

Hillsborough County Public Schools

Marshall Middle Magnet School



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	12
Planning for Improvement	18
Positive Culture & Environment	20
Budget to Support Goals	21

Marshall Middle Magnet School

18 S MARYLAND AVE, Plant City, FL 33563

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Dennis Mayo

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 (44%) 2017-18: C (46%) 2016-17: D (40%) 2015-16: C (47%)
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	12
Planning for Improvement	18
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	21

Marshall Middle Magnet School

18 S MARYLAND AVE, Plant City, FL 33563

[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	88%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	71%

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 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.

Marshall Middle Magnet is empowering students to become global thinkers, lifelong learners, and effective communicators who embrace diversity.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Marshall Middle Magnet is preparing all students to be active, reflective, critical thinkers ready to shape their environments.

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
Mayo, Dennis	Principal	<p>Instructional Leader for the site (e.g. responsible for student achievement, focused conversations with teachers, classroom visits, shares and models effective teaching strategies, confronts classroom mediocrity, has high expectations, provides structure, strong disciplinarian, creates and maintains positive school climate (orderly), drive to move school forward, and includes all staff in the team effort in promoting student achievement) for the purpose of providing support to site staff in order to increase student achievement. The job also includes the overall site operations; receiving, distributing and communicating information to enforce school, district and state policies; maintaining safety of school environment; coordinating school activities; communicating information to staff; and addressing situations, problems and/or conflicts that could negatively impact the school. Advocates for the students, staff, school, district and public education (e.g. responsive to parents and community, creates a welcoming climate and culture, markets school programs, promotes and emphasizes support for parental involvement) for the purpose of encouraging and promoting community involvement and outreach.</p>
Coleman, Shaundra	Teacher, K-12	<p>Teach students in a classroom setting, builds caring relationships with students and parents, managing student work output and behavior in the classroom while upholding high expectations daily. Develop teaching and learning materials for use in class, including lesson plans, exams, homework, projects, and assignments that promote critical thinking and preparation for life. Ms. Coleman also support other teachers on the staff, acting as a instructional role model for best practices.</p>
Richardson, Michelle	Instructional Coach	<p>Has a shared responsibility to increase student achievement, effectively support and work professionally with all personnel on campus, make informed decisions serving the best interest of the school, has a continuous eye for advancement that guides their focus and drive, encourages others to be their best, efficient problem-solver, quickly adapts to change.</p>
Todd, Chandra	Assistant Principal	<p>An instructional leader responsible for supporting the district and principal's instructional vision. The Assistant Principal deals tactfully and fairly with persons from diverse cultural backgrounds, supervise operations in support of the principal. Comply with federal and state laws, evaluate teacher and learning resources to determine strengths and areas of enrichment. Demonstrates awareness of school-community needs and is self-driven to meet those needs. The Assistant Principal aides to develop a discipline management system that results in positive student behavior and increases student achievement. The Assistant Principal maintains emotional control, works with good judgement, maintains confidence and seeks to continuously grow as a professional to develop him/her self and others.</p>
Shaw, Ira	Assistant Principal	<p>An instructional leader responsible for supporting the district and principal's instructional vision. The Assistant Principal deals tactfully and fairly with persons from diverse cultural backgrounds, supervise operations in support</p>

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		<p>of the principal. Comply with federal and state laws, evaluate teacher and learning resources to determine strengths and areas of enrichment. Demonstrates awareness of school-community needs and is self-driven to meet those needs. The Assistant Principal aides to develop a discipline management system that results in positive student behavior and increases student achievement. The Assistant Principal maintains emotional control, works with good judgement, maintains confidence and seeks to continuously grow as a professional to develop him/her self and others.</p>
Webb, Kathy	Instructional Coach	<p>MYP Coordinator and Magnet lead teacher responsible for the implementation and support of our International Studies Magnet theme. This includes professional development trainings for teachers, support during PLCs with the Instructional Framework of MYP Unit Planning, marketing, and involving parents and community stakeholders, using all aspects of Social Media including School website, Twitter, and Facebook.</p>

