

Polk County Public Schools

Jere L. Stambaugh Middle



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

| | |
|---|-----------|
| School Demographics | 3 |
| Purpose and Outline of the SIP | 4 |
| School Information | 7 |
| Needs Assessment | 10 |
| Planning for Improvement | 16 |
| Positive Culture & Environment | 21 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 0 |

Jere L. Stambaugh Middle

226 MAIN ST N, Auburndale, FL 33823

<http://www.stambaughmiddle.com/>

Demographics

Principal: Deneece Sharp

Start Date for this Principal: 5/26/2018

| | |
|--|---|
| 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 (43%) 2017-18: C (41%) 2016-17: D (35%) 2015-16: D (39%) |
| 2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information* | |
| SI Region | Southwest |
| Regional Executive Director | |
| 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 Polk 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 | 10 |
| Planning for Improvement | 16 |
| Title I Requirements | 0 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 0 |

Jere L. Stambaugh Middle

226 MAIN ST N, Auburndale, FL 33823

<http://www.stambaughmiddle.com/>

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 | 55% |

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Polk 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.

Jere L. Stambaugh will empower each student, every day, with knowledge, character and skills to be successful HOUNDS. HOUNDS are Honorable in their actions, Organized for productivity, Understanding of mistakes, Nurturing of others, Determined to achieve their Success! All Staff members will teach, reteach and teach again until students understand they can achieve greatness.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Jere L. Stambaugh Middle School will empower each student, every day, with knowledge, character and skills to be successful HOUNDS.

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 |
|-------------------|---------------------|---|
| Blankenship, Matt | Principal | Reading / Social Studies / Economically Disadvantage / MTSS |
| Melton, Holly | Assistant Principal | ELA / ESE |
| Clay, Leslie | Assistant Principal | PBiS / Discipline |

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Saturday 5/26/2018, Deneece Sharp

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.*

0

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.*

12

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

62

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 (43%) 2017-18: C (41%) 2016-17: D (35%) 2015-16: D (39%) |
| 2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information* | |
| SI Region | Southwest |
| Regional Executive Director | |
| 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 | 323 | 288 | 371 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 982 | |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 58 | 66 | 92 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 216 | |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 93 | 110 | 115 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 318 | |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 28 | 46 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 79 | |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 28 | 46 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 79 | |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 144 | 133 | 199 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 476 | |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 144 | 133 | 199 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 476 | |

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 | 85 | 101 | 126 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 312 |

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 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 9 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 29 | |

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 6/8/2020

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 | 325 | 283 | 371 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 979 | |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 51 | 79 | 87 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 217 | |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 35 | 51 | 40 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 126 | |
| Course failure in ELA or Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 32 | 49 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 87 | |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 149 | 136 | 203 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 488 | |

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 | 51 | 79 | 94 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 224 |

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 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 12 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 29 | |

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 | 325 | 283 | 371 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 979 | |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 51 | 79 | 87 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 217 | |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 35 | 51 | 40 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 126 | |
| Course failure in ELA or Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 32 | 49 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 87 | |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 149 | 136 | 203 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 488 | |

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 | 51 | 79 | 94 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 224 | |

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 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 12 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 29 | |

