
Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	12
III. Planning for Improvement	16
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	36
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	0
VI. Title I Requirements	36
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

Safety Harbor Middle School

901 1ST AVE N, Safety Harbor, FL 34695

<http://sh-ms.sites.pcsb.org/>

SIP Authority

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

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

Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)

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

Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)

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

Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)

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

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

ESEA sections 1111(d) requires that each school identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI develop a support and improvement plan created in partnership with stakeholders (including principals and other school leaders, teachers and parent), is informed by all indicators in the State's accountability system, includes evidence-based interventions, is based on a school-level needs assessment, and identifies resource inequities to be addressed through implementation of the plan. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as TSI, ATSI and non-Title I CSI must be approved and monitored by the school district. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as Title I, CSI must be approved by the school district and

Department. The Department must monitor and periodically review implementation of each CSI plan after approval.

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

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

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

I. School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

Safety Harbor Middle School empowers our teaching and learning community to form compassionate and respectful relationships and cultivates collaborative, inquiry-based learning that supports our students' college and/or career preparation in a highly interconnected world.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Safety Harbor Middle School is dedicated to ensuring 100% student growth by promoting success in college, career, and future life goals.

School Leadership Team, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring

School Leadership Team

For each member of the school leadership team, select the employee name and email address from the dropdown. Identify the position title and job duties/responsibilities as it relates to SIP implementation for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Boulieris, Dionisios	Principal	Instructional Leader AVID IB Administrative Appraisals Bridging the Gap Budgets/Auditing Chamber of Commerce Child Study Emergency Shelter Plan Equity for Excellence Leadership Team MTSS/SBLT Team PMAC Professional Development PTSA SAC School Improvement Staff Recognition School Messenger Social Media Manager Walkthroughs Weekly PLC Report Weekly Teacher Memo
Powers, Toni	Assistant Principal	First Week Plan Gifted/ESE Contact Family Engagement Emergency File Folders Child Study Team Transportation Finance Park IB Magnet ISM preparation PBIS Team Implementation SAC/Chamber of Commerce Restorative Practices 6th Grade Open House Detention/ISS plan Discovery Night Hearing and Vision Seahawk Camp Student packets for first day 6th Grade Tours Faculty Meeting School Improvement Goal by content Staff Recognition System Tardy Conductor Binders/Dividers AVID

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		Website Yearly Kickoff Proactive Threat Assessment Meetings
Dove, Diane	Assistant Principal	Bullying Reports- Say Something EOY Checklist Master Calendar Activity Requests PSAT for 8th graders AVID Deliberate Practice Instructional MTSS NJHS LEP Coordinator/ESOL Department/Grade Level Meetings Great American Teach In Literacy Committee New Teacher Orientation Schedule PTSA School Crisis Plan/Monthly Safety SIP Lead School Improvement Goal by content School Pictures/Yearbook Social Media Manager Staff Handbook Updates Canvas Student Celebrations-HR, PR, TOP Seahawk Textbooks/Instructional Materials Walkthrough Tool and Schedule PCS Connects - Tech Fish Report Pro-Ed Faciliator Property Inventory Parent Handbook Canvas updates for staff
Mills, James	Assistant Principal	Master Schedule Extended Learning Program SIP Content Manager MTSS

Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Development

Describe the process for involving stakeholders (including the school leadership team, teachers and school staff, parents, students (mandatory for secondary schools) and families, and business or community leaders) and how their input was used in the SIP development process. (ESSA 1114(b)(2))

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

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

The 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.

Demographic Data	
2023-24 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Middle School 6-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	48%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	85%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
2021-22 ESSA Identification	ATSI
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD)* English Language Learners (ELL) Asian Students (ASN) Black/African American Students (BLK)* Hispanic Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History	2021-22: C 2019-20: B

	2018-19: B 2017-18: B
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	68	60	70	198
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	15	21	40
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	8	7	29
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	18	37	61
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	78	93	91	262
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	87	50	82	219
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that have two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	45	50	55	150

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	26	44	90
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Prior Year (2022-23) As Initially Reported (pre-populated)

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

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

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

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Prior Year (2022-23) Updated (pre-populated)

Section 3 includes data tables that are pre-populated based off information submitted in prior year's SIP.

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

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

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

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review

ESSA School, District and State Comparison (pre-populated)

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school or combination schools). Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school.

