

Bay District Schools

Surfside Middle School



2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	9
Planning for Improvement	16
Title I Requirements	23
Budget to Support Goals	24

Surfside Middle School

300 NAUTILUS ST, Panama City Beach, FL 32413

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: David Pitts

Start Date for this Principal: 8/12/2019

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School PK-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2018-19 Title I School	No
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	49%
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: A (67%) 2017-18: A (66%) 2016-17: A (62%) 2015-16: A (62%) 2014-15: B (58%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northwest
Regional Executive Director	Rachel Heide
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	

ESSA Status	N/A
* 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 Bay 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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	9
Planning for Improvement	16
Title I Requirements	23
Budget to Support Goals	24

Surfside Middle School

300 NAUTILUS ST, Panama City Beach, FL 32413

[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)
Combination School PK-12	No	52%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	23%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Bay 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.

The Surfside Middle School family will provide a standards-based and technology-rich curriculum to promote student learning and foster self-esteem.

Provide the school's vision statement.

At Surfside Middle School we will inspire children to be passionate about learning. We will challenge children to meet their potential academically and socially. Teachers will model in their relationships with students and colleagues an appreciation for the uniqueness of each individual. Teachers will collaborate among grade levels and subject areas (i.e. Professional Learning Communities) to promote learning in a safe and comfortable environment. We will engage parents, students, staff, and the community in shared responsibility for advancing the school's vision and mission.

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
Pitts, David	Principal	
Bull, Chris	Teacher, K-12	
Cerney, Jill	Teacher, K-12	
Easom, Kathy	Teacher, K-12	
Wright, Martha	Teacher, K-12	
Jarrard, Kimberly	Teacher, K-12	
Land, Kelly	Teacher, K-12	
Hartzer, Richard	Assistant Principal	
Teplicek, Aaron	Administrative Support	
Mitchell, Robert	Administrative Support	

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

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

Indicator	Grade Level														Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12		
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	251	265	278	0	0	0	0	794	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	41	48	50	0	0	0	0	139	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	54	71	0	0	0	0	143	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	11	10	0	0	0	0	25	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	41	61	63	0	0	0	0	165	

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	21	46	53	0	0	0	0	120

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	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	2
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	3	0	0	0	0	7

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

49

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 9/17/2019

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	61	86	68	0	0	0	0	215
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	63	53	43	0	0	0	0	159
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	24	13	0	0	0	0	52
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	76	61	46	0	0	0	0	183
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	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	62	54	44	0	0	0	0	160

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	61	86	68	0	0	0	0	215
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	63	53	43	0	0	0	0	159
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	24	13	0	0	0	0	52
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	76	61	46	0	0	0	0	183
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	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	62	54	44	0	0	0	0	160

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	65%	73%	61%	64%	67%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	61%	64%	59%	64%	61%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	60%	58%	54%	56%	56%	51%

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
Math Achievement	72%	70%	62%	65%	68%	58%
Math Learning Gains	63%	57%	59%	56%	59%	56%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	57%	56%	52%	47%	58%	50%
Science Achievement	67%	65%	56%	53%	67%	53%
Social Studies Achievement	68%	86%	78%	79%	79%	75%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey														
Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	251 (0)	265 (0)	278 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	794 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	41 (61)	48 (86)	50 (68)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	139 (215)
One or more suspensions	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	18 (63)	54 (53)	71 (43)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	143 (159)
Course failure in ELA or Math	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	4 (15)	11 (24)	10 (13)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	25 (52)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	41 (76)	61 (61)	63 (46)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	165 (183)

