D. S. Parrott Middle School

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

D. S. Parrott Middle School

19220 YOUTH DR, Brooksville, FL 34601

https://www.hernandoschools.org/dspms

Demographics

Principal: Chris Clifford

Start Date for this Principal: 8/22/2020

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
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2019-20 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* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students* Multiracial Students* White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: C (50%) 2017-18: C (52%) 2016-17: B (54%) 2015-16: C (53%)
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 Hernando 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

D. S. Parrott Middle School

19220 YOUTH DR, Brooksville, FL 34601

https://www.hernandoschools.org/dspms

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	**2019-20 Title I School**	**2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
Middle School 6-8	Yes	100%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	40%

School Grades History

Year	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17
Grade	C	C	C	B

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Hernando 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.

Students, teachers, staff and administration at D.S. Parrott Middle School will focus on growth by engaging in active and collaborative learning and writing across content areas with high rigor that challenges, motivates and exceeds expectations, ensuring success and pride in everything we do!

Provide the school's vision statement.

Success and Pride in everything we do!

School Leadership Team

Membership
Identify the name, email address, position title, and job duties/responsibilities for each member of the school leadership team.**:**

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
LaRose, Ed	Principal	Oversees all aspects of school operations, specific responsibilities include Public Relations, Budgeting, Instructional Evaluations for Science, ELA, Electives, Guidance and classified staff - Lead Facilitator of Professional Development and school aspiring leaders.
Cermak, Walter	Instructional Coach	Instructional Practices - Reading, ELA and Social Studies Implementation.
Curren, Valerie	Teacher, K-12	Science Department Head - Data Collection, SIP Implementation and Teacher support.
Sanborn, Robert	Teacher, K-12	Math Department Head - Data Collection, SIP Implementation and Teacher support.
Sladek-Carsillo, Brandy	Teacher, K-12	Social Department Head - Data Collection, SIP Implementation and Teacher support.
Whealton, Susan	Teacher, K-12	Electives Department Head - SIP Implementation and Teacher support.
Slone, Jodi	Teacher, K-12	Assessment Teacher, contributing member of SIP team. Collects, analyzes and presents school related data to administration and faculty.
Smith, Kelly	School Counselor	Guidance Department Head - RTI Coordinator and Credit Recovery.
Wiley, Linda	Teacher, ESE	ESE Department Chair
McNaughton, Donald	Assistant Principal	Assist principal in all aspects of school operations, responsible for Professional Development, instructional evaluations for Social Studies, Mathematics and ESE, Paraprofessionals and Custodial departments. Oversees EST's and Facilities Management, Safe Schools - Emergency Drills, School Announcements.
Cavanaugh, Kasey	Teacher, K-12	ELA Department Head - Data Collection, SIP Implementation and Teacher support.
McCalla, Stacy	Teacher, K-12	Grade Level Lead - 6th Grade
Miller, Christie	Teacher, K-12	Grade Level Lead - 7th Grade
Liddon, Adrian	Teacher, K-12	Grade Level Lead - 8th Grade
Jorif, Maria	Dean	Responsibilities includes handling of student discipline; an important part of the administrative team where additional duties are executed as

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		assigned. Lead ESOL Teacher - ensures compliance with State requirements, tracking, assessing and community outreach for all ESOL and post ESOL students.
Neal, Lamon	Teacher, K-12	School Behavior Specialist and an important part of the school's leadership team.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Saturday 8/22/2020, Chris Clifford

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

3

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

16

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

50

Demographic Data

2020-21 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
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2019-20 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* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students* Multiracial Students* White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students*

School Grades History	2018-19: C (50%) 2017-18: C (52%) 2016-17: B (54%) 2015-16: C (53%)
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](#).

