

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       | 35 |
| V. Title I Requirements (optional)         |    |
| VI. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review      | 43 |
| VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus      | 44 |

# **School Board Approval**

This plan has not yet been approved by the Pinellas County School Board.

# **SIP Authority**

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

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

#### ADDITIONAL TARGET SUPPORT AND IMPROVEMENT (ATSI)

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

#### TARGETED SUPPORT AND IMPROVEMENT (TSI)

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

#### COMPREHENSIVE SUPPORT AND IMPROVEMENT (CSI)

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

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

ESEA sections 1111(d) requires that each school identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI develop a support and improvement plan created in partnership with stakeholders (including principals and other school leaders, teachers and 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<br>PROGRAM                                   | CHARTER<br>SCHOOLS   |
|---|---|----------------------|
| I.A: School Mission/Vision  |   | 6A-1.099827(4)(a)(1) |
| I.B-C: School Leadership, Stakeholder<br>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),<br>(7)(A)(iii)(I-V)-(B)<br>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

Safety Harbor IB World Middle School will provide a quality educational setting that prepares learners for college and/or career opportunities.

#### Provide the school's vision statement

Safety Harbor IB World Middle School is dedicated to ensuring achievement for all students.

# **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 Susan Alvaro

Position Title Principal

#### Job Duties and Responsibilities

The Principal is the instructional and operational leader within the school community and is critical to improving student outcomes, through the hiring, development, support, supervision and retention of high-quality instructional and support staff. As the school leader, the Principal creates a culture of rigorous learning, belonging and engagement for staff, students and families through collaboration and distributive leadership. In alignment with the Florida Principal Standards, the Principal leads the school team to increased school and student outcomes by prioritizing instruction while effectively balancing the operational, safety, and policy responsibilities of a school-building leader.

# Leadership Team Member #2

Employee's Name Diane Dove

**Position Title** Assistant Principal

#### Job Duties and Responsibilities

The Assistant Principal is an instructional and operational leader within the school community and is critical to improving student outcomes through staff development and effectiveness. In collaboration with and aligned to the direction of the Principal, the Assistant Principal supports the creation of the culture of rigorous learning, belonging and engagement for staff, students and families throughout the school community. In alignment with the Florida Assistant Principal Standards, the Assistant Principal supports and leads assigned school teams to increased school and student outcomes through ongoing training, coaching, feedback and support by prioritizing instruction while effectively balancing operational, safety and policy responsibilities, as assigned.

# Leadership Team Member #3

Employee's Name Stacie Ferrara

**Position Title** Assistant Principal

#### Job Duties and Responsibilities

The Assistant Principal is an instructional and operational leader within the school community and is critical to improving student outcomes through staff development and effectiveness. In collaboration with and aligned to the direction of the Principal, the Assistant Principal supports the creation of the culture of rigorous learning, belonging and engagement for staff, students and families throughout the school community. In alignment with the Florida Assistant Principal Standards, the Assistant Principal supports and leads assigned school teams to increased school and student outcomes through ongoing training, coaching, feedback and support by prioritizing instruction while effectively balancing operational, safety and policy responsibilities, as assigned.

# Leadership Team Member #4

Employee's Name Kate Tancrell

**Position Title** Assistant Principal

#### Job Duties and Responsibilities

The Assistant Principal is an instructional and operational leader within the school community and is critical to improving student outcomes through staff development and effectiveness. In collaboration with and aligned to the direction of the Principal, the Assistant Principal supports the creation of the culture of rigorous learning, belonging and engagement for staff, students and families throughout the

school community. In alignment with the Florida Assistant Principal Standards, the Assistant Principal supports and leads assigned school teams to increased school and student outcomes through ongoing training, coaching, feedback and support by prioritizing instruction while effectively balancing operational, safety and policy responsibilities, as assigned.

# 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.

The School Improvement Plan was developed using input from the school leadership team, teachers, school staff, parents, students, families, businesses, and community leaders. Prior to input the tentative

school grade, population and enrollment, assessments, educator qualifications, long-term goals, accelerated course enrollment, per-pupil expenditures, and existing school initiatives were shared. Input

was solicited regarding additional supplemental personnel, additional training opportunities for school staff, extended learning opportunities, parent and family engagement resources and training workshops,

and supplemental teaching, equipment, and technology.

## **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 School Improvement Plan will be included as a standing agenda item at each School Advisory Council meeting. Specifically, a data update will be provided to all stakeholders regarding the projected

levels of proficiency in ELA, math, science, and civics, along with a projected growth calculation for learning gains overall in ELA and math, as well as learning gains for students in the lowest quartile for ELA and math. Additionally, an acceleration calculation will also be shared. To ensure achievement gaps

are addressed and communicated with all stakeholders, data will be disaggregated by subgroup and shared. The status of action steps related to the identified strategies for improvement will be shared, followed by solicitation of recommended next steps from stakeholders. Updates to the School Improvement Plan will take place within 10 days of each School Advisory Council meeting to ensure feedback and revisions are accurately captured.

