
| One or more suspensions   |   |   |   |    |     |      | 43    | 63  | 52  | 158   |
| Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)   |   |   |   |    |     |      | 36    | 73  | 54  | 163   |
| Course failure in Math  |   |   |   |    |     |      | 63    | 55  | 51  | 169   |
| Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment   |   |   |   |    |     |      | 103   | 90  | 124 | 317   |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment  |   |   |   |    |     |      | 126   | 69  | 105 | 300   |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.053, F.A.C. (only applies to grades K-3) |   |   |   |    |     |      | 17    | 24  | 7   | 48    |
| Number of students with a substantial mathematics defined by Rule 6A-6.0533, F.A.C. (only applies to grades K-4)          |   |   |   |    |     |      | 10    | 0   | 0   | 10    |

#### Current Year 2025-26

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                            |   |   |   | GI | RAD | E L | EVEL |     |     | TOTAL |
|--------------------------------------|---|---|---|----|-----|-----|------|-----|-----|-------|
| INDICATOR                            | K | 1 | 2 | 3  | 4   | 5   | 6    | 7   | 8   | IOIAL |
| Students with two or more indicators |   |   |   |    |     |     | 129  | 118 | 129 | 376   |

#### Current Year 2025-26

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

| INDICATOR                           |   |   | G | BRAI | DE L | EVE | L |   |   | TOTAL |
|-------------------------------------|---|---|---|------|------|-----|---|---|---|-------|
| INDICATOR                           | K | 1 | 2 | 3    | 4    | 5   | 6 | 7 | 8 | IOIAL |
| Retained students: current year     |   |   |   |      |      |     | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1     |
| Students retained two or more times |   |   |   |      |      |     | 1 | 3 | 9 | 13    |

Printed: 10/09/2025 Page 9 of 37

#### Prior Year (2024-25) As Last Reported (pre-populated)

The number of students by grade level that exhibited each early warning indicator:

| INDICATOR   |   |   |   | GI | RAI | E L | EVEL |     |     | TOTAL |
|---|---|---|---|----|-----|-----|------|-----|-----|-------|
| INDICATOR   | K | 1 | 2 | 3  | 4   | 5   | 6    | 7   | 8   | TOTAL |
| Absent 10% or more school days  |   |   |   |    |     |     | 88   | 76  | 96  | 260   |
| One or more suspensions   |   |   |   |    |     |     | 55   | 60  | 58  | 173   |
| Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)   |   |   |   |    |     |     | 17   | 34  | 16  | 67    |
| Course failure in Math  |   |   |   |    |     |     | 22   | 20  | 3   | 45    |
| Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment   |   |   |   |    |     |     | 97   | 125 | 135 | 357   |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment  |   |   |   |    |     |     | 127  | 84  | 103 | 314   |
| 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     |

#### Prior Year (2024-25) As Last Reported (pre-populated)

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

| INDICATOR                            |   |   |   | GF | RAD | EL | EVEL |     |     | TOTAL |
|--------------------------------------|---|---|---|----|-----|----|------|-----|-----|-------|
| INDICATOR                            | K | 1 | 2 | 3  | 4   | 5  | 6    | 7   | 8   | TOTAL |
| Students with two or more indicators |   |   |   |    |     |    | 122  | 114 | 114 | 350   |

#### Prior Year (2024-25) As Last Reported (pre-populated)

The number of students retained:

| INDICATOR                           |   |   | ( | GRA | DE L | EVE | ΞL |    |   | TOTAL |
|-------------------------------------|---|---|---|-----|------|-----|----|----|---|-------|
| INDICATOR                           | K | 1 | 2 | 3   | 4    | 5   | 6  | 7  | 8 | TOTAL |
| Retained students: current year     |   |   |   |     |      |     | 21 | 12 |   | 33    |
| Students retained two or more times |   |   |   |     |      |     | 6  | 3  |   | 9     |

Printed: 10/09/2025 Page 10 of 37

# 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.

Printed: 10/09/2025 Page 11 of 37

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

Printed: 10/09/2025 Page 12 of 37

# A. ESSA School, District, State Comparison

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. The district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school or