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math 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	

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	6	7	0	0	0	0	14
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Saturday 8/22/2020

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	
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	264	232	220	0	0	0	0	716
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	131	171	144	0	0	0	0	446
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	31	85	84	0	0	0	0	200
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	18	34	0	0	0	0	55
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	91	81	72	0	0	0	0	244

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	112	134	120	0	0	0	0	366

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	4	10	26	0	0	0	0	40
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	6	8	0	0	0	0	22

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	
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	264	232	220	0	0	0	0	716
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	131	171	144	0	0	0	0	446
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	31	85	84	0	0	0	0	200
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	18	34	0	0	0	0	55
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	91	81	72	0	0	0	0	244

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	112	134	120	0	0	0	0	366

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	4	10	26	0	0	0	0	40
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	6	8	0	0	0	0	22

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	47%	56%	54%	44%	54%	52%
ELA Learning Gains	49%	53%	54%	54%	56%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	44%	47%	47%	50%	49%	44%
Math Achievement	55%	61%	58%	57%	62%	56%
Math Learning Gains	54%	55%	57%	54%	55%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	48%	51%	51%	56%	55%	50%
Science Achievement	49%	56%	51%	53%	50%	50%
Social Studies Achievement	63%	72%	72%	70%	74%	70%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey				
Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)			Total
	6	7	8	
	(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.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2019	44%	52%	-8%	54%	-10%
	2018	44%	53%	-9%	52%	-8%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison						

ELA						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
07	2019	42%	53%	-11%	52%	-10%
	2018	41%	51%	-10%	51%	-10%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison		-2%				
08	2019	47%	53%	-6%	56%	-9%
	2018	57%	54%	3%	58%	-1%
Same Grade Comparison		-10%				
Cohort Comparison		6%				

MATH						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
06	2019	44%	53%	-9%	55%	-11%
	2018	46%	53%	-7%	52%	-6%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	50%	62%	-12%	54%	-4%
	2018	57%	63%	-6%	54%	3%
Same Grade Comparison		-7%				
Cohort Comparison		4%				
08	2019	63%	50%	13%	46%	17%
	2018	50%	53%	-3%	45%	5%
Same Grade Comparison		13%				
Cohort Comparison		6%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
08	2019	50%	54%	-4%	48%	2%
	2018	57%	56%	1%	50%	7%
Same Grade Comparison		-7%				
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	63%	75%	-12%	71%	-8%

CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2018	59%	74%	-15%	71%	-12%
Compare		4%			
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	100%	59%	41%	61%	39%
2018	88%	62%	26%	62%	26%
Compare		12%			
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018	0%	45%	-45%	56%	-56%

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	19	35	26	19	35	41	8	21			
ELL	11	43	50	28	52	40					
BLK	15	35	42	27	41	34	16	37	10		
HSP	42	42	33	52	55	48	50	75	36		
MUL	49	48		67	58			40			
WHT	54	53	51	61	57	53	55	68	42		
FRL	36	45	42	47	51	47	38	55	31		
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	13	32	32	14	42	43	23	24			
ELL	21	36	25	26	46	40					
BLK	26	46	42	28	46	48	31	36			
HSP	50	45	27	53	49	44	65	69	38		
MUL	46	48		48	50						
WHT	54	59	52	61	55	47	59	61	46		
FRL	45	52	42	50	50	47	55	52	38		

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
2017 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
SWD	3	35	36	12	40	47	13	48			
ELL	25	38		25	33						
BLK	17	39	39	36	49	41	15	54			
HSP	47	59	62	49	46	42	29	65	31		
MUL	50	65		48	60		62				
WHT	47	55	50	63	55	63	64	72	56		
FRL	39	52	51	52	54	57	45	65	43		

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	52
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	70
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	518
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	98%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	26
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	2
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	42
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
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%	0

Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	29
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	1
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	48
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	52
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
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%	0
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	55
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	44
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

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.

African American (A/A) and Students with Disability (SWDs) subgroups showed the lowest performance in ELA and Math. For the 2019-20 school year only 15% of A/A and 19% of SWDs showed proficiency in ELA. Poor attendance was the main contributing factor.

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

Science showed the greatest decline in performance, falling by 9% points from the prior year. Factor(s) that contributed to this includes FCAT standards not spiralling through the curriculum of all three grade levels.

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.

6th Grade math showed the greatest gap, performing 11% lover than the state average. This drop in performance continues the negative trend, widening the gap from by 5% from the prior year. This data trend suggests incoming sixth graders are lacking mastery of the 5th grade standards.

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

8th grade math showed the most improvements increasing by 13% points from the prior year, exceeding the state and district averages. This can be attributed to exposing more level 2s and 3s to advanced classes, creating a culture of higher expectations as well as providing additional support through intensive classes for level 1s and 2s.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern?