# D. Demographic Data

| 2024-25 STATUS<br>(PER MSID FILE)  | ACTIVE   |
|--|--|
| SCHOOL TYPE AND GRADES SERVED<br>(PER MSID FILE)   | MIDDLE/JR. HIGH<br>6-8   |
| PRIMARY SERVICE TYPE<br>(PER MSID FILE)  | K-12 GENERAL EDUCATION   |
| 2023-24 TITLE I SCHOOL STATUS  | YES  |
| 2023-24 MINORITY RATE  | 51.0%  |
| 2023-24 ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED (FRL) RATE  | 88.5%  |
| CHARTER SCHOOL   | NO   |
| RAISE SCHOOL   | NO   |
| 2023-24 ESSA IDENTIFICATION<br>*UPDATED AS OF 7/25/2024  | ATSI   |
| ELIGIBLE FOR UNIFIED SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT GRANT<br>(UNISIG)  |  |
| 2023-24 ESSA SUBGROUPS REPRESENTED<br>(SUBGROUPS WITH 10 OR MORE STUDENTS)<br>(SUBGROUPS BELOW THE FEDERAL THRESHOLD ARE<br>IDENTIFIED WITH AN ASTERISK) | STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES<br>(SWD)*<br>ENGLISH LANGUAGE LEARNERS<br>(ELL)<br>ASIAN STUDENTS (ASN)<br>BLACK/AFRICAN AMERICAN<br>STUDENTS (BLK)*<br>HISPANIC STUDENTS (HSP)<br>MULTIRACIAL STUDENTS (MUL)<br>WHITE STUDENTS (WHT)<br>ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED<br>STUDENTS (FRL) |
| SCHOOL GRADES HISTORY<br>*2022-23 SCHOOL GRADES WILL SERVE AS AN<br>INFORMATIONAL BASELINE.  | 2023-24: B<br>2022-23: C*<br>2021-22: C<br>2020-21:<br>2019-20: B  |

# 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 |
|--|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|-----|-------|
| INDICATOR  | κ           | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6  | 7  | 8   | IUTAL |
| Absent 10% or more school days   |             |   |   |   |   |   | 53 | 65 | 110 | 228   |
| One or more suspensions  |             |   |   |   |   |   | 2  | 33 | 67  | 102   |
| Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)  |             |   |   |   |   |   | 5  | 6  | 8   | 19    |
| Course failure in Math   |             |   |   |   |   |   | 8  | 15 | 19  | 42    |
| Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment  |             |   |   |   |   |   | 51 | 62 | 94  | 207   |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment   |             |   |   |   |   |   | 51 | 56 | 84  | 191   |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C. (only applies to grades K-3) |             |   |   |   |   |   |    |    |     | 0     |
| Number of students with a substantial mathematics defined<br>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 |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
| INDICATOR                            | κ           | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6  | 7  | 8  | TOTAL |
| Students with two or more indicators |             |   |   |   |   |   | 24 | 49 | 88 | 161   |

#### Current Year 2024-25

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

| INDICATOR                           |  | GRADE LEVEL |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |       |  |  |
|-------------------------------------|--|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|-------|--|--|
|                                     |  | 1           | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | TOTAL |  |  |
| Retained students: current year     |  |             |   |   |   |   | 6 | 4 | 8 | 18    |  |  |
| Students retained two or more times |  |             |   |   |   |   | 4 | 3 | 3 | 10    |  |  |

## 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 |
|--|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
| INDICATOR  | κ           | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6  | 7  | 8  | IUIAL |
| Absent 10% or more school days   |             |   |   |   |   |   | 68 | 60 | 70 | 198   |
| One or more suspensions  |             |   |   |   |   |   | 4  | 15 | 21 | 40    |
| Course failure in ELA  |             |   |   |   |   |   | 14 | 8  | 7  | 29    |
| Course failure in Math   |             |   |   |   |   |   | 6  | 18 | 37 | 61    |
| Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment  |             |   |   |   |   |   | 78 | 93 | 91 | 262   |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment   |             |   |   |   |   |   | 87 | 50 | 82 | 219   |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, 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 |  |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|--|
| INDICATOR                            | Κ           | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6  | 7  | 8  | TOTAL |  |
| Students with two or more indicators |             |   |   |   |   |   | 45 | 50 | 55 | 150   |  |

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

The number of students retained:

| INDICATOR                           |  | GRADE LEVEL |   |   |   |   |    |    |    |       |  |  |
|-------------------------------------|--|-------------|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|--|--|
|                                     |  | 1           | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6  | 7  | 8  | TOTAL |  |  |
| Retained students: current year     |  |             |   |   |   |   | 20 | 26 | 44 | 90    |  |  |
| Students retained two or more times |  |             |   |   |   |   |    |    |    | 0     |  |  |

# 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))

| ₽.         |
|------------|
| ESSA       |
| School,    |
| District,  |
| State      |
| Comparison |

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. Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high

ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENT Middle School Acceleration Social Studies Achievement \* Science Achievement Math Learning Gains Math Achievement \* **ELA Learning Gains ELP Progress** College and Career Readiness Graduation Rate Math Learning Gains Lowest 25% **ELA Learning Gains Lowest 25%** ELA Grade 3 Achievement \*\* **ELA Achievement \*** Data for 2023-24 had not been fully loaded to CIMS at time of printing SCHOOL 47 50 56 49 52 <u>5</u> 52 76 74 56 DISTRICT 2024 **STATE<sup>†</sup>** SCHOOL 66 47 ប្ច 47 ယ္ယ 20 DISTRICT 2023 69 49 88 77 48 28 STATE 40 73 80 49 56 49 SCHOOL 52 65 45 58 <u>5</u> 48 32 40 43 73 DISTRICT 2022\*\* 66 44 52 52 46 72 45 30 STATE<sup>†</sup> 49  $\mathfrak{G}$ 36 50 70 76 49 58

Index (FPPI) than in school grades calculation. \*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

\*\*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)

| 2023-24 ESSA FPPI                            |      |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|--|------|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)             | ATSI |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| OVERALL FPPI – All Students                  | 57%  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| OVERALL FPPI Below 41% - All Students        | No   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 2    |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Points Earned for the FPPI             | 568  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Components for the FPPI                | 10   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percent Tested                               | 96%  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Graduation Rate                              |      |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

| ESSA OVERALL FPPI HISTORY |         |         |         |          |         |         |  |  |  |  |  |
|---------------------------|---------|---------|---------|----------|---------|---------|--|--|--|--|--|
| 2023-24                   | 2022-23 | 2021-22 | 2020-21 | 2019-20* | 2018-19 | 2017-18 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 57%                       | 55%     | 51%     | 45%     |          | 57%     | 57%     |  |  |  |  |  |

