

Agenda Item Number 7.02(2)

**Taylor County District School Board
Office of the Superintendent
Agenda Item for School Board Approval**

Date Submitted 08/21/2023 Board Meeting Date 09/19/2023

Date agenda item is due in the Superintendent's Office 09/08/2023

Person submitting the item: Jill Rudd

Name of document placed on agenda: TCMS School Improvement Plan 23-24

Summary description regarding this action item:

Please review and approve the TCMS Schoolwide improvement

plan for the 2023-2024 school year.

APPROVED

SEP 07 2023

Signatures Required

Yes ☐ No ☒

By Taylor County
School Board

Reviewed by:

Director of Finance _____

The action described above is provided for and is consistent with relevant contract and grant provisions and the Board approved budget as amended.

Director of Personnel _____

The action described above is provided for and is consistent with the Board approved staffing plan and collective bargaining agreements.

Director of Instruction Jill Rudd

The action described above is provided for and is consistent with relevant Federal programs and the Board approved School Improvement, Instructional and Curriculum Plans.

Superintendent _____

TCSB # 0607-3

Taylor County School District

Taylor County Middle School



APPROVED

SEP 07 2023

By Taylor County
School Board

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	9
III. Planning for Improvement	13
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	17
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	0
VI. Title I Requirements	0
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

Taylor County Middle School

601 E LAFAYETTE ST, Perry, FL 32347

https://www.edline.net/pages/taylor_county_middle_school

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: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%; 2. Have a graduation rate at or below 67%; 3. Have a school grade of D or F; or 4. Have a Federal Index below 41% in the same subgroup(s) for 6 consecutive years.

ESEA sections 1111(d) requires that each school identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI develop a support and improvement plan created in partnership with stakeholders (including principals and other school leaders, teachers and 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.

The mission of Taylor County Middle School is to provide a positive, safe, healthy, nurturing, and respectful environment, in which all students can learn and have the opportunity to become productive members of society.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The vision is to equip and inspire students to think, create, perform, and advocate.

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
Roberts, Kasey	Principal	Oversee schoolwide implementation of the SIP
Bean, Keri	Assistant Principal	Focuses on the lesson planning, curriculum and data
Frostick, Angie	Assistant Principal	Oversee students discipline, referrals and wellness program
Heartsfield, Yvonne	Reading Coach	Analyze data following each progress monitoring and will meet with teachers
Amman, Jennifer	Math Coach	Analyze data following each progress monitoring and will meet with teachers

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 is developed and approved by the School Advisory Council, which consists of the school leadership team, staff, parents, community leaders, and students.

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))

Following each progress monitoring assessment, the data is analyzed and shared with stakeholders. Any necessary revisions are made to ensure that we are meeting the state's academic standards and closing the achievement gap for identified students.

Demographic Data	
2023-24 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Other School 6-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	36%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	100%
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)	
School Grades History	2021-22: C 2020-21: B 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	60	87	94	241
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	46	84	86	216
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	36	24	67
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	32	24	25	81
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	51	79	88	218
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	42	101	73	216
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	40	0	0	40

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	61	100	97	258

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	2	1	5	8
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	6	15	30

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	56	65	60	181
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	30	30	20	80
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	17	14	43
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	22	11	17	50
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	95	72	62	229
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	103	69	55	227
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	54	28	40	122

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	62	59	47	168

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	2	2	3	7
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	17	14	38

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	56	65	60	181	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	30	30	20	80	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	17	14	43	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	22	11	17	50	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	95	72	62	229	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	103	69	55	227	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	54	28	40	122	

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	62	59	47	168

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	2	2	3	7
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	17	14	38

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.

District and State data will be uploaded when available.

Accountability Component	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	42			46			50		
ELA Learning Gains	39			49			55		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	26			40			52		
Math Achievement*	51			49			53		
Math Learning Gains	53			46			61		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	54			44			52		
Science Achievement*	35			36			44		
Social Studies Achievement*	70			56			67		
Middle School Acceleration	60			67			88		
Graduation Rate									
College and Career Acceleration									
ELP Progress									

* 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	48
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	430
Total Components for the Federal Index	9
Percent Tested	97
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	39	Yes	1	
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	38	Yes	1	
HSP	60			
MUL	50			
PAC				
WHT	52			
FRL	43			

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	42	39	26	51	53	54	35	70	60			
SWD	25	31	19	34	48	44	32	50	64			
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	25	36	27	37	47	41	22	65	42			
HSP	50	60		50	80							
MUL	49	46		45	56		43		62			
PAC												
WHT	49	39	26	57	54	63	39	71	66			
FRL	37	37	21	43	48	50	35	62	51			

Taylor - 0031 - Taylor County Middle School - 2023-24 SIP

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	46	49	40	49	46	44	36	56	67			
SWD	29	44	40	36	45	43	32	32				
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	30	41	33	34	43	43	14	47	62			
HSP	63	63		53	47							
MUL	46	58		57	48		36	44				
PAC												
WHT	51	51	41	54	47	49	44	61	69			
FRL	40	47	39	42	44	43	27	52	59			

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	50	55	52	53	61	52	44	67	88			
SWD	38	61	56	41	55	50	54	45				
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	37	49	35	38	49	37	27	45	90			
HSP	63	79		79	79							
MUL	45	57		34	59		45					
PAC												
WHT	54	57	61	59	64	58	51	73	87			
FRL	44	54	55	47	58	53	40	61	86			

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.