Data for 2024-25 had not been fully loaded to CIMS at time of printing

|  |        | 2025     |       |        | 2024      |       |        | 2023**   |       |
|--|--------|----------|-------|--------|-----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|
| ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENT   | SCHOOL | DISTRICT | STATE | SCHOOL | DISTRICT† | STATE | SCHOOL | DISTRICT | STATE |
| ELA Achievement*   | 47     | 64       | 58    | 43     | 57        | 53    | 44     | 54       | 49    |
| Grade 3 ELA Achievement  |        |          | 27    |        |           | 21    |        |          |       |
| ELA Learning Gains   | 53     | 62       | 59    | 47     | 56        | 56    |        |          |       |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile                                       | 45     | 54       | 52    | 48     | 50        | 50    |        |          |       |
| Math Achievement*  | 49     | 69       | 63    | 51     | 65        | 60    | 52     | 61       | 56    |
| Math Learning Gains  | 46     | 64       | 62    | 58     | 65        | 62    |        |          |       |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile                                      | 49     | 57       | 57    | 61     | 60        | 60    |        |          |       |
| Science Achievement  | 46     | 62       | 54    | 46     | 56        | 51    | 43     | 56       | 49    |
| Social Studies Achievement*                                      | 63     | 78       | 73    | 61     | 73        | 70    | 61     | 72       | 68    |
| Graduation Rate  |        |          |       |        |           |       |        |          |       |
| Middle School Acceleration                                       | 68     | 82       | 77    | 50     | 77        | 74    | 58     | 76       | 73    |
| College and Career Acceleration                                  |        |          |       |        |           |       |        |          |       |
| Progress of ELLs in Achieving English Language Proficiency (ELP) | 54     | 66       | 53    | 56     | 65        | 49    | 34     | 50       | 40    |

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

Printed: 10/09/2025 Page 13 of 37

<sup>\*\*</sup>Grade 3 ELA Achievement was added beginning with the 2023 calculation

<sup>†</sup> 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)

| 2024-25 ESSA FPPI                            |     |
|--|-----|
| ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)             | CSI |
| OVERALL FPPI – All Students                  | 52% |
| OVERALL FPPI Below 41% - All Students        | No  |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 1   |
| Total Points Earned for the FPPI             | 520 |
| Total Components for the FPPI                | 10  |
| Percent Tested                               | 96% |
| Graduation Rate                              |     |

|         |         | ESSA (  | OVERALL FPPI | HISTORY   |          |         |
|---------|---------|---------|--------------|-----------|----------|---------|
| 2024-25 | 2023-24 | 2022-23 | 2021-22      | 2020-21** | 2019-20* | 2018-19 |
| 52%     | 52%     | 52%     | 53%          | 45%       |          | 53%     |

<sup>\*</sup> Any school that was identified for Comprehensive or Targeted Support and Improvement in the previous school year maintained that identification status and continued to receive support and interventions in the 2020-21 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.

Printed: 10/09/2025 Page 14 of 37

<sup>\*\*</sup> Data provided for informational purposes only. Any school that was identified for Comprehensive or Targeted Support and Improvement in the 2019-20 school year maintained that identification status and continued to receive support and interventions in the 2021-22 school year. In April 2021, the U.S. Department of Education approved Florida's amended waiver request to keep the same school identifications for 2020-21 as determined in 2018-19 due to the COVID-19 pandemic.

# C. ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

|   | 2024-25 ES                      | SA SUBGROUP DATA      | SUMMARY   |   |
|---|---------------------------------|-----------------------|---|---|
| ESSA<br>SUBGROUP                          | FEDERAL PERCENT OF POINTS INDEX | SUBGROUP<br>BELOW 41% | NUMBER OF<br>CONSECUTIVE<br>YEARS THE<br>SUBGROUP IS<br>BELOW 41% | NUMBER OF<br>CONSECUTIVE<br>YEARS THE<br>SUBGROUP IS<br>BELOW 32% |
| Students With Disabilities                | 29%                             | Yes                   | 6   | 1   |
| English<br>Language<br>Learners           | 42%                             | No                    |   |   |
| Asian Students                            | 70%                             | No                    |   |   |
| Black/African<br>American<br>Students     | 43%                             | No                    |   |   |
| Hispanic<br>Students                      | 50%                             | No                    |   |   |
| Multiracial<br>Students                   | 63%                             | No                    |   |   |
| White Students                            | 63%                             | No                    |   |   |
| Economically<br>Disadvantaged<br>Students | 48%                             | No                    |   |   |