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
03	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
05	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
06	2019	63%	56%	7%	54%	9%
	2018	51%	51%	0%	52%	-1%
Same Grade Comparison		12%				
Cohort Comparison		63%				
07	2019	52%	54%	-2%	52%	0%
	2018	60%	51%	9%	51%	9%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Same Grade Comparison		-8%				
Cohort Comparison		1%				
08	2019	69%	59%	10%	56%	13%
	2018	68%	58%	10%	58%	10%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison		9%				
09	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		-68%				
10	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
05	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
06	2019	53%	53%	0%	55%	-2%
	2018	53%	52%	1%	52%	1%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		53%				
07	2019	69%	59%	10%	54%	15%
	2018	66%	59%	7%	54%	12%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison		16%				
08	2019	49%	48%	1%	46%	3%
	2018	52%	48%	4%	45%	7%
Same Grade Comparison		-3%				
Cohort Comparison		-17%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison						
08	2019	64%	51%	13%	48%	16%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	61%	49%	12%	50%	11%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison		64%				

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	67%	74%	-7%	71%	-4%
2018	79%	76%	3%	71%	8%
Compare		-12%			
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	94%	64%	30%	61%	33%
2018	90%	64%	26%	62%	28%
Compare		4%			
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	100%	62%	38%	57%	43%
2018	100%	62%	38%	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	31	54	58	39	50	44	46	44			
ELL	47	64	70	54	55	35	64	46			

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
ASN	87	80		87	67						
BLK	31	57	69	37	63	55	15	50			
HSP	45	46	56	50	50	32	55	45			
MUL	62	52		65	45		70	71	75		
WHT	69	63	58	76	65	62	71	71	88		
FRL	58	60	60	64	59	54	64	66	80		
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	29	44	40	40	54	45	49	54	65		
ELL	32	52	35	46	60	50					
ASN	71	38		92	67						
BLK	48	60	62	46	47	20	38	44			
HSP	45	45	53	49	58	59	60	83	100		
MUL	68	73	73	76	73	63	43	93			
WHT	65	57	50	73	65	58	69	84	83		
FRL	52	49	47	59	59	55	59	75	75		
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	25	42	39	32	42	35	26	49	90		
ELL	42	54	36	53	54	31					
ASN	91	73		100	64						
BLK	31	42	55	39	36	18					
HSP	54	56	38	59	60	50	46	63	90		
MUL	49	51	36	60	51	44	58	70	92		
WHT	68	67	61	67	57	50	53	82	77		
FRL	52	58	52	51	46	37	45	73	67		

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)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	67
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	74
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	674
Total Components for the Federal Index	10

ESSA Federal Index	
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	46
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	57
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	80
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	47
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	49
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	63
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	69
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	63
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 raw score was our student performance in Grade 8 Math. However, 60% (148/246) of Grade 8 students were enrolled in advanced Algebra 1 or Geometry courses. Additionally, Surfside's results on the Algebra I and Geometry EOCs far surpassed the state and district benchmarks, making the raw score results only indicative of 40% of Grade 8 Math student's performance.

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

The Social Studies Achievement showed the greatest decline from the prior year. Students declined from 82% proficiency in 2018 to 68% in 2019. The greatest contributing factor seems to have been the raw performance on the Civics EOC. Students taking the Civics EOC failed to meet the district or state's benchmark levels. (-7% from district, -4% from state) Students were -12% short of last year's results. SIP leadership agreed the missed content coverage resulting from Hurricane Michael was a contributing factor in the performance decline. Also, the copious amount of Civics teachers created a lack of cohesion and collaboration among the Social Studies PLC due to proximity and scheduling conflicts.

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

The greatest deficit when compared to the state levels would be the Civics EOC results. (-4%) The contributing factors were the missed instruction as a result of Hurricane Michael and the lack of collaboration among the Social Studies PLC.

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

The data component showing the greatest growth from the previous school year was our ELA's Lowest Quartile (25%). The new actions taken that impacted this result were: the implementation of the Lexonik Program, a greater emphasis on fictional text and abstract reasoning, and a return to basic vocabulary and writing instruction.

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

Areas of greatest concern from the Early Warning Systems (EWS) data is the low Federal Index for SWD. The 2018-19 level was at only 46% proficiency.

