Sergeant Paul R Smith Middle School

2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Sergeant Paul R Smith Middle School

14303 CITRUS POINTE DR, Tampa, FL 33625

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Robert Kleesattel

Start Date for this Principal: 6/24/2019

2019-20 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
2018-19 Title I School	Yes
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (58%) 2017-18: B (59%) 2016-17: B (57%) 2015-16: B (57%) 2014-15: A (66%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	

ESSA Status	TS&I
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here.	

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Hillsborough County School Board.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F. This plan is also a requirement for Targeted Support and Improvement (TS&I) and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CS&I) schools pursuant to 1008.33 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

To be designated as TS&I, a school must have one or more ESSA subgroup(s) with a Federal Index below 41%. This plan shall be approved by the district. There are three ways a school can be designated as CS&I:

1. have a school grade of D or F
2. have a graduation rate of 67% or lower
3. have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

For these schools, the SIP shall be approved by the district as well as the Bureau of School Improvement.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F, or a graduation rate 67% or less. Districts may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing for schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at www.floridacims.org.

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 Florida Department of Education 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.

Table of Contents

Sergeant Paul R Smith Middle School

14303 CITRUS POINTE DR, Tampa, FL 33625

[no web address on file]

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	**2018-19 Title I School**	**2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
Middle School 6-8	Yes	73%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	77%

School Grades History

Year	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17	2015-16
Grade	B	B	B	B

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Hillsborough County School Board.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a school improvement plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F (see page 4). For schools receiving a grade of A, B, or C, the district may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at https://www.floridaCIMS.org.

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 Florida Department of Education 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.

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

Our Mission
The Sgt. Smith Community will cultivate a learning environment that promotes scholarship, integrity, communication, and excellence.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Our Vision
Our students' journey at Sgt. Smith will produce academically driven, self-confident, responsible citizens who will make positive contributions to the community.

School Leadership Team

Membership
Identify the name, email address and position title for each member of the school leadership team:

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Kleesattel, Rob	Principal	Oversee the development and execution of the SIP plan
Terry-Byrd, Jeanne	Assistant Principal	Principal's primary designee for the development and execution of the SIP plan.
Turner, Bobbi	Instructional Coach	Principal's secondary designee for the development and execution of the SIP plan with curriculum and professional development expertise.

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

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

Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	268	255	229	0	0	0	0	752
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	26	29	35	0	0	0	0	90
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	29	54	0	0	0	0	91
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	42	61	0	0	0	0	107
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	24	48	65	0	0	0	0	137

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	8	1	0	0	0	0	14
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

FTE units allocated to school (total number of teacher units)

47

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 8/1/2019

Prior Year - As Reported

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Prior Year - Updated

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	21	25	36	0	0	0	0	82
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	23	50	0	0	0	0	78
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	35	54	0	0	0	0	89
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	89	68	85	0	0	0	0	242

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	44	62	0	0	0	0	121

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data
Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school, or combination schools).

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	56%	51%	54%	54%	50%	52%
ELA Learning Gains	56%	52%	54%	53%	53%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	47%	47%	47%	39%	45%	44%
Math Achievement	59%	55%	58%	59%	54%	56%
Math Learning Gains	53%	57%	57%	59%	59%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	45%	52%	51%	51%	51%	50%
Science Achievement	55%	47%	51%	45%	47%	50%
Social Studies Achievement	76%	67%	72%	74%	66%	70%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)			Total
	6	7	8	
Number of students enrolled	268 (0)	255 (0)	229 (0)	752 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	26 (0)	29 (0)	35 (0)	90 (0)
One or more suspensions	8 (0)	29 (0)	54 (0)	91 (0)
Course failure in ELA or Math	4 (0)	42 (0)	61 (0)	107 (0)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)

Grade Level Data
NOTE: This data is raw data and includes ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.