On April 9, 2021, FDOE Emergency Order No. 2021-EO-02 made 2020-21 school grades optional. They have been removed from this publication.

Accountability Component	2022			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	43	45	50	49	52	54
ELA Learning Gains	40	43	48	56	55	54
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	32	32	38	51	47	47
Math Achievement*	48	51	54	57	55	58
Math Learning Gains	51	52	58	54	52	57
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	58	48	55	46	46	51
Science Achievement*	45	45	49	55	51	51
Social Studies Achievement*	65	64	71	64	68	72
Middle School Acceleration	73			82		
Graduation Rate						
College and Career Acceleration						
ELP Progress	52			60		

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

See [Florida School Grades, School Improvement Ratings and DJJ Accountability Ratings](#).

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	51
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	507
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	98
Graduation Rate	

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	26	Yes	3	1
ELL	41			
AMI				
ASN	68			
BLK	38	Yes	1	
HSP	45			
MUL	47			
PAC				
WHT	55			
FRL	45			

Accountability Components by Subgroup

Each “blank” cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school. (pre-populated)

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21	ELP Progress
All Students	43	40	32	48	51	58	45	65	73			52

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21	ELP Progress
SWD	14	26	22	14	37	42	17	22	50			14
ELL	24	40	34	32	46	62	24	52	45			52
AMI												
ASN	70	56		68	71				75			
BLK	23	31	26	25	45	54	24	38	72			
HSP	36	38	35	39	44	60	37	48	59			54
MUL	34	30	30	42	56	60	18	78	75			
PAC												
WHT	51	42	32	57	55	59	56	76	78			47
FRL	32	36	34	38	50	61	33	56	60			48

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20	ELP Progress
All Students	43	40	31	44	32	29	48	67	63			56
SWD	9	18	14	17	28	25	15	38	47			26
ELL	24	35	26	28	30	35	18	61	54			56
AMI												
ASN	67	43		79	70		80		86			
BLK	22	33	33	17	26	20	14	41	28			
HSP	30	38	31	34	30	36	40	59	60			53
MUL	38	35	31	44	29	27	56	55	62			
PAC												
WHT	53	43	29	54	33	28	58	78	67			56
FRL	34	38	32	34	29	28	37	56	55			56

2018-19 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18	ELP Progress
All Students	49	56	51	57	54	46	55	64	82			60
SWD	14	39	43	22	40	41	25	25	83			33
ELL	25	48	45	40	48	45	22	40	79			60
AMI												

2018-19 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18	ELP Progress
ASN	68	68		89	77		81	82	95			
BLK	28	44	48	29	39	42	22	39	90			
HSP	42	53	47	48	51	46	47	48	75			58
MUL	46	55	40	45	49	50	41	58	88			
PAC												
WHT	56	59	52	65	57	49	64	75	83			65
FRL	38	51	49	44	47	45	41	53	76			57

Grade Level Data Review– State Assessments (pre-populated)

The data are raw data and include ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data. The percentages shown here represent ALL students who received a score of 3 or higher on the statewide assessments.

An asterisk (*) in any cell indicates the data has been suppressed due to fewer than 10 students tested, or all tested students scoring the same.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
07	2023 - Spring	42%	48%	-6%	47%	-5%
08	2023 - Spring	45%	47%	-2%	47%	-2%
06	2023 - Spring	46%	47%	-1%	47%	-1%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	63%	58%	5%	54%	9%
07	2023 - Spring	34%	36%	-2%	48%	-14%
08	2023 - Spring	60%	61%	-1%	55%	5%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	48%	47%	1%	44%	4%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	75%	53%	22%	50%	25%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	88%	46%	42%	48%	40%

CIVICS						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	66%	68%	-2%	66%	0%

III. Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis/Reflection

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

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

Based on 2022-23 proficiency data, ELA achievement (45%) was the lowest performing data component, followed by science achievement (48%), math achievement (57%), social studies achievement (66%), and middle school acceleration (74%). Overall learning gains and learning gains of the lowest quartile for both ELA and math are not available due to baseline testing using the FAST. Three-year trend data reflect a 3% increase in ELA achievement, 36% increase in math achievement, 13% increase in Algebra 1 achievement, 11% increase in geometry achievement, 1% increase in science achievement, no change in civics achievement, and an 11% increase in middle school acceleration.