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 | 28% | 48% | 54% | 31% | 48% | 52% |
| ELA Learning Gains | 38% | 52% | 54% | 33% | 51% | 54% |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | 42% | 48% | 47% | 24% | 43% | 44% |
| Math Achievement | 28% | 50% | 58% | 27% | 47% | 56% |
| Math Learning Gains | 41% | 50% | 57% | 37% | 50% | 57% |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 49% | 48% | 51% | 38% | 46% | 50% |
| Science Achievement | 24% | 44% | 51% | 26% | 44% | 50% |
| Social Studies Achievement | 56% | 72% | 72% | 50% | 64% | 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 | 27% | 48% | -21% | 54% | -27% |
| | 2018 | 25% | 41% | -16% | 52% | -27% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 2% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 07 | 2019 | 27% | 42% | -15% | 52% | -25% |
| | 2018 | 24% | 42% | -18% | 51% | -27% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 3% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 2% | | | | |
| 08 | 2019 | 29% | 48% | -19% | 56% | -27% |
| | 2018 | 34% | 49% | -15% | 58% | -24% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -5% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 5% | | | | |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|-----------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 06 | 2019 | 23% | 47% | -24% | 55% | -32% |
| | 2018 | 23% | 40% | -17% | 52% | -29% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 0% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 07 | 2019 | 23% | 39% | -16% | 54% | -31% |
| | 2018 | 18% | 40% | -22% | 54% | -36% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 5% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 0% | | | | |
| 08 | 2019 | 16% | 35% | -19% | 46% | -30% |
| | 2018 | 14% | 34% | -20% | 45% | -31% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 2% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | -2% | | | | |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
|---------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 08 | 2019 | 23% | 41% | -18% | 48% | -25% |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
|-----------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| | 2018 | 28% | 42% | -14% | 50% | -22% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -5% | | | | |
| 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 | 56% | 70% | -14% | 71% | -15% |
| 2018 | 79% | 84% | -5% | 71% | 8% |
| Compare | | -23% | | | |
| 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 | 75% | 50% | 25% | 61% | 14% |
| 2018 | 70% | 60% | 10% | 62% | 8% |
| Compare | | 5% | | | |
| GEOMETRY EOC | | | | | |
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2019 | 100% | 53% | 47% | 57% | 43% |
| 2018 | 69% | 41% | 28% | 56% | 13% |
| Compare | | 31% | | | |

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 | 17 | 35 | 35 | 18 | 40 | 41 | 14 | 31 | | | |
| ELL | 8 | 38 | 44 | 8 | 44 | 56 | 6 | 36 | | | |

| 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 |
| BLK | 18 | 37 | 45 | 17 | 30 | 38 | 13 | 46 | 73 | | |
| HSP | 28 | 39 | 45 | 22 | 43 | 58 | 20 | 56 | 78 | | |
| MUL | 35 | 59 | | 29 | 53 | | | | | | |
| WHT | 34 | 37 | 35 | 37 | 44 | 49 | 31 | 60 | 82 | | |
| FRL | 26 | 37 | 42 | 24 | 40 | 54 | 20 | 52 | 74 | | |
| 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 | 27 | 20 | 13 | 33 | 32 | 10 | | | | |
| ELL | 9 | 33 | 41 | 8 | 33 | 24 | 15 | | | | |
| BLK | 17 | 27 | 31 | 14 | 45 | 48 | 15 | | 79 | | |
| HSP | 21 | 35 | 37 | 21 | 38 | 32 | 25 | 67 | 64 | | |
| MUL | 38 | 39 | | 18 | 25 | | 50 | | | | |
| WHT | 35 | 43 | 38 | 32 | 42 | 43 | 33 | 86 | 56 | | |
| FRL | 24 | 36 | 34 | 22 | 41 | 42 | 25 | 69 | 54 | | |
| 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 | 11 | 25 | 20 | 6 | 30 | 32 | 3 | 21 | | | |
| ELL | 15 | 34 | 25 | 17 | 31 | 30 | 6 | 33 | | | |
| BLK | 24 | 31 | 26 | 20 | 35 | 31 | 25 | 38 | | | |
| HSP | 26 | 32 | 21 | 24 | 34 | 38 | 18 | 45 | 55 | | |
| MUL | 45 | 32 | | 43 | 48 | | 45 | | | | |
| WHT | 36 | 34 | 26 | 31 | 39 | 42 | 30 | 56 | 43 | | |
| FRL | 25 | 29 | 27 | 22 | 35 | 38 | 21 | 45 | 41 | | |

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 | 43 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students | NO |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 3 |
| Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency | 42 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 427 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 10 |
| Percent Tested | 98% |
| Subgroup Data | |

| Students With Disabilities | |
|--|-----|
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities | 33 |
| Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | YES |
| Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| English Language Learners | |
| Federal Index - English Language Learners | 31 |
| English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | YES |
| Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32% | 2 |
| 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 | 35 |
| Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | YES |
| Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| Hispanic Students | |
| Federal Index - Hispanic Students | 43 |
| 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 | 44 |
| 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 | 45 |
| 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 | 41 |
| 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.