Student Attendance - over 50% of students (across all grade levels) fell below the 90% attendance threshold; over 90% of the student population rely on district provided transportation. This has been an ongoing area of concern as the achievement gap has widened for those students who fall into this statistical category. Student attendance will continue to be an area of focus for the 2020-21 school year.

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

1. Building a school culture where significant efforts are made to improve Teacher/Student relationships.
2. Increase ESSA Federal Index by 5% for all students with sustained growth of 3% through the 2023 school year for the three targeted subgroups (African Americans/SWD's and ELL's) in Reading and Math.
3. Address attendance issues by achieving a 50% reduction in the number of students falling below 90%.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Equity & Diversity

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Creating stronger student/teacher relationships will positively impact student achievement and create that sense of belonging for our students. This area of focus will start with a book study with the School Based Leadership Team (SBLT) on Collective Efficacy. Building a positive school culture is fundamental to achieving to achieving this goal.
Measurable Outcome:	Improvement in attendance and behavior - - increase attendance rates in students who fell below the 90% threshold by 25% and reduce student disciplines (ODRs) by forty percent. - 271 students received a discipline referral during the 2019-20 school year. Improvement in student achievement - - A 50% reduction in the number recorded Fs at the end of the semester in each core subject.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Ed LaRose (larose_e@hcsb.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	A positive school culture is critical in narrowing the achievement gap between subgroups - if students feel good and safe in their learning environment they will be more likely to take academic risks in their classrooms. The evidence based strategies that will be used - 1) Building Student/Teacher Relationships - Getting to know our students and their families
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Along with the academic measures used to assess student achievements - students who are able to identify with their learning environment are likely to be more successful using those academic measures.

Action Steps to Implement

Launch of Book Study on Collective Teacher Efficacy with School Based Leadership Team.

Person Responsible	Ed LaRose (larose_e@hcsb.k12.fl.us)

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to African-American	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	The African American subgroup comprises 12% of the student body. Seventy-five (75%) of this target group have one or more referrals. This subgroup is 13% below the ESSA baseline; is disproportionately affected by discipline and is the only black subgroup in the district with a failing grade. Focusing on this subgroup will include 3 pillars (a) Improve Relationships by bridging the gap between students/teachers/families; (b) Use Positive Referrals to impact student behavior; (c) Achieve a 3% increase in student achievement sustainable through the 2023 school year.
Measurable Outcome:	- 3% Annual Yearly Progress through the 2023 school year. - Decrease the number of discipline referrals by 50% - Increase attendance of students below the 90% threshold by 25%
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Ed LaRose (larose_e@hcsb.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	1) Building Student/Teacher Relationships - Getting to know our students and their families. Intent here is to encourage parents to be totally vested in their child's education; create an environment where they too feel safe and empowered. 2) Making positive phone calls weekly to bridge the gap between the school and the community. 3) School Climate/Student/Parent Surveys 3) Identify and prioritize barriers to parents and engagement
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	A positive school culture is critical in narrowing the achievement gap between subgroups - if students feel good and safe in their learning environment they will be more likely to take academic risks in their classrooms. In addition parents will be included in a more tangible manner as they are integrated more into the educational process.

Action Steps to Implement

Implementation of School Equity Team - Monthly meetings to review plan and assess levels of success as it relates to academics/attendance and discipline (EWI).

Person Responsible	Donald McNaughton (mcnaughton_d@hcsb.k12.fl.us)

#3. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	The Students with Disabilities subgroup is in the second consecutive year of falling below the ESSA federal index of 42%. This group has underachieved by 26% points and is in the second year of achieving below 32%. Focusing on this subgroup will include 3 pillars (a) Improve Relationships by bridging the gap between students/teachers/families; (c) Achieve a 3% increase in student achievement sustainable through the 2023 school year.
Measurable Outcome:	- 3% Annual Yearly Progress through the 2023 school year. - Decrease the number of discipline referrals by 30% - Increase attendance of students below the 90% threshold by 25%
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Donald McNaughton (mcnaughton_d@hcsb.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	A positive school culture is critical in narrowing the achievement gap between subgroups - if students feel good and safe in their learning environment they will be more likely to take academic risks in their classrooms. The evidence based strategies that will be used - 1) ESE teachers have been trained in various Learning Strategies - three (3) LS sections have been included in the Master Schedule to afford more support for our SWDs. Quarterly monitoring of student progress and LS impact will be recorded by teachers. 2) Building Student/Teacher Relationships - Getting to know our students and their families 3) School climate/Student/Parent Surveys 4) Identify and Prioritize Barriers to parent engagement.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	A positive school culture is critical in narrowing the achievement gap between subgroups - if students feel good and safe in their learning environment they will be more likely to take academic risks in their classrooms. In addition parents will be included in a more tangible manner as they are integrated more into the educational process.