NOTE: 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
06	2019	56%	53%	3%	54%	2%
	2018	48%	52%	-4%	52%	-4%
Same Grade Comparison		8%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	50%	54%	-4%	52%	-2%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	52%	52%	0%	51%	1%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison		2%				
08	2019	57%	53%	4%	56%	1%
	2018	49%	54%	-5%	58%	-9%
Same Grade Comparison		8%				
Cohort Comparison		5%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2019	53%	49%	4%	55%	-2%
	2018	49%	48%	1%	52%	-3%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	56%	62%	-6%	54%	2%
	2018	68%	61%	7%	54%	14%
Same Grade Comparison		-12%				
Cohort Comparison		7%				
08	2019	34%	31%	3%	46%	-12%
	2018	33%	29%	4%	45%	-12%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison		-34%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2019	51%	47%	4%	48%	3%
	2018	41%	48%	-7%	50%	-9%
Same Grade Comparison		10%				
Cohort Comparison						

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	74%	67%	7%	71%	3%
2018	73%	65%	8%	71%	2%

CIVICS EOC					
Year	**School**	**District**	**School Minus District**	**State**	**School Minus State**
Compare		1%			
HISTORY EOC					
Year	**School**	**District**	**School Minus District**	**State**	**School Minus State**
2019					
2018					
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	**School**	**District**	**School Minus District**	**State**	**School Minus State**
2019	83%	63%	20%	61%	22%
2018	89%	63%	26%	62%	27%
Compare		-6%			
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	**School**	**District**	**School Minus District**	**State**	**School Minus State**
2019	100%	57%	43%	57%	43%
2018	100%	56%	44%	56%	44%
Compare		0%			

Subgroup Data

2019 SCHOOL GRADE 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**
SWD	18	32	25	25	38	34	21	52			
ELL	26	49	54	40	55	45	20	68	64		
ASN	92	65		97	68		92	100	100		
BLK	33	42	33	42	30	20	29	83			
HSP	50	54	48	52	50	45	49	68	65		
MUL	65	56		74	53		50	85	100		
WHT	68	64	48	71	64	58	71	84	73		
FRL	50	54	46	53	50	43	48	69	65		
2018 SCHOOL GRADE 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 2016-17**	**C & C Accel 2016-17**
SWD	16	40	34	19	45	45	14	13			
ELL	31	54	52	46	62	58	20	59	50		
ASN	87	67		95	72		67	100	100		
BLK	25	48	50	40	60	60	26	56			
HSP	47	53	48	55	67	63	36	77	65		
MUL	59	50		60	69	60	55	73			
WHT	63	62	41	73	63	52	60	82	85		

2018 SCHOOL GRADE 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 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
FRL	46	52	47	54	63	58	37	72	68		
2017 SCHOOL GRADE 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 2015-16	C & C Accel 2015-16
SWD	21	41	27	22	44	37	16	44	50		
ELL	25	47	49	34	59	66	4	44			
ASN	78	57		84	76		67	91	92		
BLK	47	49	31	43	48	58		83			
HSP	46	49	40	53	58	56	34	67	73		
MUL	64	54		69	63		73	83	92		
WHT	65	61	46	69	60	31	58	87	84		
FRL	47	49	37	53	56	51	39	70	78		

ESSA Data

This data has been updated for the 2018-19 school year as of 7/16/2019.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	TS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	60
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	84
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	604
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	99%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	31
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	51
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	

Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	88
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	39
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	56
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	69
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	

White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	67
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	56
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Analysis

Data Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources (see guide for examples for relevant 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 quartile was flat in ELA and decreased in math by 15%. There were multiple vacancies in VE which hindered services to those students.

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

7th grade math decreased 12 points from the previous year. Decline in use of district provided common assessments may have been a factor.

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 lowest quartile performance did not meet the state average. There were multiple vacancies in VE which hindered services to those students.

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

Science SSA- The 8th grade teachers revised their review methods, created more engaging review activities, and began reviewing earlier in the school year.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern? (see Guidance tab for additional information)

The EWS data points to our need to monitor and improve student attendance.

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

1. School Culture
2. PBIS
3. Differentiated Instruction

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	Data Driven Differentiated Instruction
Rationale	Our ELA proficiency has decreased over each of the past three years. At the same time, performance on Math, Science and Social Studies EOC's have plateaued. Increasing students literacy proficiency will lead to gains in all areas.

