

Hillsborough County Public Schools

Mann Middle School



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	18
Budget to Support Goals	19

Mann Middle School

409 E JERSEY AVE, Brandon, FL 33510

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Brad Brooks

Start Date for this Principal: 7/2/2020

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 (47%) 2017-18: C (49%) 2016-17: C (52%) 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 Hillsborough County School Board.

SIP Authority

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

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

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

Table of Contents	
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	19

Mann Middle School

409 E JERSEY AVE, Brandon, FL 33510

[no web address on file]

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	82%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	65%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

<https://www.floridacims.org>.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

At Horace Mann Middle School, our mission is to empower the student with the essential tools to become a responsible and contributing member of the community.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Preparing Student's For Life

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
Jones, Dante	Principal	Principal, oversees all interventions including behavior, attendance, tardy, and curriculum as well as coordinates ILT meetings.
Schodt, Robert	Assistant Principal	AP of Curriculum, coordinates interventions and school improvement goals
Scaglione, Nina	Instructional Coach	Reading Coach and Reading SAL, responsible for reading interventions
Sparkman, Laura	School Counselor	Coordinates attendance interventions
Dewsbury, Nicolette	Instructional Media	SAC Chair, and media specialist.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Thursday 7/2/2020, Brad Brooks

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.*

1

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.*

10

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

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 (47%) 2017-18: C (49%) 2016-17: C (52%) 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	259	198	290	0	0	0	0	747	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	91	82	115	0	0	0	0	288	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	7	10	0	0	0	0	30	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	53	64	0	0	0	0	118	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	53	64	0	0	0	0	118	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	72	51	72	0	0	0	0	195	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	90	57	79	0	0	0	0	226	

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	7	5	7	0	0	0	0	19

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	2	0	0	0	0	2	
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

Thursday 10/29/2020

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	342	346	330	0	0	0	0	1018	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	71	75	87	0	0	0	0	233	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	69	74	88	0	0	0	0	231	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	50	42	49	0	0	0	0	141	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	121	117	124	0	0	0	0	362	

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	35	65	87	0	0	0	0	187	

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	3	5	7	0	0	0	0	15
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	0	0	0	0	4

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	342	346	330	0	0	0	0	1018
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	71	75	87	0	0	0	0	233
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	69	74	88	0	0	0	0	231
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	50	42	49	0	0	0	0	141
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	121	117	124	0	0	0	0	362

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	35	65	87	0	0	0	0	187

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	3	5	7	0	0	0	0	15
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	0	0	0	0	4

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	43%	51%	54%	46%	50%	52%
ELA Learning Gains	46%	52%	54%	53%	53%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	41%	47%	47%	43%	45%	44%
Math Achievement	42%	55%	58%	47%	54%	56%
Math Learning Gains	46%	57%	57%	49%	59%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	44%	52%	51%	38%	51%	50%
Science Achievement	28%	47%	51%	49%	47%	50%
Social Studies Achievement	60%	67%	72%	62%	66%	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	45%	53%	-8%	54%	-9%
	2018	43%	52%	-9%	52%	-9%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	41%	54%	-13%	52%	-11%
	2018	35%	52%	-17%	51%	-16%
Same Grade Comparison		6%				
Cohort Comparison		-2%				
08	2019	39%	53%	-14%	56%	-17%
	2018	44%	54%	-10%	58%	-14%
Same Grade Comparison		-5%				
Cohort Comparison		4%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2019	33%	49%	-16%	55%	-22%
	2018	38%	48%	-10%	52%	-14%
Same Grade Comparison		-5%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	48%	62%	-14%	54%	-6%
	2018	51%	61%	-10%	54%	-3%
Same Grade Comparison		-3%				
Cohort Comparison		10%				
08	2019	11%	31%	-20%	46%	-35%
	2018	18%	29%	-11%	45%	-27%
Same Grade Comparison		-7%				
Cohort Comparison		-40%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2019	26%	47%	-21%	48%	-22%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	35%	48%	-13%	50%	-15%
Same Grade Comparison		-9%				
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	57%	67%	-10%	71%	-14%
2018	60%	65%	-5%	71%	-11%
Compare		-3%			
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	74%	63%	11%	61%	13%
2018	86%	63%	23%	62%	24%
Compare		-12%			
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	0%	57%	-57%	57%	-57%
2018	80%	56%	24%	56%	24%
Compare		-80%			

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	34	35	23	44	44	4	40			
ELL	20	38	33	25	38	49	18	41			