\* 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<br>SUBGROUP                          | FEDERAL<br>PERCENT OF<br>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<br>Disabilities             | 32%                                   | Yes                   | 5   |   |
| English<br>Language<br>Learners           | 47%                                   | No                    |   |   |
| Asian Students                            | 67%                                   | No                    |   |   |
| Black/African<br>American<br>Students     | 39%                                   | Yes                   | 3   |   |
| Hispanic<br>Students                      | 52%                                   | No                    |   |   |
| Multiracial<br>Students                   | 61%                                   | No                    |   |   |
| White Students                            | 63%                                   | No                    |   |   |
| Economically<br>Disadvantaged<br>Students | 51%                                   | No                    |   |   |

#### 2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY

| ESSA<br>SUBGROUP                          | FEDERAL<br>PERCENT OF<br>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<br>Disabilities             | 29%                                   | Yes                   | 4   | 2   |
| English<br>Language<br>Learners           | 33%                                   | Yes                   | 1   |   |
| Asian Students                            | 91%                                   | No                    |   |   |
| Black/African<br>American<br>Students     | 32%                                   | Yes                   | 2   |   |
| Hispanic<br>Students                      | 44%                                   | No                    |   |   |
| Multiracial<br>Students                   | 55%                                   | No                    |   |   |
| White Students                            | 59%                                   | No                    |   |   |
| Economically<br>Disadvantaged<br>Students | 45%                                   | No                    |   |   |

#### 2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY

| ESSA<br>SUBGROUP                          | FEDERAL<br>PERCENT OF<br>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<br>Disabilities             | 26%                                   | Yes                   | 3   | 1   |
| English<br>Language<br>Learners           | 41%                                   | No                    |   |   |
| Native American<br>Students               |                                       |                       |   |   |
| Asian Students                            | 68%                                   | No                    |   |   |
| Black/African<br>American<br>Students     | 38%                                   | Yes                   | 1   |   |
| Hispanic<br>Students                      | 45%                                   | No                    |   |   |
| Multiracial<br>Students                   | 47%                                   | No                    |   |   |
| Pacific Islander<br>Students              |                                       |                       |   |   |
| White Students                            | 55%                                   | No                    |   |   |
| Economically<br>Disadvantaged<br>Students | 45%                                   | No                    |   |   |

|              |   |                   |                         |                      |                                       |                   |                                 |                               |              |                           | 5.0.0  |
|--------------|---|-------------------|-------------------------|----------------------|---------------------------------------|-------------------|---------------------------------|-------------------------------|--------------|---------------------------|--|
|              | 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<br>Disabilities | All Students |                           | 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) |
|              | 42%                                       | 60%               | 59%                     | 44%                  | 25%                                   | 81%               | 30%                             | 15%                           | 52%          | ELA<br>ACH.               | <b>tabilit</b><br>indicate:<br>oopulated   |
|              |   |                   |                         |                      |                                       |                   |                                 |                               |              | GRADE<br>3 ELA<br>ACH.    | s the schoo  |
|              | 51%                                       | 60%               | 59%                     | 54%                  | 41%                                   | 75%               | 51%                             | 41%                           | 56%          | ELA                       | pone<br>of had lea   |
|              | 48%                                       | 54%               |                         | 49%                  | 44%                                   |                   | 48%                             | 45%                           | 51%          | ELA<br>LG<br>L25%         | nts by   |
|              | 41%                                       | 61%               | 55%                     | 47%                  | 24%                                   | 63%               | 36%                             | 12%                           | 52%          | MATH<br>ACH.              | / Sub  |
|              | 49%                                       | 50%               | 35%                     | 49%                  | 46%                                   | 50%               | 53%                             | 42%                           | 49%          | MATH                      | group<br>students  |
|              | 61%                                       | 59%               |                         | 55%                  | 56%                                   |                   | 58%                             | 52%                           | 56%          | MATH<br>LG<br>L25%        | than 10 eligible students with data  |
|              | 35%                                       | 59%               | 50%                     | 40%                  | 24%                                   |                   | 24%                             | 8%                            | 50%          | SCI<br>ACH.               | a for a particula  |
|              | 64%                                       | 83%               | 79%                     | 66%                  | 50%                                   |                   | 49%                             | 49%                           | 74%          | SS<br>ACH.                | rticular o   |
|              | 70%                                       | 78%               | 91%                     | 70%                  |                                       |                   | 67%                             |                               | 76%          | MS<br>ACCEL.              | omponen  |
|              |   |                   |                         |                      |                                       |                   |                                 |                               |              | GRAD<br>RATE<br>2022-23   | it and wa  |
|              |   |                   |                         |                      |                                       |                   |                                 |                               |              | C&C<br>ACCEL<br>3 2022-23 | s not cal  |
|              | CJ  | თ                 |                         | 4                    |                                       |                   | IJ.                             | Ν                             | 4            |                           | culated fo   |
|              | 50%                                       | 64%               |                         | 49%                  |                                       |                   | 52%                             | 28%                           | 47%          | ELP<br>PROGRESS           |  |
| Printed: 08/ | 06/2024                                   |                   |                         |                      |                                       |                   |                                 |                               |              |                           | Page 17 of 45  |

