

Polk County Public Schools

Berkley Accelerated School



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	15
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	20
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	0
VI. Title I Requirements	0
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	20

Berkley Accelerated

5316 BERKLEY RD, Auburndale, FL 33823

<http://schools.polk-fl.net/bams>

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.

Berkley Accelerated is committed to inspiring our students to Believe in Better, to encourage them to aspire to higher learning, and challenge them to achieve their maximum individual potential while providing a supportive and safe educational environment.

Provide the school's vision statement.

"Believe in BETTER!"

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
Bolender, Jill	Principal	
Sawyer, Brian	Assistant Principal	
Walker, Loren	Assistant Principal	
Tapp, Carrie	School Counselor	
Wilson, Ashley	Teacher, K-12	
Robinson, Crystal	Teacher, K-12	

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.

All stakeholders are involved in developing the goals for the school improvement plan. State assessment data, progress monitoring results, and student, parent, staff, and community surveys determine needs assessments for SIP goals.

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))

Students will complete a progress monitoring assessment three times a year which will provide data to determine if missing elements from the previous year which created the SIP goals, show growth for all types of subgroups of students. Using lesson plan reviews and classroom walkthroughs, the administration will adjust action steps as needed to reach the desired goal.

Demographic Data

Only ESSA identification and school grade history updated 3/11/2024

2023-24 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School 6-11
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	33%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	41%
Charter School	Yes
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	N/A
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) Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: A 2019-20: A 2018-19: A 2017-18: A
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	22	27	17	66
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	12	10	25
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	2
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	27	27	24	78
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	14	6	32
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	36	29	27	92

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	6	18	7	31

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	0	0	0	0
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	20	21	37	78
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	12	8	32
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	16	10	37
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	16	10	32
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	22	18	20	60

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	6	12	8	26

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	20	21	37	78
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	12	8	32
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	16	10	37
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	16	10	32
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	22	18	20	60

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	6	12	8	26

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	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	69	48	53	70	51	55	73		
ELA Learning Gains				59			71		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				37			56		
Math Achievement*	71	49	55	78	37	42	69		
Math Learning Gains				68			43		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				63			32		
Science Achievement*	76	47	52	76	48	54	66		
Social Studies Achievement*	87	68	68	81	53	59	85		
Middle School Acceleration	79	61	70	81	43	51	54		
Graduation Rate		54	74		46	50			
College and Career Acceleration		39	53		71	70			
ELP Progress		50	55	82	55	70	90		

* 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)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	76
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	382
Total Components for the Federal Index	5
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	70

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	695
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	31	Yes	1	1
ELL	59			
AMI				
ASN	82			
BLK	69			
HSP	75			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	76			
FRL	71			

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	42			
ELL	69			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	73			
HSP	71			

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%
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	68			
FRL	65			

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)

2022-23 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 2021-22	C & C Accel 2021-22	ELP Progress
All Students	69			71			76	87	79			
SWD	17			46			29				3	
ELL	50			56				71			3	
AMI												
ASN	82										1	
BLK	63			53			67	92			4	
HSP	72			71			73	87	71		5	
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	67			71			79	86	79		5	
FRL	59			68			67	86	75		5	

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	70	59	37	78	68	63	76	81	81			82
SWD	19	39	40	48	68	63	20	38				
ELL	48	72	71	64	80	69						82
AMI												
ASN												

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
BLK	73	50		77	65			82	90			
HSP	72	67	46	76	72	53	76	80	74			90
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	68	56	34	79	66	68	75	81	82			
FRL	63	59	33	73	71	62	67	75	79			

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	73	71	56	69	43	32	66	85	54			90
SWD	14	36	35	18	18	13						
ELL	57	73	77	46	46	36						90
AMI												
ASN	92	83		100	42				80			
BLK	72	84	82	56	45	43	50		42			
HSP	78	79	74	64	40	25	68	79	53			90
MUL	54	62		58	42							
PAC												
WHT	72	68	47	72	44	31	67	86	55			
FRL	68	68	54	59	41	29	57	81	41			

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.

Grade	Year	ELA				
		School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
10	2023 - Spring	80%	40%	40%	50%	30%
07	2023 - Spring	62%	36%	26%	47%	15%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	64%	39%	25%	47%	17%
09	2023 - Spring	80%	39%	41%	48%	32%
06	2023 - Spring	61%	35%	26%	47%	14%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	78%	38%	40%	54%	24%
07	2023 - Spring	80%	35%	45%	48%	32%
08	2023 - Spring	49%	42%	7%	55%	-6%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	51%	33%	18%	44%	7%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	78%	37%	41%	50%	28%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	71%	37%	34%	48%	23%

BIOLOGY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	94%	50%	44%	63%	31%

CIVICS						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	86%	65%	21%	66%	20%

HISTORY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	87%	49%	38%	63%	24%

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 data component that showed the lowest performance schoolwide in ELA was the reading across genres and vocabulary subtopics, specifically morphology and context and connotation. Some contributing factors could include changes in ELA staff, a decline in cooperative learning as evident through classroom observations, and a decline in vertical planning. In addition, attendance problems and suspension data showed a significant increase which could be due to relationship building and a lack of school-wide procedure implementation.