The data component that showed the lowest performance was science achievement. This can be contributed to consistent teacher vacancies, teachers who were from non-education backgrounds and inconsistent school based instructional support. This is a continued trend from previous years. In 2015 - 16 proficiency in science was 33% and the cell has steadily declined.

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

The data component that showed the greatest decline from the previous year was social studies. It dropped from 78% to 56% proficient. This is contributed to a course progression change over the past three years that limited the number of students taking the Civics End of Course exam. However, this component has risen from 49% to 56% proficient over the past four years. The second largest drop in proficiency is science - 28% to 24%. This can be contributed to consistent teacher vacancies for this group of students 6th through 8th grade, teachers who were from non-education backgrounds and inconsistent school based instructional support. This is a continued trend over the past four years.

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.

Math achievement had the greatest gap when compared to the state average, 58% compared to 28%, 30 percentage points. This is a trend from the previous year, 58% compared to 25%, 33 percentage points. However, the gap is closing. Teacher turn over, percentage of 1st or 2nd year teachers and teachers from non education backgrounds can be contributed to this gap.

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

Learning gains for the bottom 25% of students in both ELA and Math gained by 7 percentage points from the previous year. In both cases, the leadership team intentionally identified these students for teachers in classes and gave direct instruction in how to support the learning of these students. This included professional development on differentiated instruction, small group instruction and computer

aided instruction. In addition, we intentionally scheduled all students into intensive courses needed for remediation who were identified as below proficient.

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

Two potential areas of concern from the early warning system report from the end of 2018 - 2019 school year is the number of students who had one or more suspensions and the number of students who scored level 1 on a state assessment.

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

1. Support students utilizing the newly formed Student Success Team.
2. Providing full inclusion model for ESE students on general standards.
3. Remediation of 6th and 7th grade standards in 8th grade science class.
4. School wide critical reading and writing process.
5. Data based small groups within core content classes.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Differentiation**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Faculty and staff will focus on instructional practices by integrating wide spread differentiated instructional techniques. This will empower each student, every day with the knowledge, character and skills they need to be successful. Based on previous school wide data, the majority of students are performing below proficiency in the areas of ELA, Math and Science. In addition, three subgroups are performing below expectations including Students with Disabilities, English Language Learners and Black/African American students. Differentiating to the needs of these students, and all others, we will move all Stambaugh Students forward.

Measurable Outcome:

The measurable outcomes will be through monitoring student progress in STAR Reading, STAR Math, formative data including current grades/assignment completion, and district quarterly assessments. Due to the national pandemic, baseline achievement data will be used from the 2018/19 school year. Our desired outcomes are listed below.

1. ELA Achievement will move from 28% to 33%
2. Math Achievement will move from 28% to 33%
3. Science Achievement will move from 24% to 29%
4. Social Studies Achievement will move from 56% to 61%
5. The sub-group of SWD will move on the Federal Index from 33% to 38%
6. The sub-group of ELL will move on the Federal Index from 31% to 36%
7. The sub-group of Black/African American will move on the Federal Index from 35% to 40%

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Matt Blankenship (matthew.blankenship@polk-fl.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:

The evidence-based strategy being implemented for this area of focus is targeted and purposeful differentiated instructional practices including, but not limited to, scaffolding, small groups, academic teaming and error analysis.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Differentiated instruction was selected as the primary evidence-based strategy. After analyzing school wide data and trends it is clear that our students will need targeted support to reach individual and school goals for success.