#### Pinellas SAFETY HARBOR MIDDLE SCHOOL 2024-25 SIP

| 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<br>Disabilities | All Students |                         |  |
|---|-------------------|-------------------------|----------------------|---------------------------------------|-------------------|---------------------------------|-------------------------------|--------------|-------------------------|--|
| 37%                                       | 56%               | 46%                     | 33%                  | 34%                                   | 84%               | 18%                             | 12%                           | 47%          | ELA<br>ACH.             |  |
|   |                   |                         |                      |                                       |                   |                                 |                               |              | GRADE<br>3 ELA<br>ACH.  |  |
|   |                   |                         |                      |                                       |                   |                                 |                               |              | ELA<br>LG               |  |
|   |                   |                         |                      |                                       |                   |                                 |                               |              | ELA<br>LG<br>L25%       | 2022-23  |
| 45%                                       | 63%               | 54%                     | 45%                  | 28%                                   | 89%               | 37%                             | 24%                           | 55%          | MATH<br>ACH.            | 2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS |
|   |                   |                         |                      |                                       |                   |                                 |                               |              | MATH<br>LG              | ABILITY C                                      |
|   |                   |                         |                      |                                       |                   |                                 |                               |              | MATH<br>LG<br>L25%      | OMPONEN  |
| 35%                                       | 59%               | 29%                     | 27%                  | 19%                                   |                   | 20%                             | 20%                           | 47%          | SCI<br>ACH.             | TS BY SUE                                      |
| 58%                                       | 73%               | 71%                     | 54%                  | 48%                                   |                   | 35%                             | 41%                           | 66%          | SS<br>ACH.              | <b>3GROUPS</b>                                 |
| 55%                                       | 72%               | 73%                     | 55%                  |                                       | 100%              | 46%                             | 60%                           | 70%          | MS<br>ACCEL.            |  |
|   |                   |                         |                      |                                       |                   |                                 |                               |              | GRAD<br>RATE<br>2021-22 |  |
|   |                   |                         |                      |                                       |                   |                                 |                               |              | C&C<br>ACCEL<br>2021-22 |  |
| 42%                                       | 29%               |                         | 47%                  |                                       |                   | 43%                             | 18%                           | 33%          | ELP<br>PROGRESS         |  |

#### Pinellas SAFETY HARBOR MIDDLE SCHOOL 2024-25 SIP

|         | Economically<br>Disadvantaged<br>Students | White<br>Students | Pacific<br>Islander<br>Students | Multiracial<br>Students | Hispanic<br>Students | Black/African<br>American<br>Students | Asian<br>Students | Native<br>American<br>Students | English<br>Language<br>Learners | Students With<br>Disabilities | All Students |                         |                                   |
|---------|---|-------------------|---------------------------------|-------------------------|----------------------|---------------------------------------|-------------------|--------------------------------|---------------------------------|-------------------------------|--------------|-------------------------|-----------------------------------|
|         | 32%                                       | 51%               |                                 | 34%                     | 36%                  | 23%                                   | 70%               |                                | 24%                             | 14%                           | 43%          | ELA<br>ACH.             |                                   |
|         |   |                   |                                 |                         |                      |                                       |                   |                                |                                 |                               |              | GRADE<br>3 ELA<br>ACH.  |                                   |
|         | 36%                                       | 42%               |                                 | 30%                     | 38%                  | 31%                                   | 56%               |                                | 40%                             | 26%                           | 40%          | ELA                     |                                   |
|         | 34%                                       | 32%               |                                 | 30%                     | 35%                  | 26%                                   |                   |                                | 34%                             | 22%                           | 32%          | ELA<br>LG<br>L25%       | 2021-22 /                         |
|         | 38%                                       | 57%               |                                 | 42%                     | 39%                  | 25%                                   | 68%               |                                | 32%                             | 14%                           | 48%          | MATH<br>ACH.            | ACCOUNTA                          |
|         | 50%                                       | 55%               |                                 | 56%                     | 44%                  | 45%                                   | 71%               |                                | 46%                             | 37%                           | 51%          | MATH<br>LG              | BILITY CO                         |
|         | 61%                                       | 59%               |                                 | 60%                     | 60%                  | 54%                                   |                   |                                | 62%                             | 42%                           | 58%          | MATH<br>LG<br>L25%      | 2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS |
|         | 33%                                       | 56%               |                                 | 18%                     | 37%                  | 24%                                   |                   |                                | 24%                             | 17%                           | 45%          | SCI<br>ACH.             | BY SUBGROUPS                      |
|         | 56%                                       | 76%               |                                 | 78%                     | 48%                  | 38%                                   |                   |                                | 52%                             | 22%                           | 65%          | SS<br>ACH.              | ROUPS                             |
|         | 60%                                       | 78%               |                                 | 75%                     | 59%                  | 72%                                   | 75%               |                                | 45%                             | 50%                           | 73%          | MS<br>ACCEL             |                                   |
|         |   |                   |                                 |                         |                      |                                       |                   |                                |                                 |                               |              | GRAD<br>RATE<br>2020-21 |                                   |
|         |   |                   |                                 |                         |                      |                                       |                   |                                |                                 |                               |              | C&C<br>ACCEL<br>2020-21 |                                   |
|         | 48%                                       | 47%               |                                 |                         | 54%                  |                                       |                   |                                | 52%                             | 14%                           | 52%          | PROGRESS<br>Page 19 o   |                                   |
| Printed | : 08/06/20                                | )24               |                                 |                         |                      |                                       |                   |                                |                                 |                               | 6            | Page 19 o               | f 45                              |

#### Pinellas SAFETY HARBOR MIDDLE SCHOOL 2024-25 SIP

# 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.

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

# **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?

Safety Harbor Middle School Civics:

According to PM3 FAST 2022 - 2023 the percentage of students who achieved proficiency was 66%; in 2023-24 the school increased to 75%. PLC collaborative planning, teachers monitoring student data and the remediation plan developed contributed to the growth in this area.