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

Based on 2022-23 proficiency data, ELA achievement (45%) was the lowest performing data component. Lack of understanding the depth of the BEST standards and alignment of learning targets and tasks drive the low performance. Curriculum needs to be more rigorous and differentiated to be accessible for all students and increase mastery.

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.

Although the three-year data reflects a 3% increase in ELA achievement its still shows the greatest gap when compared to the state average. Lack of understand the depth of the BEST standards and alignment of learning targets to task were a contributing factor to this trend.

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

Safety Harbor Middle School Mathematics:

According to PM3 FAST 2022 - 2023:

6th Grade Students Proficiency Level 3 or Above is 63%

7th Grade Students Proficiency Level 3 or Above is 34%

8th Grade Students Proficiency Level 3 or Above is 60%

Alg 1 EOC students have an 75% Passing Rate.

Geometry EOC students have an 88% Passing Rate.

PLC collaborative planning, teachers monitoring student data and the use of review with IXL foundational skills were instrumental in achieving these results. Student celebrations were also a contributing factor to these learning gains.

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

Students with 2 or more failures.

Students with 10% or more absences.

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

- 1.) Proficiency Level of ELA
- 2.) Proficiency Level of Science
- 3.) Proficiency Level of Civics
- 4.) Proficiency of Students with Disabilities
- 5.) Students with 2 or more course failures.

Area of Focus

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

#1. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Other**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Safety Harbor Middle School is working to become 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. During the last semester of 2022-23, teachers nominated two students each month from their class rosters that exemplified two of the IB attributes. On average, 60% of staff participated in these monthly nominations.

Measurable Outcome:

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

By the end of the first semester, 80% of staff will participate in monthly IB learner recognitions. This will be measured by the Excel spreadsheet that is sent to staff each month by the IB coordinator.

Monitoring:

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

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:

Renee Caplinger-Ford (caplinger-fordr@pcsb.org)

Evidence-based Intervention:

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

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 for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

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

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

IB Coordinator will create 2023-24 IB attribute student recognition spreadsheet.

Person Responsible: Renee Caplinger-Ford (caplinger-fordr@pcsb.org)

By When: By Aug. 8th

IB Coordinator and PLT 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.

Person Responsible: Renee Caplinger-Ford (caplinger-fordr@pcsb.org)

By When: By Aug. 2nd

Leadership and IB coordinator will monitor the facilitation and effectiveness of the IB learner profile student activity during the first two days of school.

Person Responsible: Danny Boulrieris (boulrierisde@pcsb.org)

By When: By Aug 11th

IBO and IB Coordinator will provide staff with additional professional learning around the IB learner profile.

Person Responsible: Renee Caplinger-Ford (caplinger-fordr@pcsb.org)

By When: July 26th and Aug 9th

Coordinator will email IB learner attribute spreadsheet with monthly tabs on the bottom for each month with directions on expectations for nominations.

Person Responsible: Renee Caplinger-Ford (caplinger-fordr@pcsb.org)

By When: By Aug. 14th

Coordinator will calculate percentage of staff nominating at the end of each month and report to leadership.

Person Responsible: Renee Caplinger-Ford (caplinger-fordr@pcsb.org)

By When: End of each month.

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Social Studies**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Based on 2022 - 2023 proficiency data, Safety Harbor Middle School's current level of performance is 66% proficiency, as evidenced by the 2023 Spring EOC Civics Assessment.

1. We expect our performance level to be 70% by the 2023 - 2024 Civics EOC Assessment.
2. Deeper understanding of the Best standards and increased rigor in tasks through common planning will increase student achievement by at least 4% in the 2024 Civics EOC Assessment.
- 3.) Teachers will incorporate reading and writing strategies in Social Studies by text-marking, cloze reading and evidenced-based writing DBQs.

Measurable Outcome:

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

The percent of students achieving proficiency on the CIVICS EOC will increase from 66% to 70% as measured by the Spring administration of the 2024 Civics EOC.

Monitoring:

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

Administrator walkthroughs using feedback.

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

Teachers utilize ongoing formative assessment and use information gained to adjust instruction, enrich and reteach, and provide research-based interventions for benchmark proficiency.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Toni Powers (powersto@pcsb.org)

Evidence-based Intervention:

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

Teachers and students will utilize student data to organize and reorganize students to interact with social studies standards.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Data is reviewed to see if any skills need reteaching. Individual student data is shared and remediation is given to individual students as needed. Data both summative and formative can also be used to help differentiated content to students to help meet the needs of each student.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Students track data in all courses via the use of both formative and summative assessments. Students in AVID will utilize tutorials as needed. Teachers and students will track mastery of benchmarks and remediation plans will be created as needed by teachers.