Printed: 10/09/2025 Page 15 of 37

# D. Accountability Components by Subgroup

|              | Economically<br>Disadvantage<br>Students  | White<br>Students | Multiracial<br>Students | Hispanic<br>Students | Black/African<br>American<br>Students | Asian<br>Students | English<br>Language<br>Learners | Students W<br>Disabilities    | All Students |                         |                                      | D. Acco   |
|--------------|---|-------------------|-------------------------|----------------------|---------------------------------------|-------------------|---------------------------------|-------------------------------|--------------|-------------------------|--------------------------------------|---|
|              | Economically<br>Disadvantaged<br>Students | its               | cial                    | its                  | 4frican<br>;an<br>its                 | its               | n<br>age                        | Students With<br>Disabilities | dents        |                         |                                      | coun<br>lank" cell<br>ool.  |
|              | 39%                                       | 62%               | 57%                     | 43%                  | 35%                                   | 67%               | 25%                             | 16%                           | 47%          | ELA<br>ACH.             |                                      | tabilit<br>indicates  |
|              |   |                   |                         |                      |                                       |                   |                                 |                               |              | GRADE<br>3 ELA<br>ACH.  |                                      | <b>D. Accountability Components by Subgroup</b> Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for the school. |
|              | 48%                                       | 56%               | 60%                     | 54%                  | 46%                                   | 69%               | 45%                             | 35%                           | 53%          | ELA                     |                                      | <b>pone</b><br>ol had les   |
|              | 43%                                       | 57%               |                         | 44%                  | 41%                                   |                   | 38%                             | 35%                           | 45%          | ELA<br>LG<br>L25%       | 2024-25                              | nts by  |
|              | 44%                                       | 64%               | 57%                     | 47%                  | 37%                                   | 72%               | 34%                             | 22%                           | 49%          | MATH<br>ACH.            | ACCOUNT!                             | / Sub   |
|              | 45%                                       | 50%               | 47%                     | 46%                  | 43%                                   | 60%               | 44%                             | 34%                           | 46%          | MATH<br>LG              | BILITY CO                            | <b>group</b><br>students  |
|              | 49%                                       | 55%               | 73%                     | 51%                  | 45%                                   |                   | 46%                             | 35%                           | 49%          | MATH<br>LG<br>L25%      | 2024-25 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY | with data   |
|              | 40%                                       | 68%               | 58%                     | 42%                  | 32%                                   | 54%               | 20%                             | 20%                           | 46%          | SCI<br>ACH.             | BY SUBG                              |   |
|              | 55%                                       | 81%               | 78%                     | 59%                  | 51%                                   | 70%               | 41%                             | 35%                           | 63%          | SS<br>ACH.              | SUBGROUPS                            | rticular o  |
|              | 65%                                       | 72%               | 72%                     | 63%                  | 60%                                   | 100%              | 68%                             | 37%                           | 68%          | MS<br>ACCEL.            |                                      | omponen   |
|              |   |                   |                         |                      |                                       |                   |                                 |                               |              | GRAD<br>RATE<br>2023-24 |                                      | a particular component and was not calculated for   |
|              |   |                   |                         |                      |                                       |                   |                                 |                               |              | C&C<br>ACCEL<br>2023-24 |                                      | not calcu   |
|              | 53%                                       |                   |                         | 53%                  |                                       |                   | 54%                             | 24%                           | 54%          | ELP<br>PROGRESS         |                                      | lated for   |
| Printed: 10/ | Printed: 10/09/2025 Page 16 of 37         |                   |                         |                      |                                       |                   |                                 |                               |              |                         |                                      |   |

|                     | Economically<br>Disadvantaged<br>Students | White<br>Students | Multiracial<br>Students | Hispanic<br>Students | Black/African<br>American<br>Students | Asian<br>Students | English<br>Language<br>Learners | Students With Disabilities | All Students |  |   |
|---------------------|---|-------------------|-------------------------|----------------------|---------------------------------------|-------------------|---------------------------------|----------------------------|--------------|--|---|
|                     | 35%                                       | 64%               | 54%                     | 38%                  | 28%                                   | 46%               | 23%                             | 15%                        | 43%          | ELA<br>ACH.  |   |
|                     |   |                   |                         |                      |                                       |                   |                                 |                            |              | GRADE<br>3 ELA<br>ACH.   |   |
|                     | 44%                                       | 59%               | 40%                     | 47%                  | 37%                                   | 45%               | 44%                             | 37%                        | 47%          | ELA<br>LG  |   |
|                     | 47%                                       | 62%               |                         | 53%                  | 40%                                   |                   | 57%                             | 43%                        | 48%          | 2023-24 /<br>ELA<br>LG<br>L25%   |   |
|                     | 47%                                       | 69%               | 65%                     | 48%                  | 37%                                   | 54%               | 33%                             | 27%                        | 51%          | MATH ACH.  |   |
|                     | 56%                                       | 62%               | 52%                     | 59%                  | 54%                                   | 61%               | 64%                             | 56%                        | 58%          | 2023-24 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS B  ELA MATH MATH LG LG ACH. LG L25% L25% |   |
|                     | 59%                                       | 60%               | 50%                     | 64%                  | 60%                                   |                   | 69%                             | 58%                        | 61%          | MATH LG L25%   |   |
|                     | 40%                                       | 67%               | 58%                     | 36%                  | 36%                                   |                   | 24%                             | 13%                        | 46%          | BY SUBGROUPS SCI SS ACH. AC  |   |
|                     | 52%                                       | 79%               | 58%                     | 59%                  | 46%                                   |                   | 42%                             | 29%                        | 61%          | SS ACH.  |   |
|                     | 45%                                       | 57%               | 56%                     | 46%                  | 43%                                   |                   | 47%                             | 37%                        | 50%          | MS<br>ACCEL.   |   |
|                     |   |                   |                         |                      |                                       |                   |                                 |                            |              | GRAD<br>RATE<br>2022-23  |   |
|                     |   |                   |                         |                      |                                       |                   |                                 |                            |              | C&C<br>ACCEL<br>2022-23  |   |
|                     | 56%                                       |                   |                         | 55%                  |                                       |                   | 56%                             | 25%                        | 56%          | PROGRED<br>SSE 17 of 37  |   |
| Printed: 10/09/2025 |   |                   |                         |                      |                                       |                   |                                 |                            |              | %<br>Page 17 of 37   | 7 |