Action Steps to Implement

Early return of staff with PD that Focuses of Differentiated Instruction. This will include two 1/2 days of PD. This will also include two full days and two 1/2 days of common planning led by district and school based academic coaches. This will be completed by the beginning of the School Year.

Person Responsible

Matt Blankenship (matthew.blankenship@polk-fl.net)

Model differentiated instructional practices with successful classroom teachers. This will occur monthly.

Person Responsible

Holly Melton (holly.melton@polk-fl.net)

District ESE Coach will provide regular professional development to both support facilitators and core teachers focusing on building the connection between the General Education Teachers and their ESE Support Facilitation Teachers. This will build capacity to provide differentiated instructional practices for SWD students within the core classroom to meet the varying needs of all learners.

Person Responsible Holly Melton (holly.melton@polk-fl.net)

Weekly PLC's for core subject areas along with ESE Support Teachers attending their curriculum specific area. PLCs will be multifaceted focused on building plans, reviewing student work samples and making plans for remediating and accelerating instructional outcomes across all students This will occur weekly.

Person Responsible Matt Blankenship (matthew.blankenship@polk-fl.net)

Creating a growth mindset is needed to shift the culture to a belief that ALL STUDENTS can achieve so we will complete a School-wide Carol Dweck "Growth Mindset" book study during the 1st semester.

Person Responsible Matt Blankenship (matthew.blankenship@polk-fl.net)

Strategic scheduling of struggling subgroups with target instruction and supports within the general education curriculum. This will occur prior to the first day of school and then modified based on quarterly data.

Person Responsible Holly Melton (holly.melton@polk-fl.net)

Quarterly extended common planning and professional development for core subjects. This will be all day planning and PD sessions where teachers will be led by an instructional coach to develop plans in response to classroom and district data that will focus on providing immediate differentiated instruction. Additional emphasis will be placed on using instructional technology including laptops and iPads within the classroom.

Person Responsible Matt Blankenship (matthew.blankenship@polk-fl.net)

Reading Coach and Math/Science Coach will work with teachers to develop real time response to student learning and develop differentiated instructional plans. This will be accomplished through one on one academic coaching and weekly common planning led by regional and school based coaches. Teachers will be tiered by need and go through one, two or three coaching cycles.

Person Responsible Matt Blankenship (matthew.blankenship@polk-fl.net)

Utilizing district and school assessments, students will be identified and offered after school extended learning to remediate and accelerate academic success.

Person Responsible Matt Blankenship (matthew.blankenship@polk-fl.net)

LSI facilitated PD will be completed with targeted teachers. The group from last year will continue with Teaming training. A new group this year will complete the PD on Learning Targets and Target/Task alignment to continue building capacity. This will be based on available funds.

Person Responsible Matt Blankenship (matthew.blankenship@polk-fl.net)

Teacher leaders, academic coaches and administration will attend LSI summer confernece to continue building capacity in all core and instructional support areas for learning targets, target / task alignment and academic teaming. This will be based on available funds.

Person Responsible Matt Blankenship (matthew.blankenship@polk-fl.net)

Meet the academic and support needs of students in our AVID program by facilitating field trips to local college and universities to ingrain a college and/or vocational programs as a post secondary option. This

will continue to encourage them to work through difficulties in academics and persevere for a long term goal.