Person Responsible: Toni Powers (powersto@pcsb.org)

By When: May 31, 2024

Students will utilize Civics Reflection books to reflect on benchmarks
Students will incorporate Focused Note-Taking as they review benchmarks.

Person Responsible: Toni Powers (powersto@pcsb.org)

By When: May 31, 2024

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Our current level of performance is 59% Mathematics Achievement, as evidenced in the 2022 - 2023 School Grade Report.

We expect our performance to be at least 67% Mathematics Achievement by the 2023- 2024 School Grade Report.

According to PM3 FAST 2022 - 2023:

6th Grade Students Proficiency Level 3 or Above is 63%

7th Grade Students Proficiency Level 3 or Above is 34%

8th Grade Students Proficiency Level 3 or Above is 60%

Alg 1 EOC students have an 75% Passing Rate.

Geometry EOC students have an 88% Passing Rate.

The gap is occurring because the depth of the benchmark is not explicitly being taught, practiced and reviewed and differentiated instruction is not consistently evident in all classrooms by all teachers. If differentiated learning opportunities are implemented as part of explicit student instruction, the problem would be reduced by 5%.

Measurable Outcome:

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

The percent of all students' achievement in mathematics will increase from 59% to 67%, as measured by the 2023 - 2024 Fast Mathematics PM3 Achievement as reported on the School Grade Report.

Monitoring:

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

Administrator walkthroughs using feedback.

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

Teachers utilize ongoing formative assessment and use information gained to adjust instruction, enrich and reteach, and provide research-based interventions for benchmark proficiency.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Danny Boulieris (boulierisde@pcsb.org)

Evidence-based Intervention:

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

Teachers will provide tasks that are complex and at the level of the standard. Scaffolding and opportunities for productive struggle will be built into learning engagements and will become part of the classroom culture.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Appropriate tasks complexity builds stamina and promotes creative problem solving so that students understand concepts at a deeper level and are able to apply this knowledge to more advanced math and in interdisciplinary contexts.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Admin, teachers, conduct regular, monthly, Professional Learning Communities (PLCs) inclusive of review of student responses to tasks and formative assessments and plan for instructional lessons that include remediation and differentiation as needed for all students.

Person Responsible: Danny Boulieris (boulierisde@pcsb.org)

By When: May 31, 2024

Students track data in all courses via the use of both formative and summative assessments. Students in AVID will utilize tutorials as needed. Teachers and students will track mastery of benchmarks and remediation plans will be created as needed by teachers.

Person Responsible: Danny Boulieris (boulierisde@pcsb.org)

By When: May 31, 2024

#4. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Safety Harbor Middle's ELA proficiency rate was our lowest score. ELA mastery is imperative for all students. Students can use ELA skills in other academic areas and throughout their lives. We believe achieving growth in ELA can help students in their other subjects and prepare them for college and career.

1. Our current level of performance is 46% as measured by the 2022-2023 FAST ELA.
2. We expect our performance level to be 53% by the 2023-2024 FAST ELA.
3. Lack of understanding the depth of the BEST standards and alignment of learning targets and tasks drive the low performance. Curriculum needs to be more rigorous and differentiated to be accessible for all students and increase mastery.
4. Deeper understanding of the BEST standards and increased the cognitive rigor in tasks through common planning will increase student achievement by 10% by the 2023-2024 FAST ELA.

Measurable Outcome:

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

The percent of all students achieving ELA proficiency will increase from 46% to 53%, as measured by the FAST ELA.

Monitoring:

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

Administrator walkthroughs using feedback.

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

Teachers utilize ongoing formative assessment and use information gained to adjust instruction, enrich and reteach, and provide research-based interventions for benchmark proficiency.