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

1. Social Studies Achievement & Civics EOC
2. Federal Index for SWD (Specifically Math Learning Gains)
3. Grade 7 ELA FSA Proficiency
4. Grade 6 Math Proficiency
5. Blk Subgroup in Achievement for all content areas

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	Social Studies Achievement & Civics EOC Proficiency
Rationale	<p>This area of focus was identified as a critical need by reviewing the 2018-19 school data. Student achievement in Social Studies showed a -14% (82% in 2018 to 68% in 2019) decline from the previous school year. Additionally, student proficiency on the Civics EOC resulted in a -12% decline from the previous school year (79% in 2018 to 67% in 2019) and was -7% lower than the district mean and -4% from the state mean. As a measure of the overall school grade, results from Social Studies achievement and the Civics EOC proficiency quantifiably impacts student learning and success.</p>
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	At a minimum, Surfside plans to raise the Social Studies achievement level to 80%, and we plan to see 80% of students show proficiency on the Civics EOC.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	David Pitts (pittsdm@bay.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	<p>1. We will use district mandated common summative assessments to gauge student proficiency / mastery of the Social Studies and Civics standards.</p> <p>2. We will monitor specific ELA assessment results to determine if students are successfully building content specific background knowledge. (Note: 6-8 EL Education curriculum richly integrates Social Studies content.)</p> <p>3. We will use CWT to track teacher success in terms of pacing and instructional methods and provide support where needed.</p>
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	We defined evidence-based strategies as any school improvement strategy producing evidence to monitor or gauge progress toward our objectives. The rationale for using any strategy would be for the purpose of progress monitoring toward our stated goals.
Action Step	
Description	<p>1. We will streamline the Social Studies / Civics PLC, by limiting the number of instructors, in order to increase collaboration and planning among content specific teachers.</p> <p>2. We will utilize the collaboration of our assigned liaison and the district's Civics PLC to strengthen instruction and plan for appropriate pacing.</p> <p>3. We will use ESE inclusion (push-in) teachers alongside the content specific teachers to increase student support in the classroom.</p> <p>4. We will integrate Social Studies content and appropriate grade level text using the newly adopted ELA EL Education curriculum into our daily ELA courses.</p> <p>5. We will continue to enhance instruction through our 1-to-1 schoolwide approach by using technology rich instructional methods in each classroom.</p> <p>6. We will continue to increase our student engagement by adding Kagan and Criss strategies through professional development and mentoring.</p>
Person Responsible	Richard Hartzer (hartzrc@bay.k12.fl.us)

#2	
Title	Students With Disability (SWD) Subgroup - Overall Index
Rationale	This area of focus was identified as a critical need by reviewing the 2018-19 school data. The overall federal index for this subgroup showed only 46% proficiency. The content areas of greatest concern were ELA achievement (31%), Math achievement (39%), and Math's lowest quartile (44%). The reason this is of great concern for Surfside Middle School is because the minimum threshold for schools to enter the state required Targeted Support and Improvement (TS&I) status is an overall federal index, by subgroup, of 41%.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Surfside Middle School plans to achieve percentages of 50% or higher in all school grade components within the SWD subgroup and an overall SWD federal index of 55%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	David Pitts (pittsdm@bay.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	<p>Because this objective spans several content areas, our strategies will include:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The use common summative assessments to gauge student proficiency / mastery of the ELA and Math standards. 2. The use of NWEA Map data, comparing Fall and Winter results to determine student progress in ELA and Math content areas.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	We defined evidence-based strategies as any school improvement strategy producing evidence to monitor or gauge progress toward our objectives. The rationale for using any strategy would be for the purpose of progress monitoring toward our stated goals.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. We will create an Inclusion PLC for teachers who provide direct accommodations or services to students with 504 or ESE individual education plans (ASPIRE & Push-In) to meet monthly on the fourth Wednesday of the PLC rotation schedule. 2. We will use ESE inclusion (push-in) teachers alongside the content specific teachers to increase student support within the general education classroom. 3. We will adopt a mentor program among our faculty to provide individualized (CICO) support to students in our lowest quartiles and receiving IEP services. 4. We will continue to enhance instruction through our 1-to-1 schoolwide approach by using technology rich instructional methods in each classroom. 5. We will continue to increase our student engagement by adding Kagan and Criss strategies through professional development and mentoring.
Person Responsible	David Pitts (pittsdm@bay.k12.fl.us)