#### Lowest Performance

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

Safety Harbor Middle School Science:

According to PM3 FAST 2022 - 2023 the percentage of students who achieved proficiency was 47%; in 2023-24 the school increased to 50%. Contributing factors to lower achievement than expected include- students poor retention of three years of information, poor spiraling of information to support student retention, teacher turnover in 6th and 7th grade science, lack of comprehension of science vocabulary.

#### **Greatest Decline**

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

Safety Harbor Middle School Math:

According to PM3 FAST 2022 - 2023 the percentage of students who achieved proficiency was 55%; in 2023-24 the school decreased to 52%. Contributing factors to lower achievement than expected include students not cognitively engaged with the content through learning activities that engage students in problem solving critical thinking and academic discourse.

#### **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 was an 8% increase over state scores in Civics.

## **EWS Areas of Concern**

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

Students with 10% or more absences.

## **Highest Priorities**

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

- 1.) Learning Gains in Math
- 2.) Proficiency Level of Math
- 3.) Proficiency Level of Science
- 4.) Proficiency of Students with Disabilities
- 5.) Proficiency of ELL 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.

## Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

#### 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.

Our current level of proficiency is 52 percent based on the Spring 2023-24 FAST PM3 State Assessment. Our focus on increasing student proficiency levels while improving overall assessment performance compared to previous years.

Level 1-24% Level 2- 26% (2.2= 13%) Level 3-22% Level 4- 17% Level 5- 11%

#### 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 percent of all students achieving ELA proficiency will increase from 52% to 58%, as measured by the FAST PM3 ELA.

#### 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.

Administrator walkthroughs using feedback tools.

Regularly assess (formally and informally) and utilize data to modify and adjust instruction.

Administration and Language Arts/Reading Coach will facilitate and monitor lesson plans during weekly PLC meetings

Administration and teachers will review cycle assessment data and project where students will score on the 2025 FAST ELA.

## Person responsible for monitoring outcome

Susan Alvaro

#### 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:**

1) Plan and implement BEST training for staff. 2) Provide PD on the resources provided by the district to support instruction. 3) Provide support around planning lessons aligned to the benchmarks during PLC. 4) Foster an environment of cooperation and collaboration amongst students including academic language, discussions, and group tasks. Teachers will ask higher order questions and use appropriate wait time to assess students' understanding of concepts. 5) Teachers will utilize common board configuration to create consistency about daily learning objectives/expectations schoolwide.

#### **Rationale:**

1) Teacher training/ professional development can help teachers improve their skills and knowledge and grow as educators. 2) The planning process gives teachers an opportunity to check their own knowledge of the concepts being taught, discuss misconceptions with peers and plan materials needed to teach the concept. 3) Collaborative learning structures increase the development of higherlevel thinking, communication, and leadership skills. Higher-order questions put advanced cognitive demand on students. 4) Establishing a uniform structure for displaying key information creates routines leading to student success

#### 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

Professional Development and Coaching

## Person Monitoring:

Administrator over ELA

**By When/Frequency:** Administrator will attend weekly PLCs

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

ELA and Reading teachers receive professional development and coaching around instruction using B.E.S.T. Benchmarks and district curriculum resources to provide all students with consistent opportunities to engage in complex, grade-level content, knowledge-building, and tasks aligned to the rigor of the standard/benchmark. Administrator and ELA staff to attend rollout trainings and other trainings as needed.

# Area of Focus #2

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.

Our current level of proficiency is 52% percent based on the Spring 2023-24 FAST PM3 State Assessment. Performance of students in Algebra was impacted by lack of consistent instruction due to high absenteeism. In other math classes, the problem/gap is occurring because of lack of rigor, standards-based instruction and intentionally planned data-driven remediation practices. By increasing use of rigorous tasks, differentiated instruction, and intentional standards-based planning and instruction developed through collaborative planning and using the B1G M components and the achievement level descriptors, proficiency scores will increase by

#### 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 percent of all students achieving math proficiency will increase from 52% to 62%, as measured by the FAST PM3 Math.

The percent of all students achieving ALG proficiency will increase from 72% to 90%, as measured by the BEST Alg EOC

The percent of all students achieving Geom proficiency will increase from 97% to 100%, as measured by the BEST Geom EOC

#### 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.

Administrator walkthroughs using feedback tools.

Regularly assess (formally and informally) and utilize data to modify and adjust instruction.

Administration will facilitate and monitor lesson plans during weekly PLC meetings

Administration and teachers will review cycle assessment data and project where students will score on the 2025 BEST/EOC.

## Person responsible for monitoring outcome

Diane Dove

#### **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:**

1) Teachers participate in professional learning opportunities around implementation of the BEST Standards, the Mathematical Thinking & Reasoning Standards and Benchmark Achievement Level Descriptors. 2) Provide PD on the resources provided by the district to support instruction. 3) Provide support around planning lessons aligned to the benchmarks during PLC. 4) Foster an environment of cooperation and collaboration amongst students including academic language, discussions, and group tasks. Teachers will ask higher order guestions and use appropriate wait time to assess students' understanding of concepts. 5) Teachers will utilize common board configuration to create consistency about daily learning objectives/expectations schoolwide.

#### Rationale:

1) Teacher training/ professional development can help teachers improve their skills and knowledge and grow as educators. 2) The planning process gives teachers an opportunity to check their own knowledge of the concepts being taught, discuss misconceptions with peers and plan materials needed to teach the concept. 3) Collaborative learning structures increase the development of higherlevel thinking, communication, and leadership skills. Higher-order questions put advanced cognitive demand on students. 4) Establishing a uniform structure for displaying key information creates routines leading to student success

#### 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

**Professional Learning Communities** 

#### **Person Monitoring:**

By When/Frequency: Weekly

Susan Alvaro

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

Conduct weekly Professional Learning Communities (PLCs) inclusive of 'data chats' to review student data to identify and plan for cognitively engaging learning activities, including remediation activities. Data can come from the FAST assessments, IXL, Instructional Materials assessments, and/or teacher and district formal and informal assessments. Administrator and math staff to attend trainings as needed.