Action Steps to Implement

Implementation of School Equity Team - Monthly meetings to review plan and assess levels of success as it relates to academics/attendance and discipline (EWI).

Person Responsible	Donald McNaughton (mcnaughton_d@hcsb.k12.fl.us)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities.

1. Provide all students the opportunity to experience multiple learning platforms within a diversified learning environment (Addition of the Pre-AP Academy) with keen focus on increasing learning gains in Reading and Math by 5% for all students and 3% annually through the 2022 for our three ESSA subgroups – (Blacks, and SWDs).

2.The ELL ESSA subgroup will also be a priority area of focus - this subgroup though meeting the minimum benchmark according to the Federal Index was only 1 point above said index. Keeping this group on our focus radar is also an important component of the list of school improvement priorities.

Part IV: Positive Culture & Environment

A positive school culture and environment reflects: a supportive and fulfilling environment, learning conditions that meet the needs of all students, people who are sure of their roles and relationships in student learning, and a culture that values trust, respect and high expectations. Consulting with various stakeholder groups to employ school improvement strategies that impact the positive school culture and environment are critical. Stakeholder groups more proximal to the school include teachers, students, and families of students, volunteers, and school board members. Broad stakeholder groups include early childhood providers, community colleges and universities, social services, and business partners.

Stakeholders play a key role in school performance and addressing equity. Consulting various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment ensuring all stakeholders are involved.

D. S. Parrott Middle School is a Title I school that diligently fosters positive relationships with parents, families, and other community stakeholders. Print and digital communication includes automated calls, flyers, backpack notices, and the school's website. Teachers will inform and communicate with parents throughout the school year with the Remind app and parent/teacher conferences. Arrangements will be made when DSPMS knows in advance that a parent needs assistance (ADA accommodations non-English language translation) at an event. The HCSD Parent Academy will be invited to provide professional learning to teachers about the importance of involving parents in their student's academics. We use Facebook to inform our community about DSPMS's activities, achievements, and initiatives, as well as invite community feedback. DSPMS conducts monthly School Advisory Council/Title I Committee meetings for stakeholder input relevant to school improvement and parent concerns. DSPMS also conducts a Title I Annual Meeting, hosts parent conferences throughout the year, and fosters parental engagement through parent workshops such as Scavenger Hunts, STEAM, and student led parent conferences.
Parents participate in the development and revision of the Title I Compact and Title I Parent Involvement Plan. The Title I facilitator trains the teachers in the requirements and procedures of the Title I Annual Meeting and Title I Compact. The plan is distributed to parents at the Title I Annual Meeting either face to face or digitally and sent home by backpack to parents who are not able to attend the Title I Annual Meeting.
DSPMS staff who support the social-emotional needs of students include a full time guidance counselor, social worker, Dean, ESE support specialist, and an itinerant staffing specialist. The social-emotional needs of students are supported by a full-time School Resource officer who ensures students feel safe at school and know they can report concerns. To support student transitioning to DSPMS, faculty and staff participate in staffings for incoming 6th grade students and outgoing 8th grade students. Additionally, DSPMS hosts a sixth grade orientation each spring for parents and students who will be attending DSPMS the following school year. These students and parents tour the campus, meet staff, and attend a presentation highlighting DSPMS programs and resources.
DSPMS also fosters a positive school climate for students as a PBIS school. Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports (PBIS) is an evidence-based three-tiered framework to improve and integrate all of the data, systems, and practices affecting student outcomes every day. PBIS creates schools where all students succeed. Tier 1 practices and systems establish a foundation of regular, proactive support while preventing unwanted behaviors. Schools provide these universal supports to all students, school-wide. Tier 2 practices and systems support students who are at risk for developing more serious problem behaviors before those behaviors start. The supports help students develop the skills they need to benefit from core programs at the school. At Tier 3, students receive more intensive, individualized support to improve their behavioral and academic outcomes. At this level, schools rely on formal assessments to determine a student's need.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

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