Jere L. Stambaugh Middle

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

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

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, <u>click here</u>.	

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 approached 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.