School, District and State data will be uploaded when available.

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.

The lowest performing component was ELA on FAST PM3 scores. Our 6th grade students came in at 82% below proficiency. These students were 3rd graders during the Covid pandemic and have struggled consistently.

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

Civics EOC data showed the greatest decline. During 21-22, we had approximately 70% of our students showing as proficient. During the 22-23 school year, we declined to 47% proficient. Multiple teacher changes throughout the school year contributed to the decline.

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.

Our greatest gap is in Social Studies (Civics). The state average was 67% and we are at 47%, which a gap of 20 percentage points. Multiple teachers changes this school year contributed to the gap.

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

Science is our area of most improvement. During the school year, we moved experience teachers into the 8th grade science positions.

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

Two areas of concern are ELA Level 1 on the FAST and Math Level 1 on the FAST.

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

1. Discipline
2. Attendance
3. ELA FAST Achievement
4. Math FAST Achievement
5. Civics Achievement

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 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 prior school year, TCMS had 216 students with one or more suspensions, 2007 discipline referrals, and 241 students with attendance below 90%. We are implementing a structured program which includes breathing and relaxation techniques, restorative circles that include state resiliency standards, and an increased number of restorative practices incorporated into our discipline matrix.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Students with one or more referrals, total number of discipline referrals, and students with attendance below 90% will all decrease by at least 3%.

Monitoring:

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

This will be monitored by generating and reviewing a monthly EWS report via FOCUS.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Kasey Roberts (kasey.roberts@taylor.k12.fl.us)

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.)

Restorative practices and resiliency standards are the evidence-based interventions that will target this area of focus.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

These strategies are evidence-based and have been associated with improved school culture as well as a reduction in discipline referrals and student suspension rates.

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.

Create and implement a restorative practice plan that includes preventive measures such as daily Box Breathing and Wellness Wednesday. Reactive restorative practice measures will be included in this plan.

Person Responsible: Angie Frostick (angie.frostick@taylor.k12.fl.us)

#2. 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.

The Federal Percents of Points Index indicates that our Students with Disabilities are at 39%.

Measurable Outcome:

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

We will focus on this subgroup in an effort to raise the index to 41% or higher, an increase of at least 2 percentage points.

Monitoring:

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

Progress monitoring assessments will occur three times throughout the year for ELA, Math, Science, and Civics. Data analysis will occur following each assessment.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Keri Bean (keri.bean@taylor.k12.fl.us)

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.)

Evidence-based interventions are ExactPath and Study Island by Edmentum for ELA and Math, as well as Study Island for Science and Civics. Read180 and Math180 are additional interventions that target lowest-performing students.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

These strategies were chosen due to their high ESSA tier rating.

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.

Analyzing prior year student data for placement in correct courses to match the interventions.

Person Responsible: Yvonne Heartsfield (yvonne.heartsfield@taylor.k12.fl.us)

Providing professional learning to teachers on implementing the necessary interventions and strategies.

Person Responsible: Yvonne Heartsfield (yvonne.heartsfield@taylor.k12.fl.us)

Data analysis following each progress monitoring assessment.

Person Responsible: Yvonne Heartsfield (yvonne.heartsfield@taylor.k12.fl.us)

#3. 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.

The Federal Percents of Points Index indicates that our Students with Disabilities are at 38%.

Measurable Outcome:

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

We will focus on this subgroup in an effort to raise the index to 41% or higher, an increase of at least 3 percentage points.

Monitoring:

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

Progress monitoring assessments will occur three times throughout the year for ELA, Math, Science, and Civics. Data analysis will occur following each assessment.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Keri Bean (keri.bean@taylor.k12.fl.us)

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.)

Evidence-based interventions are ExactPath and Study Island by Edmentum for ELA and Math, as well as Study Island for Science and Civics. Read180 and Math180 are additional interventions that target lowest-performing students.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

These strategies were chosen due to their high ESSA tier rating.

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.

Analyzing prior year student data for placement in correct courses to match the interventions.

Person Responsible: Yvonne Heartsfield (yvonne.heartsfield@taylor.k12.fl.us)

Providing professional learning to teachers on implementing the necessary interventions and strategies.

Person Responsible: Yvonne Heartsfield (yvonne.heartsfield@taylor.k12.fl.us)

Data analysis following each progress monitoring assessment.

Person Responsible: Yvonne Heartsfield (yvonne.heartsfield@taylor.k12.fl.us)

Analyzing prior year student data for placement in correct courses to match the interventions.

Person Responsible: Yvonne Heartsfield (yvonne.heartsfield@taylor.k12.fl.us)

Providing professional learning to teachers on implementing the necessary interventions and strategies.

Person Responsible: Yvonne Heartsfield (yvonne.heartsfield@taylor.k12.fl.us)

Data analysis following each progress monitoring assessment.

Person Responsible: Yvonne Heartsfield (yvonne.heartsfield@taylor.k12.fl.us)

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).

The school leadership team, in conjunction with the School Advisory Council, and district administration, analyzes per-pupil expenditures, instructional time, early interventions, teacher quality, school leadership quality, facilities and availability of rigorous content/courses, as well as the need for specialized instructional support personnel.