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

The number of suspensions increased significantly from the previous year due to many different factors, some of which include the previous year's lack of school-wide procedure implementation and struggling social skill development. For the state assessment data, overall the ELA scores in reading across genres and vocabulary were lower than our normal percentages. This year being the first implementation of the FAST, it is hard to compare a true decline of data.

Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends.

The data component with the most significant gap is reading across genres and vocabulary. Berkley Accelerated was above average in all areas of the state. However, this subtopic had the closest average to the state. The factors that could have contributed to this are the CLOSE reading strategies that were not being fully implemented across subject areas.

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

Due to FAST being in year one, the improvement areas are estimated. Overall, reading the informational text category is a school-wide strength. Reading informational text is a strong focus in all subject areas through reading and writing.

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

One or two potential areas of concern are the growing attendance and suspension indicators. Both categories have increased from previous years.

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

The highest priorities for school improvement for the 2023-2024 school year are to increase school attendance, decrease suspension rates, and increase school-wide scores in the areas of morphology and context and connotation.

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.

Our early warning system indicators showed an increase in suspension numbers and attendance issues in grades 6-10.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Berkley will implement school-wide SEL (social-emotional learning) strategies such as enforcing school-wide procedure implementation and conducting relationship-building activities daily.

Monitoring:

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

This measurable outcome will be monitored through classroom observations and lesson plans. At the end of the school year, suspension and attendance data will be reviewed with the desired outcome of decreased suspension and attendance issues.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Loren Walker (loren.walker@berkleymiddle.net)

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. Monitor students engaging in equivalent rigorous and engaging experiences aligned to state expectations using iObservations.
2. Engage teachers in social-emotional learning and relationship building using the Marzano Lesson Framework and engagement strategies.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Marzano Lesson Framework is research-based highly effective teaching strategies that encompasses a lot of collaborative, rigorous, and engaging lessons. Kagan collaborative learning is a proven method of successful collaboration 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.

1. Monitor engagement strategies and activities discussed during grade-level team meetings weekly.
2. Conduct walkthroughs using observation until the team demonstrates 100% highly effective use of Marzano/Kagan engagement strategies.
3. Review and collaborate post-progress monitoring benchmark results from F.A.S.T. and observation walkthrough data.
4. Establish a protocol to review the effective use of Kagan/Marzano Reading engagement strategies

through the Lesson Plan folder.

5. Monitor the impact between data review from F.A.S.T. and observation and planning for highly effective engagement strategies using the Marzano Framework and Kagan Collaborative strategies.
6. Monitor school-wide relationship-building strategies through lesson plans and student and parent surveys.
7. Share social-emotional learning strategies school-wide and within grade-level team meetings weekly.
8. Professional development for teachers for Marzano and Kagan.
9. Tiered support and strategy intervention for parent support forms to help students correct behaviors before suspension status.

Person Responsible: Jill Bolender (jill.bolender@berkleymiddle.net)

By When: By the end of the 2023-2024 school year.

#2. 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.

Outcomes from state assessments identify a need for improvement in ELA in the subarea of reading across genres, more specifically morphology and context, and connotation.

Measurable Outcome:

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

School-wide ELA scores will increase by at least 20% in the areas of morphology and context and connotation.

Monitoring:

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

Progress Monitoring data offered by F.A.S.T. assessments will be used to ensure students are mastering benchmarks, being taught after planning is properly implemented.

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.)

Monitor students engaging in equivalent reading experiences aligned to state expectations using iObservations. Engage teachers in standards-based planning protocol using the Marzano Lesson Framework and engagement strategies. Provide training and lesson plan examples for teachers in the areas of morphology and context and connotation.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Deficiencies in the areas of morphology and context and connotation will be addressed by engaging teachers in standard-based planning using research-based strategies such as the Marzano lesson framework and Kagan Collaborative strategies using graphic organizers, close reading strategies, and cross-curricular texts.

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. Create a calendar of progress monitoring dates to enhance the importance of student growth.
2. Monitor items discussed during grade-level team meetings weekly.
3. Conduct walkthroughs using iObservation to ensure close reading strategies and cross-curriculum reading occur.
4. Review and collaborate post-progress monitoring benchmark results from F.A.S.T. and iObservation walkthrough data.

5. Establish a protocol to review the effective use of Reading engagement strategies through the Lesson plan folder.
6. Monitor the impact between data review from F.A.S.T and iObservation and planning for highly effective engagement strategies using the Marzano framework.
7. Teacher professional development in the areas of morphology and context and connotation.

Person Responsible: Jill Bolender (jill.bolender@berkleymiddle.net)

By When: By the end of the 2023-2024 school year.

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).

Budget to Support Areas of Focus

Part VII: Budget to Support Areas of Focus

The approved budget does not reflect any amendments submitted for this project.

1	III.B.	Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Early Warning System				\$10,000.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2023-24
			8142 - Berkley Accelerated	General Fund	625.0	\$10,000.00
<i>Notes: Provide social-emotional training for staff and monitor impacts</i>						
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA				\$20,000.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2023-24
			8142 - Berkley Accelerated	Other Federal	625.0	\$20,000.00
<i>Notes: Marzano and Kagan summer professional development for staff</i>						
Total:						\$30,000.00

Budget Approval

Check if this school is eligible and opting out of UniSIG funds for the 2023-24 school year.

No