2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
ASN	73	67		67	42						
BLK	29	37	34	24	38	41	20	36	53		
HSP	42	45	34	43	48	41	26	61	76		
MUL	35	45		42	37		20	65			
WHT	50	50	52	49	50	52	33	70	72		
FRL	38	43	41	37	44	42	25	57	67		
2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	16	37	35	26	40	32	20	51			
ELL	22	36	35	36	49	37	21	42			
ASN	62	57		79	81		67		91		
BLK	29	41	45	31	40	26	18	51	72		
HSP	40	47	39	50	50	34	43	57	86		
MUL	35	31	20	36	41	17	54	73			
WHT	52	52	37	55	58	37	39	75	71		
FRL	39	44	37	43	47	31	34	60	77		
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	12	35	33	16	31	29	13	25			
ELL	16	47	43	16	42	37	13	46			
ASN	81	71		90	82						
BLK	30	38	28	28	38	35	26	51	79		
HSP	44	54	47	45	48	35	44	58	79		
MUL	51	56		55	51		54	77	80		
WHT	54	58	53	55	52	43	63	68	75		
FRL	40	50	39	40	45	37	40	57	72		

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	48
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	62
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	484
Total Components for the Federal Index	10

ESSA Federal Index	
Percent Tested	98%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	30
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	1
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	36
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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	62
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	47
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	41
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	53
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	45
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.

There is no current data due to the epidemic, referring back to prior year data 6th grade math and 8th grade math, 6th grade math experienced the loss of two experienced teachers on a leave. This affected the quality of instruction. 8th grade math had several co teach sections of math without a experienced ESE teacher and this created a deficiency in our ability to meet those students' needs.

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

There is no current data due to the epidemic, referring back to prior year data Algebra I experienced a 12% loss. We are not appropriately removing students from the class that are struggling or giving them enough remediation and tutorials.

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.

There is no current data due to lack of state testing prior year data shows Science had the largest gap. They experienced a 10% point drop down to 28% compared with the state's 52%. There is a lack of focus with reviewing previous standards throughout the 8th grade year. The teachers experience some push back on the idea of common planning and review. This will be pushed with more efficacy this year in order to raise student success. There is also a lack of fidelity in using common assessments. The curriculum shift will mean an increased fidelity will be required as some topics will only be covered in 6th grade and students will need to experience review and remediation in 8th grade to enable success.

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

Referring to prior year data due to no state testing this year The 7th grade math when compared to the cohort comparison increased by 10%. ELA went up in both 6th and 7th grade grade level comparison and in 8th grade cohort comparison. The bottom quartile in ELA and Math increased. The increase could be attributed to the joint PLCs with reading and language arts, an increased focus on revisiting the text, and repeated writing across subject area curriculums.

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

We increased in EWS across the board, of particular concern to us is the attendance. We believe attendance affects multiple other EWS categories. A factor in the attendance increase is the job share our social worker engaged in last year that led to a lack of focus at our school site.

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

1. Addressing academic deficiencies due to loss of face to face instruction.
2. Social Emotional Needs of students who have been neglected during the current world climate.
3. Attendance
- 4.
- 5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: We know that our students have been out of physical school for 5 months and there will be learning deficiencies as well as social emotional needs. We will use a baseline assessment to discover any standard and content deficiencies, that will enable us to plan for interventions, remediation, and extension.

Measurable Outcome: EWS will decrease by 10% in attendance and course failures.
3% gains in Science, ELA, and Math.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Dante Jones (dante.jones@hcps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Checks for understanding/ common assessments
Whole school use of Nearpod to unify instruction between home and school
SEL Systems

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: School wide focus on multiple data points will improve student performance. The book study from last year on Visible Learning will continue to be used as source material to help provide intervention strategies.

Action Steps to Implement

- 1.) Nearpod will be used to unify instruction between home and school to provide engaging lessons
- 2.) 7 Mindsets to live your ultimate life will be used to provide SEL segments to the entire school
- 3.) SURF (sustained uninterrupted reading fun) will be built into the bell schedule to encourage independent reading
- 4.) PLCs will use standards aligned data chat with common planning to close learning gaps

Person Responsible: Dante Jones (dante.jones@hcps.net)

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Close the achievement gap concerning under performing subgroups, including ELL, ESE, and African American.