Admin and teachers will review cycle assessment data and project where students will score on the 2024 FAST ELA.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Dionisios Boulieris (boulierisd@pcsb.org)

Evidence-based Intervention:

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

Administration/content Literacy Coach will support teachers with planning rigorous lessons and tasks aligned to standards and district resources utilizing data to differentiate/scaffold instruction to meet the needs of each student. Admin/Literacy Coach will give teachers timely feedback on lessons, tasks, and implementation.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Data-driven and rigorous, differentiated instruction ensures that various types of learners with varying needs will all be able to learn. Rigorous, differentiated instruction will allow growth in all our sub-group populations as well.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Administrators/Literacy Coach will regularly observe lessons to monitor strategy implementation and provide feedback to teachers to support next steps.

Person Responsible: James Mills (millsjam@pcsb.org)

By When: May 31, 2024

Admin, teachers, and ISDs conduct regular, monthly, Professional Learning Communities (PLCs) inclusive of review of student responses to tasks and formative assessments and plan for instructional lessons that include text-dependent questions, close and critical reading, and skill/strategy- based groups to implement during core instruction to support success with complex texts and written responses.

Person Responsible: James Mills (millsjam@pcsb.org)

By When: May 31, 2024

Teachers will attend DWT and various trainings on the new BEST standards. ISDs will facilitate Professional Development during teacher planning days. Teachers will utilize these trainings to develop lesson plans that include differentiation and cognitive rigor to fit the needs of all students.

Person Responsible: James Mills (millsjam@pcsb.org)

By When: May 31, 2024

#5. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Other**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Increase non district mandated parent nights in an effort to bring more families into the school to ask questions and become familiar with the school itself.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Increase parent nights from 3 to 4 parent nights for the 2023 - 2024 School year.

Monitoring:

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

Scheduling 4 parent nights.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

[no one identified]

Evidence-based Intervention:

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

Increase Parental Involvement.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Increase Parental involvement leads to higher student achievement , increased comfort with the school and staff for parents and students alike and allows families to feel as if they are apart of the SHMS learning community.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Schedule 4 Parent Nights

1. Parent University
2. Data Chat/Movie Night
3. Related Arts Showcase
4. Family Game or Fitness Night

Person Responsible: Danny Boulieris (boulierisde@pcsb.org)

By When: Schedule, organize and promote Parent Night Activities by September 2023.

#6. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Early Warning System**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

In the 2021 - 2022 school year our student attendance rate was 94.9% for all students. In the 2022-2023 school year, our goal was to increase our attendance rate to 98% by May 2023. Our attendance rate was 96% for all students by May 2023.

Measurable Outcome:

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

The percentage of all students missing 5 or more days will decrease from 4.8% to 2% as measured by attendance in FOCUS.

Monitoring:

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

Each week our DMT will pull or rate of attendance by grade level . The attendance rates will be announced during morning announcements and be included in the Friday Message. At the end of the month the grade level with the highest attendance rate will be recognized and earn additional Seahawk Bucks. In addition, our Child Study Team (CST) will meet twice a month to monitor students who are absent and make connections with families. CST team members will monitor and provide supports based on individual student needs.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Toni Powers (powersto@pcsb.org)

Evidence-based Intervention:

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

SHMS will strengthen the attendance problem-solving process to address and support the needs of our students across all tiers on an on-going basis.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

We will continue to monitor, address and support the needs of our students across all Tiers to improve attendance of all students.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

SHMS will continue to reach out to all student families who have been absent 5 or more days. This contact will be recorded in Focus and our CST team will monitor these students.

Person Responsible: Toni Powers (powersto@pcsb.org)

By When: On-going monthly

CST Team will meet twice a month to review data and monitor the effectiveness of the school-wide attendance strategies.

Person Responsible: Toni Powers (powersto@pcsb.org)

By When: On-going monthly

SHMS CST will implement Tier 2 and Tier 3 plans for specific students that require additional supports, on-going review of the effectiveness will occur twice a month.

Person Responsible: Toni Powers (powersto@pcsb.org)

By When: on-going monthly

#7. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Our current level of performance is 48% proficiency, as evidenced in SSA proficiency (level 3 and above). We expect our performance to be 56% by the 2023 - 2024 school grade report.

Measurable Outcome:

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

The percent of 8th grade students achieving science proficiency will increase from 48% to 56%, as measured by the 8th grade state-wide science assessment.

Monitoring:

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

Administrator walkthroughs using feedback.