#3	
Title	Grade 7 ELA FSA Proficiency
Rationale	This area of focus was identified as a critical need by reviewing the 2018-19 school data. The Grade 7 ELA FSA proficiency was at 52% for the 2018-19 school year. This was -8% less than the prior year results. Additionally, this was -2% less than the district mean and the same result as the state mean. The reason for concern is that the Grade 7 result was between 11-17% less than the 6th and 8th grade Surfside comparisons.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Surfside plans to increase the Grade 7 ELA FSA proficiency results to at least 61%, which is 7% beyond the district mean.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	David Pitts (pittsdm@bay.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. We will use the district pacing guides, the newly adopted EL curriculum, and common summative assessments to gauge student proficiency / mastery of the ELA standards. 2. The use of NWEA Map data, comparing Fall and Winter results to determine student progress in ELA and use the comparison study to project 2019-20 FSA results.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	We defined evidence-based strategies as any school improvement strategy producing evidence to monitor or gauge progress toward our objectives. The rationale for using any strategy would be for the purpose of progress monitoring toward our stated goals.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. We will work deliberately with the ELA PLC, district liaisons, and literacy coaches to determine the best course of action for the implementation of the newly adopted ELA curriculum (EL Education). 2. We will use ESE inclusion (push-in) teachers alongside the content specific teachers to increase student support within the general education classroom. 3. We will adopt a mentor program among our faculty to provide individualized (CICO) support to students in our lowest quartiles and receiving IEP services. 4. We will continue to enhance instruction through our 1-to-1 schoolwide approach by using technology rich instructional methods in each classroom. 5. We will continue to increase our student engagement by adding Kagan and Criss strategies through professional development and mentoring.
Person Responsible	David Pitts (pittsdm@bay.k12.fl.us)

#4	
Title	Grade 6 Math FSA Proficiency
Rationale	This area of focus was identified as a critical need by reviewing the 2018-19 school data. The Grade 6 Math FSA proficiency was at 53% for the 2018-19 school year. This was equivalent to the district mean and -2% less than the state mean. The reason for concern is that the Grade 6 Math FSA results showed no growth from the prior year.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Surfside plans to increase the Grade 6 Math FSA proficiency results to at least 60%, which is 7% beyond the 2018-19 district mean and 5% beyond the 2018-19 state mean.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	David Pitts (pittsdm@bay.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. We will use quarterly common summative assessments, created by district liaisons, to gauge student proficiency / mastery of the Grade 6 Math standards. 2. We will use NWEA Map data, comparing Fall and Winter results to determine student progress in Math and use the comparison/projection study to anticipate 2019-20 FSA results.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	We defined evidence-based strategies as any school improvement strategy producing evidence to monitor or gauge progress toward our objectives. The rationale for using any strategy would be for the purpose of progress monitoring toward our stated goals.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. We will work deliberately with the Math PLC, district liaisons, and math coaches to determine the best course of action for the new implementation of Algebra Nations. 2. We will use Math 180 with fidelity to develop a prescriptive schedule for ASPIRE students showing weaknesses in specific standard strands and Dreambox as a Tier 2/3 intervention & progress monitoring application. 3. We will use ESE inclusion (push-in) teachers alongside the content specific teachers to increase student support within the general education classroom. 4. We will continue to enhance instruction through our 1-to-1 schoolwide approach by using technology rich instructional methods in each classroom. 5. We will continue to increase our student engagement by adding Kagan and Criss strategies through professional development and mentoring.
Person Responsible	David Pitts (pittsdm@bay.k12.fl.us)