Measurable Outcome: We will increase our subgroups Federal Index by 3% in order to progress to achieving the state goal of 41%

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Robert Schodt (robert.schodt@sdhc.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy: Extended learning opportunities and breakout groups
Standards aligned teaching strategies
Initiating a RTI/MTSS Tier 2 and Tier 3 process and progress monitoring for efficacy
Culturally responsive teaching

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Response to intervention has the highest effect sizes as we learned in our book study last year on Visible Learning. We currently have not been doing much RTI, creating an RTI program and using it with fidelity along with extended learning opportunities provides the most opportunity for growth. Our teachers also need to be educated in culturally responsive teaching in order to better meet our subgroups needs.

Action Steps to Implement

- 1.) Targeted invitations to subgroup members for ELP and Subject Area bootcamps
- 2.) Classroom materials will be tailored to our subgroups for diversity and inclusion, including a culturally relevant teaching PD with our AVID coordinator.
- 3.) Common assessments will be reviewed in ILT with attention to subgroups for learning gaps
- 4.) Professional development on Implied Bias
- 5.) Culturally Responsive Materials Study including : We Got This by Cornelius Minor, Teaching Tolerance Article reviews, and How to be an Anti Racist among other reference materials.

Person Responsible Robert Schodt (robert.schodt@sdhc.k12.fl.us)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

NA

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.

We will to continue to use our SEL coordinator Jill Adair to help push and encourage teachers to build a positive relationship with students and parents through SEL and particularly the 7 mindsets. TELL survey results and PFE survey results are used to plan engaging programs that help to meet parents and student needs. SAC Chair and Title One coordinator will collaborate with the AVID coordinator on engaging Family Nights including the Fall Family Night, AVID college night, Camp Raider (incoming 6th graders), and a Reading Family Night, helping parents with strategies for student and parent success. Field trips are conducted through AVID, band, intensive reading and science that include college visits, and DISNEY educational programs. . We have set up a food pantry in collaboration with ECHO as well as continuing community partnerships with the Tampa Bay Lightning, Caspers (Mcdonalds), First Tee, and CVS.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

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

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Standards-aligned Instruction				\$282,067.62
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
		130-Other Certified Instructional Personnel	2801 - Mann Middle School		1.0	\$61,950.24
			<i>Notes: reading coach</i>			
		130-Other Certified Instructional Personnel	2801 - Mann Middle School		1.0	\$69,141.60
			<i>Notes: guidance counselor</i>			
		500-Materials and Supplies	2801 - Mann Middle School			\$3,500.00
			<i>Notes: planners, school wide systems</i>			
		510-Supplies	2801 - Mann Middle School			\$5,000.00
			<i>Notes: school supplies, classroom supplies, student supplies,</i>			
		130-Other Certified Instructional Personnel	2801 - Mann Middle School			\$15,000.00
			<i>Notes: stipend for professional development, technology maintenance, and project based learning.</i>			

			2801 - Mann Middle School			\$5,500.00
			<i>Notes: subscription to Nearpod</i>			
			2801 - Mann Middle School			\$60,000.00
			<i>Notes: computer carts, 150 computers</i>			
			2801 - Mann Middle School			\$5,000.00
			<i>Notes: books and software, Iqball, Maniac Mgee, Seedfolks, and other curriculum aligned Diverse Novels</i>			
			2801 - Mann Middle School			\$2,000.00
			<i>Notes: SEL and Character Building Lessons</i>			
			2801 - Mann Middle School			\$1,540.00
			<i>Notes: hiring Substitutes so teachers can see model lessons and classrooms</i>			
			2801 - Mann Middle School			\$15,000.00
			<i>Notes: paper, stamps, copies, envelopes, toners, and other materials required to maintain parent contact and engaging lessons</i>			
			2801 - Mann Middle School			\$13,435.78
			<i>Notes: T-payroll for common and vertical planning sessions for SALS</i>			
			2801 - Mann Middle School			\$25,000.00
			<i>Notes: Newline Interactive Displays</i>			
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups				\$106,281.22
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
		130-Other Certified Instructional Personnel	2801 - Mann Middle School		1.0	\$88,781.22
			<i>Notes: Success Coach</i>			
		610-Library Books	2801 - Mann Middle School			\$2,500.00
			<i>Notes: book study on We Got This and other books focused on diversity and inclusion.</i>			
		510-Supplies	2801 - Mann Middle School			\$4,000.00
			<i>Notes: paper and supplies for common assessments, boot camps, checks for understanding RTI model,</i>			
		610-Library Books	2801 - Mann Middle School			\$5,000.00
			<i>Notes: books and materials to support and reflect the diversity and inclusion of our subgroups</i>			
		130-Other Certified Instructional Personnel	2801 - Mann Middle School			\$6,000.00
			<i>Notes: ELP, and Tutorials, weekend boot camps</i>			
Total:						\$388,348.84