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

Teachers utilize ongoing formative assessment and use information gained to adjust instruction, enrich and reteach, and provide research-based interventions for benchmark proficiency.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Diane Dove (doved@pcsb.org)

Evidence-based Intervention:

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

1. Teachers will implement literacy strategies to engage reading and analyze complex text in science.
2. Teachers will provide extensive inquiry-based instruction which includes opportunities for students to think scientifically through research, content exploration with reading and writing opportunities (claims and evidence).
3. Science teachers will use the NOS matrix provided by the science curriculum specialist.
4. Science teachers will utilize data to differentiate and scaffold instruction to increase student performance through focused remediation.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

By introducing and implementing a school wide writing and reading plan, all students will build endurance and comprehension skills needed for success, along with intentional placement in science courses. Culturally Relevant Teaching practices will engage students in science with a deeper understanding of the content.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

1. Teachers across content integrate literacy strategies. Science teachers will provide students opportunities to read and respond to informational texts regarding the process and outcomes of their

inquiries while utilizing the Nature of Science and science language as they investigate.

2. Teachers will utilize common planning to create and facilitate rigorous inquiry-based lessons that reach the breadth of the standard.

3. Use supplemental texts to include shorter, challenging, and technical passages that elicit close reading and rereading.

4. Bi-weekly and monthly PLCs for data chats to review student work regarding assigned tasks and formative assessments for future planning.

5. Monitor data and provide remediation to fill in gaps and plan instructional lessons that meet the needs of all students.

Person Responsible: Diane Dove (doved@pcsb.org)

By When:

#8. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

2022-23 achievement data for students with disabilities reflect a proficiency in ELA of 11% and in math of 27%. Three-year trend data (2020-21; 2021-22; 2022-23) reflect ELA proficiency rates of 9%, 14%, and 11%, rates below the 32% target for three consecutive years.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Based on 2022-23 FAST PM3 data, 21% of students with disabilities will meet proficiency targets in ELA resulting in a growth of 10 percentage points (11% to 21%).

Monitoring:

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

Proficiency targets will be communicated using our school-wide data wall, along with monthly reminders during PLCs. Following PM1, proficient students will be identified and reviewed during a PLC. Teachers will identify the proficient students and then select a group of students to target for additional interventions to reach the proficiency targets. Monthly data reviews will take place with these students to monitor the effectiveness of Tier 1 core instruction outcomes and progress based on the Tier 2 interventions being delivered.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

James Mills (millsjam@pcsb.org)

Evidence-based Intervention:

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

Teachers will routinely use a set of comprehension-building practices to help students make sense of the text. Specifically, teachers will build students' world and word knowledge so they can make sense of the text; consistently provide students with opportunities to ask and answer questions to better understand the text they read; teach students a routine for determining the gist of a short section of text; and teach students to monitor their comprehension as they read.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

By the time students are in the middle grades, reading material in all subject areas conveys information and ideas that students are expected to learn and understand. When students are unable to understand these texts, they miss crucial opportunities to learn grade-level content. This strategy provides teachers with ways to support students as they learn and practice routines and develop habits that enable students to understand what they are reading.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Teachers will examine the student achievement data for all students assigned to them, specifically noting trends in areas of strength and weakness. Each grade level will prioritize assessed benchmarks within each reporting category and align areas of strength and weakness for students with disabilities.

Person Responsible: James Mills (millsjam@pcsb.org)

By When: August 31, 2023

General education ELA teachers will share identified strengths and weaknesses of their identified students with disabilities with support facilitation teachers. General education teachers and support facilitation teachers will collaborate to develop support structures and opportunities for embedded intervention within the general education classroom related to the evidence-based intervention.

Person Responsible: James Mills (millsjam@pcsb.org)

By When: September 15, 2023

Support facilitation teachers will participate in one (1) monthly PLC with the ELA department to ensure alignment of support activities and progress of identified students with disabilities. Support facilitation teachers will actively collaborate with general education teachers during the PLC to identify if changes need to be made to Tier 1 core instruction and what (if any) Tier 2 interventions may be needed to further assist identified students with disabilities in their goals to meet proficiency.

Person Responsible: James Mills (millsjam@pcsb.org)

By When: May 31, 2024

All students will use prior-year achievement data and 2023-24 FAST PM1 data to set growth goals for PM2 and PM3. Growth goals will be maintained by students in their ELA binders and include targets for scale score ranges that will result in a student moving from their current achievement level to the next highest achievement level. Students will develop two (2) action steps they will commit to in order to move to the next achievement level. Following the completion of the student data chat, students will visit the grade-level data room and move their individual data target following assessment opportunities.