#5	
Title	Black (BLK) Subgroup - Overall Index
Rationale	This area of focus was identified as a critical need by reviewing the 2018-19 school data. The overall federal index for this subgroup showed only 47% proficiency. The content areas of greatest concern were Science achievement (15%), ELA achievement (31%), and Math achievement (37%). The reason this is of great concern for Surfside Middle School is because the minimum threshold for schools to enter the state required Targeted Support and Improvement (TS&I) status is an overall federal index, by subgroup, of 41%.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Surfside Middle School plans to achieve percentages of 50% or higher in all school grade components within the BLK subgroup and an overall Black/African American federal index of 55%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	David Pitts (pittsdm@bay.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	<p>Because this objective spans several content areas, our strategies will include:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The use common summative assessments to gauge student proficiency / mastery of the ELA, Math, Science, and Social Studies standards. 2. The use of NWEA Map data, comparing Fall and Winter results to determine student progress in ELA, Math, and Science content areas.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	We defined evidence-based strategies as any school improvement strategy producing evidence to monitor or gauge progress toward our objectives. The rationale for using any strategy would be for the purpose of progress monitoring toward our stated goals.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. We will identify specific students within the subgroup in need of academic, behavioral, and social interventions. 2. We will develop a mentor program, from among the school faculty, tailored to address the needs of the identified students within the subgroup. 3. We will use ESE inclusion (push-in) teachers alongside the content specific teachers to increase student support within the general education classroom. 4. We will continue to enhance instruction through our 1-to-1 schoolwide approach by using technology rich instructional methods in each classroom. 5. We will continue to increase our student engagement by adding Kagan and Criss strategies through professional development and mentoring.
Person Responsible	David Pitts (pittsdm@bay.k12.fl.us)

#6	
Title	Student Behavior
Rationale	The 2017-18 school year resulted in 919 discipline referrals at Surfside Middle School. During the 2018-19 school year there were only 746 discipline referrals. If the storm days are taken into account, Surfside was projected to have 855 discipline referrals; which is 7% less than the previous 2017-18 school year.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Our goal for the 2019-2020 school year is to see a 10% decrease in discipline referrals from the previous projected total of 2018-2019. We plan to decrease our referral total to under 770 for the 2019-20 school year.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	David Pitts (pittsdm@bay.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	We defined evidence-based strategies as any school improvement strategy producing evidence to monitor or gauge progress toward our objectives. The rationale for using any strategy would be for the purpose of progress monitoring toward our stated goals.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Achieving this objective would mean we were able to establish a(n): 1. More positive culture within the student body to be observed during CWT 2. Student body with more awareness about mental health and the impact of trauma to be observed in our guidance evaluation data 3. More positive classroom climate for teachers with significant parental support to be observed in our referral data 4. Increased understanding of acceptable social and behavioral vocabulary (i.e. inclusion, exclusion, kindness, bullying, harassment, threat, etc...)
Action Step	
Description	1. Administration will facilitate character education training (with curriculum) to satisfy mental health training requirement during REEF time. 2. Administration and faculty will work to build positive rapport with students to limit negative interaction. 3. Administration will introduce and implement referral flow chart to inform teachers of DR process. 4. Administration will host motivational speakers to discuss character education. 5. Administration will award a "Student of the Week" to be a positive reinforcement of good behavior. 6. Administration will implement incentive program for "Student of the Quarter" - lunch reward from Chik-Filet. 7. Administrative team will review discipline data monthly and report out and plan for any potential teacher intervention / classroom management needs.
Person Responsible	David Pitts (pittsdm@bay.k12.fl.us)

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).