# Area of Focus #3

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

## Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science

#### 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.

Our current level of proficiency is 47 percent based on the Spring 2023-24 Science State Assessment. Our focus on increasing student proficiency levels while improving overall assessment performance compared to previous years.

#### 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 percent of all students achieving Science proficiency will increase from 47% to 55%, as measured by the SSA

#### 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.

Administrator walkthroughs using feedback tools.

Regularly assess (formally and informally) and utilize data to modify and adjust instruction.

Administration will facilitate and monitor lesson plans during weekly PLC meetings

Administration and teachers will review cycle assessment data and project where students will score on the 2025 SSA

#### Person responsible for monitoring outcome

Stacie Ferrara

#### **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:**

1) Teachers participate in ongoing professional development focused on consistent spiraling of both content and scientific thinking standards to ensure continuous monitoring of student performance on science big ideas. 2) Provide PD on the resources provided by the district to support instruction. 3) Provide support around planning lessons aligned to the benchmarks during PLC. Plan and implement opportunities for students to complete claim, evidence, reasoning (CER) tasks that require the testing a scientific idea and providing written evidence and reasoning for their findings 4) Foster an environment of cooperation and collaboration amongst students including the encouragement of productive struggle for students as they work through vocabulary and comprehension using appropriate strategies. Teachers will ask higher order questions and use appropriate wait time to assess students' understanding of concepts. 5) Implement intentional integration of literacy and

writing in science including the use of grade-appropriate complex texts utilized for close and critical reading strategies and processed using text dependent questions. 6) Teachers will utilize common board configuration to create consistency about daily learning objectives/expectations schoolwide. 7) Teachers will utilize IXL for remediation of standards.

#### Rationale:

1) Teacher training/ professional development can help teachers improve their skills and knowledge and grow as educators. 2) The planning process gives teachers an opportunity to check their own knowledge of the concepts being taught, discuss misconceptions with peers and plan materials needed to teach the concept. 3) Collaborative learning structures increase the development of higherlevel thinking, communication, and leadership skills. Higher-order questions put advanced cognitive demand on students. 4) Establishing a uniform structure for displaying key information creates routines leading to student success

#### 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

Increase teacher intentionality of embedding spiraled standards and scientific thinking standards to ensure consistent deepening of learning throughout all three grade levels

#### Person Monitoring:

By When/Frequency:

Stacie Ferrara

# Weekly through PLCs & observations

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

Administrators monitor teacher practice and provide feedback to support growth through regularly observing science lessons to monitor strategy implementation and use of data in informing instruction. Guide teachers in strategy walks of other classrooms based on evidence of implementation of high yield strategies. Administrator and science staff to attend trainings as needed.

# Area of Focus #4

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

# ESSA Subgroups specifically relating to Black/African American Students (BLK)

#### 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.

Students in the subgroup Black/African American averaged 26% proficiency in ELA

#### 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 percent of BLK students achieving ELA proficiency will increase from 26% to 38%, as measured by the FAST PM3 ELA.

#### 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.

PLCs will be attended by administration to observe intentional planning of diverse materials and professional development being provided to improve teaching practices.

#### Person responsible for monitoring outcome

Administration

#### **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:**

Provide an instructional model that ensures rigorous, culturally responsive instruction for all students using assignments aligned to challenging state standards, engagement strategies and student centered practices.

#### Rationale:

Rigorous learning opportunities are challenging and motivate students to learn more at a deeper level.

#### 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 Culturally Responsive Teaching PD

**Person Monitoring:** Administration By When/Frequency: Weekly in PLCs

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

Provide targeted professional development and coaching to teachers and leaders on responsive strategies to increase engagement in rigorous instruction for Black learners and increase the percentage of proficient students.

# Area of Focus #5

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

## ESSA Subgroups specifically relating to Students With Disabilities (SWD)

#### Area of Focus Description and Rationale

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

2023-24 achievement data for students with disabilities reflect a proficiency in ELA of 12%

#### 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 percent of ESE students achieving ELA proficiency will increase from 12% to 20%, as measured by the FAST PM3 ELA.

#### 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.

PLCs will be attended by ESE staff to ensure that plans demonstrate how Individualized Education Plans (IEPs)/personal learning plans have been addressed in the lesson/unit

#### Person responsible for monitoring outcome

Administration

#### **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:**

1) Plan and implement BEST training for staff. 2) Provide PD on the resources provided by the district to support instruction. 3) Provide support around planning lessons aligned to the benchmarks during PLC. 4) Foster an environment of cooperation and collaboration amongst students including academic language, discussions, and group tasks. Teachers will ask higher order questions and use appropriate wait time to assess students' understanding of concepts. 5) Teachers will utilize common board configuration to create consistency about daily learning objectives/expectations schoolwide.

#### Rationale:

1) Teacher training/ professional development can help teachers improve their skills and knowledge and grow as educators. 2) The planning process gives teachers an opportunity to check their own knowledge of the concepts being taught, discuss misconceptions with peers and plan materials needed to teach the concept. 3) Collaborative learning structures increase the development of higher-

level thinking, communication, and leadership skills. Higher-order questions put advanced cognitive demand on students. 4) Establishing a uniform structure for displaying key information creates routines leading to student success

#### 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 Professional Development

Person Monitoring: Administration By When/Frequency: Weekly PICs

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

ESE, ELA and Reading teachers receive professional development and coaching around instruction using B.E.S.T. Benchmarks and district curriculum resources to provide all students with consistent opportunities to engage in complex, grade-level content, knowledge-building, and tasks aligned to the rigor of the standard/benchmark. ESE Staff plan for implementation of specially designed instructional practices to support targeted interventions for students with disabilities

# Area of Focus #6

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

## ESSA Subgroups specifically relating to English Language Learners (ELL)

## 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.

Students in the subgroup ELL averaged 20% proficiency in ELA

#### 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 percent of ELL students achieving ELA proficiency will increase from 20% to 30%, as measured by the FAST PM3 ELA.