| Economically<br>Disadvantaged<br>Students | White<br>Students | Multiracial<br>Students | Hispanic<br>Students | Black/African<br>American<br>Students | Asian<br>Students | English<br>Language<br>Learners | Students With Disabilities | All Students |                         |  |
|---|-------------------|-------------------------|----------------------|---------------------------------------|-------------------|---------------------------------|----------------------------|--------------|-------------------------|--|
| 36%                                       | 59%               | 54%                     | 41%                  | 32%                                   | 57%               | 22%                             | 17%                        | 44%          | ELA<br>ACH.             |  |
|   |                   |                         |                      |                                       |                   |                                 |                            |              | GRADE<br>3 ELA<br>ACH.  |  |
|   |                   |                         |                      |                                       |                   |                                 |                            |              | ELA<br>LG               |  |
|   |                   |                         |                      |                                       |                   |                                 |                            |              | ELA<br>LG<br>L25%       | 2022-23                                |
| 44%                                       | 67%               | 63%                     | 49%                  | 38%                                   | 63%               | 33%                             | 28%                        | 52%          | MATH<br>ACH.            | ACCOUNT                                |
|   |                   |                         |                      |                                       |                   |                                 |                            |              | MATH<br>LG              | 2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY S |
|   |                   |                         |                      |                                       |                   |                                 |                            |              | MATH<br>LG<br>L25%      | OMPONEN                                |
| 34%                                       | 59%               | 42%                     | 41%                  | 30%                                   |                   | 16%                             | 19%                        | 43%          | SCI<br>ACH.             | TS BY SUE                              |
| 55%                                       | 82%               | 81%                     | 54%                  | 46%                                   |                   | 40%                             | 30%                        | 61%          | SS<br>ACH.              | UBGROUPS                               |
| 46%                                       | 73%               | 58%                     | 51%                  | 38%                                   |                   | 38%                             |                            | 58%          | MS<br>ACCEL             |  |
|   |                   |                         |                      |                                       |                   |                                 |                            |              | GRAD<br>RATE<br>2021-22 |  |
|   |                   |                         |                      |                                       |                   |                                 |                            |              | C&C<br>ACCEL<br>2021-22 |  |
| 50%                                       |                   |                         | 54%                  |                                       |                   | 54%                             | 17%                        | 34%          | ELP                     |  |

Printed: 10/09/2025

# E. Grade Level Data Review - State Assessments (prepopulated)

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.

|          |       |           | 2024-25 SPF         | RING                     |                    |                   |
|----------|-------|-----------|---------------------|--------------------------|--------------------|-------------------|
| SUBJECT  | GRADE | SCHOOL    | DISTRICT            | SCHOOL -<br>DISTRICT     | STATE              | SCHOOL -<br>STATE |
| ELA      | 6     | 52%       | 66%                 | -14%                     | 60%                | -8%               |
| ELA      | 7     | 43%       | 63%                 | -20%                     | 57%                | -14%              |
| ELA      | 8     | 42%       | 62%                 | -20%                     | 55%                | -13%              |
| Math     | 6     | 41%       | 71%                 | -30%                     | 60%                | -19%              |
| Math     | 7     | 50%       | 72%                 | -22%                     | 50%                | 0%                |
| Math     | 8     | 21%       | 33%                 | -12%                     | 57%                | -36%              |
| Science  | 8     | 45%       | 61%                 | -16%                     | 49%                | -4%               |
| Civics   |       | 61%       | 76%                 | -15%                     | 71%                | -10%              |
| Algebra  |       | 70%       | 61%                 | 9%                       | 54%                | 16%               |
| Geometry |       | 77%       | 60%                 | 17%                      | 54%                | 23%               |
|          |       |           | 2024-25 WIN         | ITER                     |                    |                   |
| SUBJECT  | GRADE | SCHOOL    | DISTRICT            | SCHOOL -<br>DISTRICT     | STATE              | SCHOOL -<br>STATE |
| Algebra  |       | * data su | ppressed due to few | er than 10 students or a | ll tested students | scoring the same. |

Printed: 10/09/2025 Page 19 of 37

# 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?

The data component showing the greatest improvement is Middle School Acceleration which improved by 18 points. The second most improvement area was ELA Achievement which improved by 6 points. New actions consisted of a certified reading teacher and reading endorsed teacher providing tier 2 instruction in core classes.

#### **Lowest Performance**

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

The component with the lowest performance was ELA lowest 25th quartile and ELA achievement at 47 points. Contributing factors to low performance was student's historical low achievement 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 Math learning gains and Math lowest 25th percentile with a 12 point decline in each component. A significant factor was limited teacher experience.