School safety continues to be a priority as our School Safety Team meets regularly to discuss the implementation of State and district mandates designed to improve security and student safety on and off campus.

Additionally, as our local school district continues to grow in its understanding of trauma informed care and mental health, our school counseling team meets regularly to discuss the implementation of State and district mandates designed to improve the overall mental health of our stakeholders.

In order to address all additional schoolwide improvement initiatives we will educate the Surfside Middle School Faculty on the UChicago 5 Essentials designed to positively impact stakeholder relationships, teacher recruitment and development, and most importantly--student growth and success. Furthermore we will administer the 5Essentials Survey to determine Surfside's strengths and weaknesses towards overall school improvement. The 5 Essentials, that are indicators of school improvement include:

1. Effective Leaders
2. Collaborative Teachers
3. Involved Families
4. Supportive Environments
5. Ambitious Instruction

The University of Chicago's research initiative, which has been utilized in more than 6,000 schools across 36 states, has determined that schools strong on at least three of the above indicators are ten times more likely to show substantial gains in student learning over time than schools weak on three or more of the indicators. Their research also shows that a persistently low score in even one of the five indicators reduces the likelihood of improvement to less than 10 percent.

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, Â§ 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.

The school has a very active School Advisory Council and has been recognized as a Five Star School for 18 years consecutively. Our SAC participated in writing the current mission and vision statements for our school and reviews data, goals and strategies for the school improvement plan before it is finalized. We hold several parent coffees across the year, two open house times, summer open campus days, and utilize parent volunteers in a myriad of ways. Volunteer hours reached over 30,000 last school year (parent/student/teacher).

To provide as much information to parents as possible, the school uses the district Parent Portal system, e-mail, newsletters, and our web page. We also utilize an IRIS alerts, our electronic message board, and parent conferences. Individual teachers utilize other technology applications to keep parents involved in the instructional program, including Remind 101, Edmodo, and website favorites. All of these initiatives encourage parent participation among all our student subgroups.

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.

Students' social-emotional needs are met in a variety of ways at Surfside. Not only do we provide counseling services, but we also welcome mentoring from community members and staff for at-risk students. Students also participate in numerous activities which provide avenues for social-emotional growth and well-being, including teams and clubs. A military counselor is provided through Navy resources, and a JS2S (Junior Student to Student) club for student ambassadors welcomes and supports our military students as well as other students affected by mobility issues.

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

Several activities facilitate the transition from elementary school to middle school and from middle school to high school. These include end of the year visits to high schools for 8th graders and incoming 6th grade visits in the spring from area feeder schools. A spring open house for parents and rising 6th graders provides an opportunity for this as well. High school counselors are invited to visit 8th grade classrooms and assist students with registration, as do high school coaches. The collegiate program directors from each high school visit with their student teams in spring for mini-seminars for 8th graders as well. Open campus is held through the month of July for rising 6th graders and parents to visit campus and familiarize themselves with our school, and our JS2S provides a welcoming climate for transfer students in need of transition services.

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.

Members of the SILT (School Improvement Leadership Team) meet monthly, including during the summer, to plan and organize a variety of areas for our school. They present school inservice, participate in interviews, organize and participate in curricular teams, and provide leadership for our Professional Learning Communities, as well as our grade level teams. SILT members serve on special committees, i.e., MTSS, Social, Positive Behavior Support, etc., and coordinate service projects throughout the year. They are a highly collaborative group who mentor new teachers and support all aspects of school life. Teachers share in the budgeting process and help establish priority needs for students, with all funding dispersed and used in accordance with local, state and federal guidelines.

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

n/a

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Social Studies Achievement & Civics EOC Proficiency	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Students With Disability (SWD) Subgroup - Overall Index	\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Grade 7 ELA FSA Proficiency	\$0.00

4	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Grade 6 Math FSA Proficiency	\$0.00
5	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Black (BLK) Subgroup - Overall Index	\$0.00
6	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Student Behavior	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00