State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	We will raise our ELA bottom quartile 47% from last year to 50% this year Civics EOC from 76% to 78% We will increase Mathematics 59% to 63%
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Bobbi Turner (bobbi.turner@sdhc.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	Responsive Planning Standards Based Lessons Objectives Check For Understanding Teacher Planned Higher Order Thinking Questions Gradual Release Know Your Students (Data, learning styles, motivation and interests) including students with disabilities Teacher Reflection (Know and respond to observations and checks for understanding)
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Through administrative walk throughs, teacher observations, data chats and final observation conferences, it has been determined that teachers need to use responsive planning which includes knowing their students which promotes excitement for learning. In our Domain 3 Observation Data... 1% received an RA, 24% received progressing and 66% received accomplished, 9% exemplary

Action Step	
Description	1. Differentiated Instruction PD 2. PLC's with a focus on Responsive Lesson Planning 3. PD based on student needs per data 4. Walk-Throughs 5. Coaching, Demonstration Classrooms, Learning Walks
Person Responsible	Bobbi Turner (bobbi.turner@sdhc.k12.fl.us)

#2	
Title	School Culture
Rationale	Disruption (92 incidences), Disobedience (42 incidences) and Disrespect (32 incidences) are the the majority of referrals written.

State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	We would like to reduce the number of referrals by 3% which is 335 referrals. 70 students 1-5 days 9 students 6-10 days 2 students > than 10 19 ESE 1-5 4 ESE 6-10 Total # of days out ESE... 41 days
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Bobbi Turner (bobbi.turner@sdhc.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	Implementing PBIS (Positive Behavior Interventions and Strategies) school wide Parent/Family Involvement
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Number of referral incidences have doubled since the 2016-2017 school year
Action Step	
Description	1. PBIS committee will attend the district PBIS training to create a school wide plan for implementation 2. PBIS will present the plan during pre-planning 3. Monitor implementation effectiveness quarterly although the committee will meet monthly
Person Responsible	Jeanne Terry-Byrd (jeanne.terry-byrd@hcps.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities (optional)

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities (see the Guidance tab for more information).

N/A

Part IV: Title I Requirements

Additional Title I Requirements
This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A schoolwide program and opts to use the Schoolwide Improvement Plan to satisfy the requirements of the schoolwide program plan, as outlined in the Every Student Succeeds Act, Public Law No. 114-95, § 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

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

We work closely with our PTSA, and utilize Edsby Parent Link, Weekly Matters to communicate with parents, families and community members. We have established several business partnerships such as Retro Fitness, Smoothie King, McDonalds, PDQ and Kamenar Apparel and Promotions. We are continuing our partnership with The Medal of Honor Foundation in preparation for the upcoming Medal of Honor Convention.

PFEP Link

The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.

Describe how the school ensures the social-emotional needs of all students are being met, which may include providing counseling, mentoring and other pupil services.

The School Board of each Florida district is required by state law to establish a comprehensive program for student progression that is based on an evaluation of each student's performance including an assessment of how well the student masters the performance standards approved by the state board. The district's program for student progression is based on mastery of the English language arts, mathematics, science, and social studies standards. (F.S. 1008.25)

The HCPS Student Progression Plan includes information on initial placement, reporting student progress, reading remediation, academic acceleration, grade promotion and retention, graduation requirements, transfer credits, student recognition, accommodations, dual enrollment, and extended learning opportunities.

For complete information, please visit our Student Progression Plan at: http://www.sdhc.k12.fl.us/docs/00/00/21/33/studentprogressionplan.pdf

HCPS utilizes a variety of strategies for assisting students as they transition from one school to another.

HCPS employs multiple strategies for preparing children for entry into kindergarten. Over 6,000 children participate in one of several preschool programs offered by the School District (Head Start, VPK and PreK-ESE). Developmental screenings are available for all families prior to entry into kindergarten through Child Find, a service within the Florida Diagnostic and Learning Resources System (FDLRS). Additionally, the district works closely with School Readiness providers to share information.