Person Responsible Jennifer Davis (jennifer.davis@polk-fl.net)

#2. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Discipline

| | |
|---|---|
| Area of Focus Description and Rationale: | Based on school-wide data, 25.9% of the student population received at least one day out of school suspension. When these students are suspended, they cannot participate in the learning environment at the school. |
| Measurable Outcome: | The measurable outcome is to decrease the number of students who receive an out of school suspension by 10%. |
| Person responsible for monitoring outcome: | Leslie Clay (leslie.clay@polk-fl.net) |
| Evidence-based Strategy: | The strategies that will be utilized include the student success (MTSS) team, school-wide PBIS tools, Champs, and MTSS Tier Interventions. The student success team will be comprised of a Assistant Principal, Dean, Behavior Interventionist, Student Success Coach, School Counselors and Reading Interventionist. |
| Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: | The evidence to support this strategy comes from relational teaching research by Eric Jensen showing students from poverty need direct and explicit instruction in the ways to behave in and outside the classroom. With an economically disadvantaged rate of 96% it is clearly evident this is a high need school-wide focus. This will especially support the academic success for our below federal index subgroups including Students with Disabilities, English Language Learners and Black/African American students who have trouble working within the traditional school environment. |

Action Steps to Implement

At the beginning of the year teachers will attend Professional Development to develop individualized classroom interventions/consequences including a classroom incentive plan. This will be completed by the first student contact day. This will also include a review of the established discipline response matrix.

Person Responsible Leslie Clay (leslie.clay@polk-fl.net)

Grade level class assemblies to explain our H.O.U.N.D.S creed and establish school wide expectations. This will be completed by the end of August, 2020.

Person Responsible Leslie Clay (leslie.clay@polk-fl.net)

Professional development for targeted teachers will be provided in the area of classroom management. This will be based on a tiered approach from Administrative observations, instructional coach recommendations, discipline data and room calls tracking.

Person Responsible Leslie Clay (leslie.clay@polk-fl.net)

The Behavior Interventionist will be utilized to work with select students experiencing anger management, mental health issues, classroom control, and any other situations effecting student success.

Person Responsible Leslie Clay (leslie.clay@polk-fl.net)

Monthly school-wide incentives for students meeting H.O.U.N.D.S. expectations. This will be based on behavior and attendance expectations. Deadline monthly.

Person Responsible Leslie Clay (leslie.clay@polk-fl.net)

Identify at risk students utilizing the E.W.S. system and implement the Check and Connect mentoring program.

Person Responsible Ramon Cruz (ramon.cruz@polk-fl.net)

Meet monthly with the student success team (MTSS) to identify student area of concerns including academic, attendance and behavior. The team will review relevant data, identify areas of support, and provide follow up actions for students. In addition, the team will monitor student success following interventions. This team will include the principal, an AP, Behavior Interventionist, Success Coaches, Counselors and reading interventionist.

Person Responsible Leslie Clay (leslie.clay@polk-fl.net)

The student success coaches will meet regularly with students to monitor their success in behavior and academics. Success coaches will develop small groups that focus on social / emotional success along with meeting with students individually.

Person Responsible Matt Blankenship (matthew.blankenship@polk-fl.net)

Family outreach will be conducted in order to increase family / school connections. This includes parent nights focused on academic enrichment each quarter of the school year.

Person Responsible Matt Blankenship (matthew.blankenship@polk-fl.net)

Build student voice and accountability by establishing a school wide student council along with grade level student councils that will regularly meet and explore / recommend changes and improvements to student incentives and discipline.

Person Responsible Matt Blankenship (matthew.blankenship@polk-fl.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

Additional areas of focus will be Social Emotional Learning school wide and student engagement outside the classroom. This will be addressed through alternative scheduling days on early release. On these days students will be able to meet with teachers for remediation, hold club meetings and engage in activities build social / emotional capacity and leadership. This will be directed by the principal.

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.

Stambaugh Middle School builds a positive school culture and environment by holding all students and staff to our HOUNDS expectations. These include being Honorable, Organized, Understanding, Nurturing, Determined and Successful. It is expected that all community members will hold each other accountable so that we are successful as a whole. In addition, we regularly seek stakeholder input through our family nights, social media, School Advisory Council and Parent / Teacher / Student Organization meetings. Through these opportunities, we all stakeholders have direct access to the principal and other leadership team members. In addition, Stambaugh will start a school wide and individual grade level student councils in order to foster ownership and accountability within the student body.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

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