#### **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 compared to the sate average was math learning gains with a 16 point gap between school and state.

#### **EWS Areas of Concern**

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

Math learning 25th percentile and ELA achievement.

#### **Highest Priorities**

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

Printed: 10/09/2025 Page 20 of 37

Math learning gains
Math learning 25th percentile
ELA Achievement

Printed: 10/09/2025 Page 21 of 37

## 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.

#### Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

#### **Area of Focus Description and Rationale**

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.

ELA achievement is the lowest of the accountability component and is 12 point below the state achievement. This is a critical area because literacy is needed across all content areas and ELA serves as a core content area that supports literacy needs required for proficiency in each content area.

#### **Measurable Outcome**

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.

2024- 2025 ELA achievement was 47 points and reflects a six point increase in comparison to the 2023-2024 achievement data but continues to be below the district and state average. The measurable outcome is attaining 60 points, which exceeds the state average by 2 points. To secure such achievement, the following targets will be established for each grade level:

6th—Prior year proficiency was 52 percent, which is 8 points below the state average. Based on these data points, the targeted outcome for 6th grade is 65 points in achievement.

7th - prior year proficiency was 43 percent which is 14 points below state average. Based on these data points, the targeted outcome is 65 points in achievement for 7th grade.

8th - prior year proficiency was 42 percent which is 13 points below state average. Based on these data points, the targeted outcome is 65 points in achievement for 8th grade.

#### Monitoring

Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for implementation and impact to reach

Printed: 10/09/2025 Page 22 of 37

#### the desired outcome.

The area of focus will be monitored weekly during Tier II departmental data meetings and through regular assessments, data analysis, progress tracking, and ongoing discussions and planning with teachers. Administration and teachers will gather and analyze data on student performance weekly to identify areas of improvement and implement targeted interventions. Weekly monitoring of iReady is 45 minutes weekly, and 75 percent of lessons are planned.

The two areas of focus are ELA achievement and Students with disabilities. To meet the goals of these two focus areas, a 90-minute instructional block will feature intervention-focused station rotation. Teachers will use a variety of resources including:

- iReady teacher toolbox, lesson path, and phonics for reading, teacher toolbox
- · Foundational reading
- · Learning strategies

Weekly monitoring for iReady will consist of:

- 45 minutes weekly in the reading intervention course
- 75 percent of lessons passed

Student groups will be based on achievement data and will be adjusted as student performance changes. A schedule for tutorial support will be established using a push-in and pull-out tier 2 model. A certified reading teacher and an ESOL/ESE certified intervention teacher will offer push-in and pull-out support in science, and civics to reinforce reading in the content area. High-needs student groups identified through the tier 2 small group instructional delivery model will be chosen for additional tutorial opportunities beyond the regular school day.

#### Person responsible for monitoring outcome

Crystal Higgs - Jamie Barnes

#### **Evidence-based Intervention:**

Evidence-based intervention: (May choose more than one evidence-based intervention.) Describe the evidence-based intervention (practices/programs) being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each relevant grade level and describe how the identified interventions will be monitored for this Area of Focus (20 U.S.C. § 7801(21)(A)(i) and (B), ESEA Section 8101(21)(A) and (B)).

#### **Description of Intervention #1:**

Content Area Reading iReady Lesson paths Support facilitation Push-in and pull-out literacy tier 2 small group instruction Literacy intervention placement - weekly during homeroom

#### Rationale:

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

Printed: 10/09/2025 Page 23 of 37

across the K-12 continuum. All of the listed interventions have been included in the K-12 Comprehensive Evidence- Based Reading Plan.

#### Tier of Evidence-based Intervention:

Tier 1 – Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

#### **Action Steps to Implement:**

Action step(s) needed to address this Area of Focus or implement this intervention. Identify 2 to 3 action steps and the person responsible for each step.

#### **Action Step #1**

Tier 2 Instructional Delivery Model

Person Monitoring: By When/Frequency:

Crystal Higgs - Jamie Barnes - Adrienne Roupe Weekly

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

A 90-minute instructional block will feature a tier 2 small group instructional delivery model to customize instruction through small groups. Student groups will be based on achievement data and will be adjusted as student performance changes. A schedule for tutorial support will be established using a push-in and pull-out small group model. A certified reading teacher and an ESOL/ESE certified intervention teacher will offer push-in and pull-out support in science, and civics to reinforce reading in the content area. High-needs student groups identified through the tier 2 small group instructional delivery model will be chosen for additional tutorial opportunities beyond the regular school day. The two areas of focus are ELA achievement and Students with disabilities. To meet the goals of these two focus areas, a 90-minute instructional block will feature intervention-focused station rotation. Teachers will use a variety of resources, including: iReady lesson path, and phonics for reading, teacher toolbox iXL diagnostic and individualized learning plans Math Nation Foundational reading Algebra Workshop Learning strategies Weekly monitoring for iReady will consist of: 45 minutes weekly 75 percent of lessons passed Student groups will be based on achievement data and will be adjusted as student performance changes. A schedule for tutorial support will be established using a push-in and pull-out small group model. A certified reading teacher and an ESOL/ESE certified remedial teacher will offer push-in and pull-out support in math, science, and civics to reinforce reading in the content area. High-needs student groups identified through the small group instructional delivery model will be chosen for additional tutorial opportunities beyond the regular school day.