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Thursday 7/2/2020, Dennis Mayo

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.*

17

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

45

Demographic Data

<p>2020-21 Status (per MSID File)</p>	<p>Active</p>
<p>School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)</p>	<p>Middle School 6-8</p>
<p>Primary Service Type (per MSID File)</p>	<p>K-12 General Education</p>
<p>2019-20 Title I School</p>	<p>Yes</p>
<p>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)</p>	<p>100%</p>

<p>2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)</p>	<p>Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students* Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students*</p>
<p>School Grades History</p>	<p>2018-19: C (44%) 2017-18: C (46%) 2016-17: D (40%) 2015-16: C (47%)</p>
<p>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</p>	
<p>SI Region</p>	<p>Central</p>
<p>Regional Executive Director</p>	<p>Lucinda Thompson</p>
<p>Turnaround Option/Cycle</p>	<p>N/A</p>
<p>Year</p>	
<p>Support Tier</p>	
<p>ESSA Status</p>	<p>TS&I</p>
<p>* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here.</p>	

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	332	283	324	0	0	0	0	939
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	67	52	71	0	0	0	0	190
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	47	57	0	0	0	0	113
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	88	166	0	0	0	0	254
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	88	166	0	0	0	0	254
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	66	74	95	0	0	0	0	235
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	77	59	105	0	0	0	0	241

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	97	83	94	0	0	0	0	274

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	71	34	91	0	0	0	0	196
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	6	8	0	0	0	0	18

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 9/22/2020

Prior Year - As Reported

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	67	52	71	0	0	0	0	190
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	47	57	0	0	0	0	113
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	57	32	56	0	0	0	0	145
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	97	83	94	0	0	0	0	274

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	0	0	0	0	0	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	67	52	71	0	0	0	0	190
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	47	57	0	0	0	0	113
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	57	32	56	0	0	0	0	145
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	97	83	94	0	0	0	0	274

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	0	0	0	0	0	0
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

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	33%	51%	54%	31%	50%	52%
ELA Learning Gains	42%	52%	54%	38%	53%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	35%	47%	47%	32%	45%	44%
Math Achievement	43%	55%	58%	36%	54%	56%
Math Learning Gains	52%	57%	57%	40%	59%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	48%	52%	51%	32%	51%	50%
Science Achievement	29%	47%	51%	29%	47%	50%
Social Studies Achievement	44%	67%	72%	58%	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	32%	53%	-21%	54%	-22%
	2018	32%	52%	-20%	52%	-20%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	33%	54%	-21%	52%	-19%
	2018	29%	52%	-23%	51%	-22%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison		1%				
08	2019	27%	53%	-26%	56%	-29%
	2018	37%	54%	-17%	58%	-21%
Same Grade Comparison		-10%				
Cohort Comparison		-2%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2019	31%	49%	-18%	55%	-24%
	2018	32%	48%	-16%	52%	-20%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	48%	62%	-14%	54%	-6%
	2018	45%	61%	-16%	54%	-9%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison		16%				
08	2019	27%	31%	-4%	46%	-19%
	2018	21%	29%	-8%	45%	-24%
Same Grade Comparison		6%				
Cohort Comparison		-18%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2019	27%	47%	-20%	48%	-21%
	2018	31%	48%	-17%	50%	-19%
Same Grade Comparison		-4%				
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	40%	67%	-27%	71%	-31%
2018	44%	65%	-21%	71%	-27%
Compare		-4%			
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	87%	63%	24%	61%	26%
2018	81%	63%	18%	62%	19%
Compare		6%			
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	0%	57%	-57%	57%	-57%
2018	0%	56%	-56%	56%	-56%
Compare		0%			