Person Responsible: James Mills (millsjam@pcsb.org)

By When: May 31, 2024

#9. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to English Language Learners**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

2022-23 achievement data for English language learners reflect a proficiency in ELA of 16% and in math of 41%. Three-year trend data (2020-21; 2021-22; 2022-23) reflect ELA proficiency rates of 24%, 24%, and 16%, rates below the 32% target for three consecutive years.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Based on 2023-24 FAST PM3 data, 26% of English language learners will meet proficiency targets in ELA resulting in a growth of 10 percentage points (16% to 26%).

Monitoring:

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

Proficiency targets will be communicated using our school-wide data wall, along with monthly reminders during PLCs. Following PM1, proficient students will be identified and reviewed during a PLC. Teachers will identify the proficient students and then select a group of students to target for additional interventions to reach the proficiency targets. Monthly data reviews will take place with these students to monitor the effectiveness of Tier 1 core instruction outcomes and progress based on the Tier 2 interventions being delivered.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

James Mills (millsjam@pcsb.org)

Evidence-based Intervention:

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

In addition to receiving high-quality, Tier 1 core instruction at grade-level, English language learners will be exposed to subject-area instruction that integrates oral and written English language instruction into content-area teaching. Teachers will strategically use instructional tools to anchor instruction and help students make sense of content. Teachers will explicitly teach the content-specific academic vocabulary, as well as the general academic vocabulary that supports it. Students will also be provided daily opportunities to talk about content in pairs or small groups. Writing opportunities to extend student learning and understand of the content material will also be provided by all teachers.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Five studies that met WWC standards provide evidence for this intervention. All five studies resulted in positive impacts on content-area acquisition measures in science or social studies. Two studies essentially investigated the effectiveness of interventions that provide comprehensive instruction in content-area classes by employing all of the practices articulated in this intervention. The remaining three studies furnish evidence for some of the instructional practices described in this intervention.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Teachers will examine the student achievement data for all students assigned to them, specifically noting trends in areas of strength and weakness. Each grade level will prioritize assessed benchmarks within each reporting category and align areas of strength and weakness for English language learners.

Person Responsible: James Mills (millsjam@pcsb.org)

By When: August 31, 2023

The ELL teacher and support staff will share identified strengths and weaknesses of their identified English language learners with content-area teachers. Content-area teachers and ELL support staff will collaborate to develop support structures and opportunities for embedded intervention within the general education classroom related to the evidence-based intervention.

Person Responsible: James Mills (millsjam@pcsb.org)

By When: September 15, 2023

Content-area teachers will participate in one (1) quarterly PLC with the ELL support staff to ensure alignment of support activities and progress of identified English language learners. The ELL team will actively collaborate with content-area teachers during the PLC to identify if changes need to be made to Tier 1 core instruction and what (if any) Tier 2 interventions may be needed to further assist identified English language learners in their goals to meet proficiency.

Person Responsible: James Mills (millsjam@pcsb.org)

By When: May 31, 2024

All students will use prior-year achievement data and 2023-24 FAST PM1 data to set growth goals for PM2 and PM3. Growth goals will be maintained by students in their ELA binders and include targets for scale score ranges that will result in a student moving from their current achievement level to the next highest achievement level. Students will develop two (2) action steps they will commit to in order to move to the next achievement level. Following the completion of the student data chat, students will visit the grade-level data room and move their individual data target following assessment opportunities.

Person Responsible: James Mills (millsjam@pcsb.org)

By When: May 31, 2024

#10. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Black/African-American**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

2022-23 achievement data for Black/African/American students reflect a proficiency in ELA of 31% and in math of 33%. Three-year trend data (2020-21; 2021-22; 2022-23) reflect ELA proficiency rates of 22%, 23%, and 31%, rates below the 32% target for three consecutive years.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Based on 2023-24 FAST PM3 data, 41% of Black/African-American students will meet proficiency targets in ELA resulting in a growth of 10 percentage points (31% to 41%).