#### 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.

PLCs will be attended by administration to observe intentional planning of diverse materials and professional development being provided to improve teaching practices.

#### Person responsible for monitoring outcome

Administration

#### **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:**

1) Plan and implement BEST training for staff. 2) Provide PD on the resources provided by the district to support instruction. 3) Provide support around planning lessons aligned to the benchmarks during PLC. 4) Foster an environment of cooperation and collaboration amongst students including academic language, discussions, and group tasks. Teachers will ask higher order questions and use appropriate wait time to assess students' understanding of concepts. 5) Teachers will utilize common board configuration to create consistency about daily learning objectives/expectations schoolwide.

#### Rationale:

1) Teacher training/ professional development can help teachers improve their skills and knowledge and grow as educators. 2) The planning process gives teachers an opportunity to check their own knowledge of the concepts being taught, discuss misconceptions with peers and plan materials needed to teach the concept. 3) Collaborative learning structures increase the development of higherlevel thinking, communication, and leadership skills. Higher-order questions put advanced cognitive demand on students. 4) Establishing a uniform structure for displaying key information creates routines leading to student success

#### 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 Culturally Responsive Teaching

## Person Monitoring:

Administration

By When/Frequency: Weekly PLCs

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

Provide targeted professional development and coaching to teachers and leaders on responsive strategies to increase engagement in rigorous instruction for ELL learners and increase the percentage of proficient students.

# Area of Focus #7

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

## Instructional Practice specifically relating to 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.

Our current level of proficiency is 75 percent based on the Spring 2023-24 Science State Assessment. Our focus on increasing student proficiency levels while improving overall assessment performance compared to previous years.

#### 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 percent of all students achieving Civics proficiency will increase from 75% to 80%, as measured by the Civics EOC

#### 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.

Administrator walkthroughs using feedback tools.

Regularly assess (formally and informally) and utilize data to modify and adjust instruction.

Administration will facilitate and monitor lesson plans during weekly PLC meetings

Administration and teachers will review cycle assessment data and project where students will score on the 2025 Civics EOC

#### Person responsible for monitoring outcome

Kate Tancrell

#### **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:**

1) Teachers participate in ongoing professional development focused on consistent spiraling of both content and critical concepts in the civics standards to ensure continuous monitoring of student performance cycle assessments. 2) Provide PD on the resources provided by the district to support instruction. 3) Provide support around planning lessons aligned to the benchmarks during PLC. 4) Foster an environment of cooperation and collaboration amongst students including the

encouragement of productive struggle for students as they work through vocabulary and comprehension using appropriate strategies. Teachers will ask higher order questions and use appropriate wait time to assess students' understanding of concepts. 5) Teachers will utilize common board configuration to create consistency about daily learning objectives/expectations schoolwide.

#### **Rationale:**

1) Teacher training/ professional development can help teachers improve their skills and knowledge and grow as educators. 2) The planning process gives teachers an opportunity to check their own knowledge of the concepts being taught, discuss misconceptions with peers and plan materials needed to teach the concept. 3) Collaborative learning structures increase the development of higherlevel thinking, communication, and leadership skills. Higher-order questions put advanced cognitive demand on students. 4) Establishing a uniform structure for displaying key information creates routines leading to student success

#### 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

Using data to adjust instruction

#### Person Monitoring:

By When/Frequency: Weekly PLC

Kate Tancrell

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

Regularly assess (formally and informally) and utilize data to modify and adjust instruction. Teachers utilize ongoing formative assessment and use the information gained to adjust instruction, enrich and reteach, and provide research-based interventions. Teachers engage student with data conversations and involve them with the review/remediation process.

#### Action Step #2

Increasing teacher clarity surrounding understanding and execution of benchmark-based instruction and reading across the content.

#### Person Monitoring:

By When/Frequency:

Kate Tancrell

Weekly walkthroughs

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

History teachers utilize systemic documents (curriculum guide, Canvas resources, textbook materials, DBQ online) to collaborate on planning and enacting lessons that build the historical timeline and regularly incorporate close reading and writing around historical documents. Teachers choose a common instrument for students to track and reflect on their growth in historical thinking/disciplinary literacy skills. US and World History teachers utilize DOE-developed and published resources for teaching the Civics and Government Benchmarks in the US and World History courses.

# **IV. Positive Culture and Environment**

# Area of Focus #1

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.

Safety Harbor Middle School is recognized as an IB World School that models the IB learner profile attributes. The 10 attributes revolve around high expectations of the entire teaching and learning community. When teachers use the attributes to recognize positive student behavior that aligns with our SOAR expectations, their words build student efficacy and eventually student agency

#### 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.

By the end of the first semester, 80% of staff will participate in student recognition activities as measured by the PBIS Rewards System and/or spreadsheet showing staff who recognized students demonstrating IB learner attributes.

## 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 Excel spreadsheet lists names of staff and staff has all month to fill in a student name. At the end of each month, IB learner profile certificates are made and delivered to teacher mailboxes to give to students. The percentage is calculated based on the number of nominations divided by total staff. Reminder emails are sent to staff to fill in spreadsheet in a timely manner. Assistant Principals and PLC leads remind staff to make their nominations in weekly meetings.