Subgroup Data

2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	15	31	32	22	47	47	17	18			
ELL	12	30	30	28	50	49	12	27	71		
BLK	35	50	45	39	48	43	20	27			
HSP	29	38	32	39	50	44	26	40	78		
MUL	36	45		50	55						
WHT	38	45	40	50	56	55	33	58	67		
FRL	31	41	34	41	52	48	26	44	71		

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	15	36	33	17	37	38	11	31			
ELL	15	36	41	24	42	43	7	30	50		
BLK	20	42	38	31	51	52	10	43			
HSP	32	45	41	37	50	43	23	43	78		
MUL	56	59		59	65						
WHT	40	43	44	48	53	57	50	53	76		
FRL	33	44	41	38	51	48	29	46	73		
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	32	31	11	28	27	10	24			
ELL	16	35	34	19	23	17	13	37	57		
BLK	15	22	10	23	44	37	6	39			
HSP	27	38	36	32	35	25	29	55	71		
MUL	31	33		31	20						
WHT	40	44	37	44	47	43	35	67	65		
FRL	29	37	33	34	39	31	26	55	69		

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	44
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	43
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	441
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	98%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	29
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	2

English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	35
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	
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	38
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	42
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	47
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	49
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	43
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 in science with 29%, a decrease of 3 points over the previous year. Contributing factors include having teachers with less than 5 years teaching the courses as well as teacher vacancies throughout all grade levels covered by substitutes.

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

ELA lower quartile had a decrease of 7% points for all grade levels. Contributing factors include Inconsistent rigorous instruction and standards based planning with professional learning communities.

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.

Civics showed a -31% gap from the school to the state average, with the school being 40% and the state 71%. Contributing factors include students have difficulty interpreting the skill level of the questions as well as a teacher vacancy. Also had teachers with less than 5 years teaching the course.

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

The data component that showed the most improvement was in the area of Math, with achievement for the school at 87% as compared to the state at 61% for Algebra. This data has been consistent for 2 years. New actions taken in this area include the school adopting a research support class for specific students and providing additional supports using computer based programs as well as the resource, Algebra Nation. Consistency with course instructors is another key factor for this area.

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

2020-2021 Attendance data shows that 190 (20%) student have average daily attendance rates of below 90%. We feel if we focus on equitable practices with a focus on restoring relationships we may be able to keep more students in class.

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

1. Implementation of school-wide instructional program with fidelity (Achieve 3000 ELA and Math)
2. Standards based planning focused on rigorous instruction (PLC's by subject area)
3. Reduction of discipline referrals focused on restorative practice while focusing on attendance
4. ESSA Students- closing the gaps through small group interventions
5. Increasing parent and community involvement while marketing our Magnet Theme.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Area of focus will be centered around FSA achievement levels. SWD in ELA, science, and social studies were below 20% points. Students scored far below their peers.
Measurable Outcome:	Based on the 2021 FSA, our goal for all areas, ELA, science, and social studies to be above 20% if not higher. ELA would be a 5% increase, science 3%, and social studies 2%. Math was at 22% and we expect to see growth to 25%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Dennis Mayo (dennis.mayo@hcps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Instructional framework includes small group instruction with strategic pull outs. Targeted interventions such as lunch and learn as well as boot camps for specific groups of students who have been identified based on their FSA achievement levels.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	By working with smaller groups of students that have similar needs, the standards can be reviewed and retaught as needed. Specific strategies can be re-enforced by groups of teachers all working toward mastery of the standards.

Action Steps to Implement

Working with the ESE teachers and core teachers, students will be grouped based on needs. Once grouped, lessons and standards will be reviewed using specific strategies. Students will be able to use critical thinking skills, apply knowledge, reflecting and verbalizing what strategy they will use to answer the questions.

Person Responsible	Dennis Mayo (dennis.mayo@hcps.net)
---------------------------	------------------------------------

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to African-American

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Area of focus will be on science (20% achievement), social studies (27% achievement), ELA (35%), and math (39% achievement).