#### Action Step #2

Literacy Professional Development

Person Monitoring: By When/Frequency:

Adrienne Roupe Weekly

# 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

Printed: 10/09/2025 Page 24 of 37

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)

#### **Area of Focus Description and Rationale**

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.

The ESSA subgroup Students with Disabilities (SWD) achievement is a crucial area of focus because this area is essential for fostering an inclusive learning environment and enhancing overall achievement for all learners. A focus on the ESSA subgroup SWD ensures that students receive the specific resources and support they need to meet achievement markers. This focus enhances and contributes to a more equitable and inclusive learning environment.

#### Measurable Outcome

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 ESSA subgroup Students with Disabilities (SWD) achievement levels was represented with 29 percent of the federal points index. This represents a 13 point gap between the next lowest performing subgroup. 29 percent of the federal index showcases a 5 point decline from 34 percent in the 2023 - 2024 academic year.

#### Monitoring

Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for implementation and impact to reach the desired outcome.

The area of focus will be monitored weekly during Tier II departmental data meetings and through regular assessments, data analysis, progress tracking, and ongoing discussions and planning with teachers. Administration and teachers will gather and analyze data on student performance weekly to identify areas of improvement and implement targeted interventions.

#### Person responsible for monitoring outcome

Crystal Higgs - Daniel Thompson

#### **Evidence-based Intervention:**

Printed: 10/09/2025 Page 25 of 37

Evidence-based intervention: (May choose more than one evidence-based intervention.) Describe the evidence-based intervention (practices/programs) being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each relevant grade level and describe how the identified interventions will be monitored for this Area of Focus (20 U.S.C. § 7801(21)(A)(i) and (B), ESEA Section 8101(21)(A) and (B)).

#### **Description of Intervention #1:**

Foundations for Reading Curriculum iReady lesson path, phonics for reading, teacher toolbox iXL diagnostic and individualized learning plans Math Nation Algebra Workshop Learning strategies

#### Rationale:

Foundational reading curriculum to support students with disabilities who demonstrate low achievement levels in literacy. This curriculum is used by certified reading teachers to support the growth and development in phonemic awareness, phonics and word study, vocabulary, automaticity/fluency, and comprehension.

#### Tier of Evidence-based Intervention:

Tier 1 – Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

#### **Action Steps to Implement:**

Action step(s) needed to address this Area of Focus or implement this intervention. Identify 2 to 3 action steps and the person responsible for each step.

#### **Action Step #1**

Accelerate Achievement and Learning Growth of Students with Disabilities

Person Monitoring: By When/Frequency:

Crystal Higgs - Daniel Thompson Weekly

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

A 90-minute tier 2 instructional block will feature a small group instructional delivery model to customize instruction through small groups. Student groups will be based on achievement data and adjusted as student performance changes. A schedule for tutorial support will be established using a push-in and pull-out small group model. A certified reading teacher and an ESOL/ESE certified intervention teacher will offer push-in and pull-out support in science, and civics to reinforce reading in the content area. High-needs student groups identified through the tier 2 small group instructional delivery model will be chosen for additional tutorial opportunities beyond the regular school day. The area of focus will be monitored weekly during Tier II departmental data meetings and through regular assessments, data analysis, progress tracking, and ongoing discussions and planning with teachers. Administration and teachers will gather and analyze student performance data weekly to identify improvement areas and implement targeted interventions. Monitoring will occur through student performance indicators in the following programs: Foundations for Reading Curriculum iReady diagnostic and progress monitoring, lesson path, phonics for reading, teacher toolbox iXL diagnostic and individualized learning plans Math Nation Algebra Workshop Learning strategies

#### **Action Step #2**

**Targeted Tier Support** 

Person Monitoring: By When/Frequency:

Crystal Higgs - Lynette Gonzalez Weekly

Printed: 10/09/2025 Page 26 of 37

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

A schedule for weekly intervention will be established to allocate a minimum of 30 extra minutes during the school day for targeted support for the SWD subgroup. Students will be grouped based on data and achievement performance, with lessons tailored to address specific learning gaps. A push-in schedule will be developed for interventionist and academic paraprofessionals to provide instructional support to SWD in science and social studies. The interventions and tutorial schedule will be created through school and district assessments and date from the following interventions: Foundations for Reading Curriculum iReady diagnostic, lesson path, phonics for reading, teacher toolbox iXL diagnostic and individualized learning plans Math Nation Algebra Workshop Learning strategies

# IV. Positive Learning 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.

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.