## Person responsible for monitoring outcome

**IB** Coordinator

# 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:** 

Prior to the beginning of the school year, incoming 6th graders will participate in Seahawk Camp where they will participate in activities acclimating them to the processes of Safety Harbor IB World

Middle. The focus is on creating a well-rounded IB Learner. Leadership will weave the attributes into their own communication and way of work, which will be a model for teachers, starting in pre-school. Each quarter teachers will be given a short IB learner profile activity to deliver to all students. All teachers will display their IB learner profile poster in a prominent area of their classroom and refer to it consistently whether they are using it for classroom management or for a writing prompt to understand text. When teachers use the language of the profile, it becomes a part of them.

#### Rationale:

IB learner attributes are used internationally to support positive culture in schools. The IB learner profile is an international standard for what makes "good humans". When all teachers and staff have a common language around high expectations, we can be more specific about our intended outcomes.

#### Tier of Evidence-based Intervention:

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG? No

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

Action Step #1 Professional Development

#### **Person Monitoring:**

IB Coordinator

By When/Frequency: Monthly

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

1) IB Coordinator will create a 30 min student activity around the IB learner profile to be taught by all teachers during one block during the first two days of school. 2) Leadership and IB coordinator will monitor the facilitation and effectiveness of the IB learner profile student activity during the first two days of school. 3) IB Coordinator will provide staff with additional professional learning around the IB learner profile. 4) IB Coordinator will facilitate training on PBIS Rewards System. 5) Behavior Team to survey students on recommendations for incentives then set up incentive rewards activities. 6) Staff to introduce the IB Learner profile during Seahawk Camp.

# Area of Focus #2

#### 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.

No Answer Entered

#### 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.

No Answer Entered

#### 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.

No Answer Entered

#### Person responsible for monitoring outcome

#### **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

**Person Monitoring:** 

By When/Frequency:

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

# Area of Focus #3

#### 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.

No Answer Entered

#### 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.

No Answer Entered

#### 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.

No Answer Entered

#### Person responsible for monitoring outcome

#### **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

**Person Monitoring:** 

By When/Frequency:

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

# V. Title I Requirements (optional)

# A. Schoolwide Program Plan (SWP)

This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A SWP and opts to use the SIP to satisfy the requirements of the SWP plan, as outlined in ESEA Section 1114(b). This section of the SIP is not required for non-Title I schools.

#### **Dissemination Methods**

Provide the methods for dissemination of this SIP, UniSIG budget and SWP to stakeholders (e.g., students, families, school staff and leadership, and local businesses and organizations). Please articulate a plan or protocol for how this SIP and progress will be shared and disseminated and to the extent practicable, provided in a language a parent can understand. (ESEA 1114(b)(4))

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

https://www.pcsb.org/Page/2764

## 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))

https://www.pcsb.org/domain/1112

## 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))

Safety Harbor IB World Middle School will put a strong emphasis on providing content professional development and monitoring systems for both instructors and students. In 6th grade, students and staff will be teamed to provide better opportunities for collaboration, discussions and review of practices. In other grade levels, teachers will meet weekly in content PLCs to review content standards/benchmarks, lesson planning, and data review. Teachers will meet monthly with their subject area department to discuss vertical alignment, assessments and instruction. Progress will be monitored by administration through daily walk throughs, attendance in PLCs and review of assessments.

#### 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))

The Title I Schoolwide Program Plan will be developed using input from school, family, and community members to determine how Title I funds are used based on a needs assessments. Opportunities to attend both online and in-person will be provided, followed by surveys to provide input on Title I funding.

# 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))

At Safety Harbor IB World Middle School, each grade level is staffed with an assistant principal and school counselor. Any student requesting services can be seen immediately for support. We also have a school social worker and school psychologist, who students can access for specialized support. Students may also receive services through a 504 Plan or an IEP.

## 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))

There are several opportunities for students to begin their career/college pathway. Each year students upload information into the web program, Naviance, that measures students' interest and suggests possible careers. Often times, students' electives can coordinate with those suggestions as we have technical courses, performing art courses, visual arts course and other career focused courses.

## 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)).

Safety Harbor IB World Middle will implement a schoolwide behavior plan that incorporates our SOAR expectations. Students will earn rewards for following the guidelines. We will also utilize a daily panner for communication with parents. Behavioral interruptions will be handled immediately by one of our grade level administrators. The school behavior specialist will monitor discipline referrals to intervene with students showing behavioral struggles. Staff will use PBIS Rewards to improve percentage of students exhibiting SOAR expectations. Staff will use programs Student Conductor and Smart Pass to monitor student attendance, behavior and time spent away from instruction.

## 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)).

1) Plan and implement BEST training for staff.

2) Provide PD on the resources provided by the district to support instruction.

3) Provide support around planning lessons aligned to the benchmarks during PLC.

4) Foster an environment of cooperation and collaboration amongst students including academic language, discussions, and group tasks. Teachers will ask higher order questions and use appropriate wait time to assess students' understanding of concepts.

5) Teachers will utilize common board configuration to create consistency about daily learning objectives/expectations schoolwide.

6) Teachers will be trained on the use of PBIS Rewards, IXL, Student Conductor, SMartPass, Performance Matters and FOCUS.

7)Teachers will have the ability to use TDE's, with subs being paid for with Title 1 funds, to attend PDs school/District Based.

8) Staff will have opportunities to review data post school to assist with scheduling, hiring, SIP development and other admin duties.

9) Additional training on IB principles to be offered and paid for

## Strategies to Assist Preschool Children

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

No Answer Entered

# VI. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review

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

## Process to Review the Use of Resources

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

No Answer Entered

## Specifics to Address the Need

Identify the specific resource(s), rationale (i.e., data) and plan to address the need(s) (i.e., timeline). No Answer Entered

# **VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus**

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

No