Measurable Outcome: Effective instruction in ELA centered around Achieve 3000 data will help to track progress toward this goal. African American students will score at or above the Lexile levels of their peers. Over all goal for school - 75% of students will increase their Lexile level as measured by the level-set assessment by the end of the year. FSA result will show at least 5% increase in measured areas.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Dennis Mayo (dennis.mayo@hcps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Conference regularly with student to review growth in proficiency, using multiple points. Train teachers on Achieve 3000 and effective implementation. Small group pull out for students scoring below average; Bright Fish Program will be used with these students. Reading resource will model and support teachers around the instructional frameworks. Utilize USA Test Prep for support with Civics assessment and monitor data for growth of targeted students.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Students must be aware of their performance and develop goals to improve. Students must have access to relevant, current reading material, promoting independent reading, which increases vocabulary and performance on standardized assessments. Use of Bright Fish will help student build fluency and confidence to close the achievement gap and comprehend grade level text. Modeling the expectation of the instructional framework will build confidence in the teachers ability to implement with fidelity and increase student engagement. USA Test Prep increases Civics vocabulary and interpretation of questions, promoting critical thinking skills necessary.

Action Steps to Implement

Capture baseline assessment data.
 Create structure around using Achieve 3000 in all classes and monitor for implementation.
 Create small groups of students to review strategies and standards.

Person Responsible Chandra Todd (chandra.todd@sdhc.k12.fl.us)

#3. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to English Language Learners

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	On the 2019 FSA, our ELL students scored at 12% for ELA achievement, 28% for math, 12% for science, and 27% for social studies. All areas are of concern with a specific focus on ELA achievement.
Measurable Outcome:	The school will focus on improving ELA achievement from 12% to 20%, an 8% increase. We believe that the additional focus in ELA will provide gains in the other subjects as well.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Ira Shaw (ira.shaw@sdhc.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Targeted interventions such as lunch and learn and boot camps for specific groups of students. Small group instruction utilizing the ELL paras to give individualized attention and strategic pull out for students scoring below average. Bright Fish Program will be used with these students to build fluency and comprehension skills needed to close the achievement gap and comprehend grade-level text. Reading resource will mode and support teachers around the instructional frameworks.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Resource personnel will be used to support students in the classrooms. Our rationale is that by focusing on small groups of students with language and strategy supports we will be able to close gaps in learning.

Action Steps to Implement

Select the criteria
Identify students
Develop remediation lessons and follow up with review of data from the progress monitoring tool- Achieve 3000 and Bright Fish

Person Responsible Ira Shaw (ira.shaw@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.

A focus on teacher and staff development centered around equitable practices that include restorative practices, cultural awareness, as well as engaging the parent and community. Attendance will be closely monitored using home visits, and phone calls to check on student absenteeism.

We will continue to focus on the IB learner profile and train teachers on effective instruction as it relates to the IB curriculum. Supports will be needed to provide teachers opportunities and plan for improvement.

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.

The school has increased our efforts to communicate with a larger group of stakeholders by using Twitter, Facebook and parent link. The school will continue to explore additional opportunities to use social media to reach an even larger group of parents/stakeholders.

The school would benefit from a partnership with parents that goes below the surface. The PTA has been re-instated and is increasing its presence in the school and community.

This year the school voted to have a school-wide uniform policy that students and staff are supporting. Currently an estimated 90% of the students have met the uniform expectations.

Our school is working toward and International Baccalaureate authorization. We are currently focused on training staff around the learner profile attributes and Middle Years Programme Unit Planning. The school is focusing on branding and marketing the school so we can continue to attract key students to add to the diversity of the campus while having high expectations for learning. Engaging specific groups of parents will be a focus once we are allowed to meet on campus.

Our vision and mission statements have been re-created with the IB focus in mind. The community including students and parents voted on the new mission and vision, which was adopted in early September of 2020.

We will continue to reach out and work with parents in regards to Canvas, Edsby, e Learning and additional supports they need to access their student's grade and lessons. We have contacted several hundred parents to determine needs of their students.

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: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: African-American	\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: English Language Learners	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00