#### **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.

10+ Unexcused absences were reduced from was a 37 percent to 31 percent decrease (+6) from the 23-24 school year to the 24-25 school year. 15+ Unexcused absences were reduced from was a 30.4 percent to 29 percent decrease (+1) from the 23-24 school year to the 24-25 school year.

The following are the intended outcomes for the 24-25 school year:

By 9 percentage points, the percentage of students with 15 or more absences will be reduced. The students with 10 or more absences will be reduced by 12 percentage points, resulting in only 18 percent of students having 10 or more absences

#### 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.

Printed: 10/09/2025 Page 27 of 37

The area of focus will be monitored monthly during MTSS/PBIS meetings and through regular attendance tracking, data analysis, progress tracking, and ongoing discussions and planning with students, parents, and teachers. MTSS AND PBIS team members will gather and analyze data on student attendance and behavior to implement targeted interventions. Weekly monitoring will occur through:

Attendance Dashboard

Attendance/Action Planning Team Meetings

Drop-out prevention teacher-student meetings

Social worker home visits

Student/family support plans collaboratively developed and monitored by SCSO to support truancy.

Secure weekly reports from the SCSO Truancy Center

#### Person responsible for monitoring outcome

Crystal Higgs - Jania Fuller

#### **Evidence-based Intervention:**

Evidence-based intervention: (May choose more than one evidence-based intervention.) Describe the evidence-based intervention (practices/programs) being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each relevant grade level and describe how the identified interventions will be monitored for this Area of Focus (20 U.S.C. § 7801(21)(A)(i) and (B), ESEA Section 8101(21)(A) and (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:

Tier 2 – Moderate Evidence

#### Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

#### **Action Steps to Implement:**

Action step(s) needed to address this Area of Focus or implement this intervention. Identify 2 to 3 action steps and the person responsible for each step.

Printed: 10/09/2025 Page 28 of 37

#### Action Step #1

Targeted implementation support through MTSS Framework and Drop Out Prevention Teacher.

Person Monitoring: By When/Frequency:

Crystal Higgs - Jamie Barnes Weekly

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

Collect and analyze data to identify students who may require additional support. Data sources could include academic performance data, behavior data, and other relevant information to complete the tiering process. Design tiered interventions to address the needs of different groups of students. This could involve providing additional instruction, intervention programs, or behavioral support through identified pathways in the MTSS planning or Drop out prevention teacher-student sessions.

Printed: 10/09/2025 Page 29 of 37

# 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 20 U.S.C. § 6314(b) (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 (20 U.S.C. § 6314(b)(4), ESEA Section 1114(b)(4)).

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

The SIP will be disseminated through the newsletter, School Advisory Council and the website in English and Spanish.

Webpage: https://millennium.scps.k12.fl.us/

#### 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 Family Engagement Plan (PFEP) is made publicly available (20 U.S.C. § 6318(b)-(g), ESEA Section 1116(b)-(g)).

Millennium Middle School will implement strategies such as hosting regular family events and workshops, conducting parent-teacher conferences, establishing open communication channels, and involving parents in decision-making processes through PTSA, roundtables, and surveys.

Additionally, providing resources for families and seeking feedback on their experiences will help build

Additionally, providing resources for families and seeking feedback on their experiences will help build positive relationships.

Webpage: https://millennium.scps.k12.fl.us/

#### Plans to Strengthen the Academic Program

Describe how the school plans to strengthen the academic program in the school, increase the

Printed: 10/09/2025 Page 30 of 37

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 (20 U.S.C. § 6314(b)(7)(A)(ii), ESEA Section 1114(b)(7)(A)(ii)).

The two areas of focus are ELA achievement and Students with disabilities. To meet the goals of these two focus areas, a 90-minute instructional block will feature intervention-focused station rotation. Teachers will use a variety of resources including:

- iReady diagnostic and progress monitoring, lesson path, and phonics for reading, teacher toolbox
- iXL diagnostic and individualized learning plans
- · Math Nation
- · Foundational reading
- Algebra Workshop
- · Learning strategies

Weekly monitoring for iReady will consist of:

- 45 minutes weekly
- 75 percent of lessons passed

Student groups will be based on achievement data and will be adjusted as student performance changes. A schedule for tutorial support will be established using a push-in and pull-out small group model. A certified reading teacher and an ESOL/ESE certified intervention teacher will offer push-in and pull-out support in science, and civics to reinforce reading in the content area. High-needs student groups identified through the small group instructional delivery model will be chosen for additional tutorial opportunities beyond the regular school day.

#### 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 this Act, 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) (20 U.S.C. § 6314(b)(5) and §6318(e)(4), ESEA Sections 1114(b)(5) and 1116(e)(4)).