HCPS utilizes multiple strategies for preparing students for their next school, including transitioning from elementary to middle school, middle school to high school, or simply moving to a new school mid-year. Examples include:

Bring 6th/9th graders back early for orientation
Train a cadre of student ambassadors to help orient other students
Parent information and/or education opportunities
Hold articulation meetings between 5th and 6th grade teachers
Campus visits
Shadow days
Middle school students visit, tutor and or perform at elementary schools
High school students visit, tutor, or perform at middle schools.

Describe the strategies the school employs to support incoming and outgoing cohorts of students in transition from one school level to another.

To ensure efficient/systematic allocation and use of resources, the PSLT/ILT utilizes an RtI/MTSS framework to improve learning for all. Resources allocated support a continuum of academic and behavioral supports, ensuring all students have fluid access to instruction (varying intensity levels matched to most appropriate available resources).

An annual inventory of resource materials, staff, and funds allocated determines necessary resource materials and personnel available to meet student needs through a resource map.

To ensure support systems, small group, and individual needs are met, the PSLT:
Reviews school-wide data on an ongoing basis, identifying instructional needs across the school; Supports the implementation of high quality instructional practices during core and intervention blocks; Reviews progress monitoring data of core to ensure fidelity of instruction and attainment of SIP goal(s) in curricular, behavioral, and attendance domains; Communicates school-wide data to PLCs, facilitating problem solving within the content/grade level teams.

The PSLT meets regularly (bi-weekly/monthly). The PSLT meeting calendar is structured around the district's assessment calendar, ensuring opportunities to review assessments, outcome data, and engage in the problem solving process for appropriate data-driven decisions. Team members include administrator(s), guidance counselor(s), school psychologist, ESE specialist, content area coaches/ specialists, PLC teacher liaisons, others as needed

Title I:
PartA
Funding enriches eligible schools with additional instructional staff, PD, ELP, and supplemental resources for raising student achievement in high-poverty schools.

TitleIII
Services are provided to ensure ELLs have access to academic content that is equal in scope, sequence, breadth, and depth to the curricular offerings available to all. Services include educational materials and ELL district supported services such as interpreters, translators, bi-lingual support services, teachers, parent involvement and community outreach programs, improving education of immigrant and ELLs.

Describe the process through which school leadership identifies and aligns all available resources (e.g., personnel, instructional, curricular) in order to meet the needs of all students and maximize desired student outcomes. Include the methodology for coordinating and supplementing federal, state and local funds, services and programs. Provide the person(s) responsible, frequency of meetings, how an inventory of resources is maintained and any problem-solving activities used to determine how to apply resources for the highest impact.

HCPS strategies to advance college and career awareness include: Career interest inventory offered to students through Florida Shines; District College Nights; District Financial Aid Nights; Postsecondary representative visits at high schools; Field trip opportunities for career awareness; Field trip opportunities to technical colleges; and Opportunities for students to take courses within their area of interest at their high school, via virtual school, and through dual enrollment.

Describe the strategies the school uses to advance college and career awareness, which may include establishing partnerships with business, industry or community organizations.

AVID field trips to college campuses, Teachers promote their colleges in their classrooms, AVID college night
College spirit shirts on Friday, College Door Decorating Contest, Great American Teach-In, STEM, partnership with Westpoint, Veteran's Day Celebration, Broadcasting Academy, HOSA medical skills

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Data Driven Differentiated Instruction				$122,454.09
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20
	2110	100-Salaries	0074 - Sergeant Paul R Smith Middle School	Title, I Part A	1.5	$122,454.09
			Notes: Reading Coach- Bobbi Turner 169746 $83,427.30 Math Coach- Michelle Jones 107213 $39,026.79			
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: School Culture				$78,053.58
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20
	2110	100-Salaries	0074 - Sergeant Paul R Smith Middle School	Title, I Part A	1.0	$78,053.58
			Notes: Student Success Coach- Amy Anderson 147761 $78,053.58			
					Total:	$200,507.67