Monitoring:

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

Proficiency targets will be communicated using our school-wide data wall, along with monthly reminders during PLCs. Following PM1, proficient students will be identified and reviewed during a PLC. Teachers will identify the proficient students and then select a group of students to target for additional interventions to reach the proficiency targets. Monthly data reviews will take place with these students to monitor the effectiveness of Tier 1 core instruction outcomes and progress based on the Tier 2 interventions being delivered.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

James Mills (millsjam@pcsb.org)

Evidence-based Intervention:

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

In addition to receiving high-quality, Tier 1 core instruction at grade-level, integrating writing and reading to emphasize key writing features will be emphasized with Black/African-American students. Teachers will teach students to understand that both writers and readers use similar strategies, knowledge, and skills to create meaning. In addition, teachers will use a variety of written exemplars to highlight key features of texts.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Eight studies contributed to the level of evidence for this intervention. Three studies meet WWC group design standards without reservations, and five studies meet WWC group design standards with reservations. Several studies found positive effects on at least one writing outcomes. Positive effects were found in the overall writing quality, genre elements, and word choice domains. Trend-data reveal that improving Black/African-American student achievement outcomes in writing leads to higher overall ELA student achievement.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 2 - Moderate Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Teachers will examine the student achievement data for all students assigned to them, specifically noting trends in areas of strength and weakness. Each grade level will prioritize assessed benchmarks within each reporting category and align areas of strength and weakness for Black/African-American students.

Person Responsible: James Mills (millsjam@pcsb.org)

By When: August 31, 2023

All students will use prior-year achievement data and 2023-24 FAST PM1 data to set growth goals for PM2 and PM3. Growth goals will be maintained by students in their ELA binders and include targets for scale score ranges that will result in a student moving from their current achievement level to the next highest achievement level. Students will develop two (2) action steps they will commit to in order to move to the next achievement level. Following the completion of the student data chat, students will visit the grade-level data room and move their individual data target following assessment opportunities.

Person Responsible: James Mills (millsjam@pcsb.org)

By When: May 31, 2024

CSI, TSI and ATSI Resource Review

Describe the process to review school improvement funding allocations and ensure resources are allocated based on needs. This section must be completed if the school is identified as ATSI, TSI or CSI in addition to completing an Area(s) of Focus identifying interventions and activities within the SIP (ESSA 1111(d)(1)(B)(4) and (d)(2)(C).

Resource allocation is prioritized to support the underperforming subgroups of students with disabilities, English language learners, and Black/African-American students. Additional school improvement funds are not available outside of Title I, Part A. However, the addition of a full-time Literacy Coach is being funded through Title I, Part A to support improvements in student achievement with the identified subgroups.

Title I Requirements**Schoolwide Program Plan (SWP) Requirements**

This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A SWP and opts to use the SIP to satisfy the requirements of the SWP plan, as outlined in the ESSA, Public Law No. 114-95, § 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

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

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

The School Improvement Plan and Title I Schoolwide Program Plan components will be shared through a link on the school's website homepage, overview during the initial School Advisory Council meeting, overview during the initial Title I Parent Night, overview during the initial PTSA meeting, and included in its entirety as a resource in the Parent and Family Resource Center within the school.

<https://www.pcsb.org/safetyharbor-ms>

Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission, support the needs of students and keep parents informed of their child's progress.

List the school's webpage* where the school's Family Engagement Plan is made publicly available. (ESSA 1116(b-g))

The Parent and Family Engagement Plan will include information related to parent trainings to increase student achievement, staff training for engaging parents, communication methods between home and school, flexible meeting times, accessibility for parents, and coordinating with other federal programs. Each of these components will be shared during SAC, PTSA, and parent/family nights.
<https://www.pcsb.org/safetyharbor-ms>

Describe how the school plans to strengthen the academic program in the school, increase the amount and quality of learning time and help provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum. Include the Area of Focus if addressed in Part III of the SIP. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)ii)

To strengthen the academic program in the school, year-two implementation of the International Baccalaureate (IB) Middle Years Programme (MYP) will begin for the 2023-24 school year. This challenging framework encourages students to make practical connections between their studies and the real world. The curriculum framework comprises eight subject groups, providing a broad and balanced education for early adolescents. Inclusive by design, the framework is built for students of all interests and academic abilities.

If appropriate and applicable, describe how this plan is developed in coordination and integration with other Federal, State, and local services, resources and programs, such as programs supported under ESSA, violence prevention programs, nutrition programs, housing programs, Head Start programs, adult education programs, career and technical education programs, and schools implementing CSI or TSI activities under section 1111(d). (ESSA 1114(b)(5))

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.