Throughout the course of the school year, formally on a quarterly basis, Federal Projects and Resource Development department leadership meet with leadership from the Department of Teaching and Learning (Title II, Part A), Families in Need (Title IX, Part A), Student Support Services (IDEA), Alternative Program (Title I, Part D), and Early Learning (Pre-K/VPK). At these quarterly cross-department collaborative meetings, status updates of the Title I, Part A funded activities and initiatives

Printed: 10/09/2025 Page 31 of 37

#### Seminole MILLENNIUM MIDDLE SCHOOL 2025-26 SIP

are discussed. Such topics could include discussions between Federal Projects and Resource Development staff and Department of Teaching and Learning (DTL) staff discussing the implementation of a primary grades phonics program at Title I elementary schools. Resulting from these conversations, DTL leadership may suggest more purchased materials for the phonics program, and/or more on-site training days. These decisions would have an impact to the Title I budget for the next school year, which would then lead to further conversations with DTL leadership about adjusting needs and priorities for the other Title I, Part A funded activities.

Federal Projects and Resource Development department leadership also meet with leadership from the Department of Teaching and Learning (Title II, Part A), Families in Need (Title IX, Part A), Student Support Services (IDEA), Alternative Program (Title I, Part D), and Early Learning (Pre-K/VPK) to develop the Title I, Part A plan. The various areas of focus which are supported with Title I, Part A funds are discussed with the respective leadership from those departments/programs, to ensure that the activities being proposed have the highest likelihood of success.

During the planning phase of Title I school-wide plans, which typically begins late February or early March for the upcoming school year, leadership from the Federal Projects and Resource development department coordinate Title I collaborative planning sessions. Invited to these planning sessions are Title I school principals and designees from their leadership teams. Title I school team planning sessions are grouped so that all of the schools supported by a specific Assistant Superintendent meet together. Having the Assistant Superintendent participate in the collaborative planning session proves helpful, in that they are available to remind the principals of other programs or funding sources available. For instance, the Assistant Superintendent, Student Support Services would be able to remind a principal that IDEA funds are already in place to support an initiative that the principal wanted to include in their upcoming Title I, Part A plan.

Printed: 10/09/2025 Page 32 of 37

## 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 (20 U.S.C. § 6314(b)(7)(A)(iii)(I), ESEA Section 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(I)).

Millennium will provide implicit and explicit instruction of academic, social, and emotional skills through district SEL lessons. The School Social Workers coordinate with school personnel, parents, community agencies, and students to promote optimal learning outcomes.

Millennium Middle School will partner with the Peace and Justice Institute (PJI) to facilitate a PJI Whole School Resilience Program. The program will offer opportunities for staff, students, and parental development. The goal is to build strong relationships among school employees, teachers, and students using a resilience perspective, supporting self-regulation in adults and children.

#### 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 (20 U.S.C. § 6314(b)(7)(A)(iii)(II), ESEA Section 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(II)).

Students will participate in the LEAP series of courses, which includes learning, exploring, and advancing pathways. In these courses, they will learn about career opportunities, cluster careers, and computer science pathways.

#### **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. § 6314(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III), ESEA Section 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III)).

Students are identified as being at risk based on their academic and/or behavior data. Once identified, the team monitors the student to make informed decisions concerning appropriate progress monitoring and the adjustment of supports based on the student's response to research-based interventions. The following actions will be taken to support problem behaviors:

Printed: 10/09/2025 Page 33 of 37

- Proactive monitoring and interventions through early identification and tiering
- Behavior Interventionist will monitor and meet with students with early indicators of problem behavior.
- School-wide mentoring program for students in the top 10 percent of reoccurring problem behaviors
- Partnering with local mentoring organization Vibrant Families to mentor a cohort of incoming 6th-grade students.
- Promote a positive school climate of empathy, honesty, and emotional intelligence, where difficult situations and conflicts can be addressed skillfully with compassionate care and restorative practices

#### **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 (20 U.S.C. § 6314(b)(7)(A)(iii)(IV), ESEA Section 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(IV)).

Weekly professional development opportunities for teachers, support facilitators, academic paraprofessionals, and school personnel will include the following:

- · District instructional coach PD on respective content areas
- International Baccalaureate Middle Years Program Training
- Vertical and Horizontal Articulation
- Teacher Choice Offerings include conditions for learning, classroom management, arts integration, differentiated instruction, small group instruction, data-driven practices, lesson study, and co-facilitation.

#### 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 (20 U.S.C. § 6314(b)(7)(A)(iii)(V), ESEA Section 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(V)).

No Answer Entered

Printed: 10/09/2025 Page 34 of 37

#### VI. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review

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

#### Process to Review the Use of Resources

Describe the process you engage in with your district 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) and rationale (i.e., data) you have determined will be used this year to address the need(s) (i.e., timeline).

In the area of literacy, performance data from FAST and iReady in elementary schools or benchmark assessments in secondary schools 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.

Printed: 10/09/2025 Page 35 of 37

# VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus

Check if this school is eligible for 2025-26 UniSIG funds but has chosen NOT to apply.

No

Printed: 10/09/2025 Page 36 of 37

BUDGET

0.00

Page 37 of 37 Printed: 10/09/2025