

Hillsborough County Public Schools

# Mclane Middle School



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

---

## Table of Contents

---

<b>School Demographics</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>Positive Culture &amp; Environment</b>	<b>20</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>21</b>

# Mclane Middle School

306 N KNIGHTS AVE, Brandon, FL 33510

[ no web address on file ]

## Demographics

**Principal: Keisha Thompson**

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2020

<b>2019-20 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Middle School 6-8
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2019-20 Title I School</b>	Yes
<b>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
<b>2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners Asian Students Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students* White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
<b>School Grades History</b>	2018-19: C (41%) 2017-18: C (43%) 2016-17: D (34%) 2015-16: D (38%)
<b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>	
<b>SI Region</b>	Central
<b>Regional Executive Director</b>	<a href="#">Lucinda Thompson</a>
<b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>	N/A
<b>Year</b>	N/A
<b>Support Tier</b>	N/A
<b>ESSA Status</b>	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](http://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

---

<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>Title I Requirements</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>21</b>

# Mclane Middle School

306 N KNIGHTS AVE, Brandon, FL 33510

[ no web address on file ]

## School Demographics

<p><b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Middle School 6-8</p>	<p><b>2019-20 Title I School</b></p> <p style="text-align: center;">Yes</p>	<p><b>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">88%</p>
<p><b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">K-12 General Education</p>	<p><b>Charter School</b></p> <p style="text-align: center;">No</p>	<p><b>2018-19 Minority Rate</b> (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">86%</p>

## 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.**

All stakeholders will foster a collaborative culture to build a community of accountable critical thinkers to be successful members of society.

**Provide the school's vision statement.**

To build relationships through trust and mutual respect, with all stakeholders, in order to foster academic and emotional success for all students.

We support the District's vision of Preparing Students for Life, and are working to ensure that our students leave our school equipped with the tools they need to graduate on time. Our District's graduation rate goal is 90% by 2020. With that in mind, we have developed the following Vision for our school:

To advance the academic and personal success of students, faculty and staff by promoting respect, character, and community.

### 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
Glenn, Brandon	Principal	Hiring of staff, observations, data collection, FTE, evaluations,
Vasaturo, Troy	Assistant Principal	
Lawson, Alana	Assistant Principal	
FreemanGray, Melissa	Instructional Coach	
Berghauser, Donna	Psychologist	Data-based decision making, multi-tiered system of supports/response to intervention MTSS/Rtl, academic/behavioral/mental health interventions, climate and culture building, consultation, psychoeducational evaluations, systems change and suicide/violence/ bullying prevention

### Demographic Information

**Principal start date**

Wednesday 7/1/2020, Keisha Thompson

**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.*

2

**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**

45

**Demographic Data**

<b>2020-21 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Middle School 6-8
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2019-20 Title I School</b>	Yes
<b>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
<b>2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners Asian Students Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students* White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
<b>School Grades History</b>	2018-19: C (41%) 2017-18: C (43%) 2016-17: D (34%) 2015-16: D (38%)
<b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>	
<b>SI Region</b>	Central
<b>Regional Executive Director</b>	<a href="#">Lucinda Thompson</a>
<b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>	N/A



<b>Year</b>	N/A
<b>Support Tier</b>	N/A
<b>ESSA Status</b>	TS&I
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, <a href="#">click here</a> .	

**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	276	212	257	0	0	0	0	745
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	129	100	83	0	0	0	0	312
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	1	0	0	0	0	5
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	14	0	0	0	0	32
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	12	0	0	0	0	26
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	90	69	88	0	0	0	0	247
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	98	73	99	0	0	0	0	270

**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	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	4

**The number of students identified as retainees:**

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

**Date this data was collected or last updated**

Thursday 9/17/2020

**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	232	209	213	0	0	0	0	654
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	32	13	42	0	0	0	0	87
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	7	6	0	0	0	0	28
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	83	78	94	0	0	0	0	255

**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	113	109	110	0	0	0	0	332

**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	2	4	3	0	0	0	0	9
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	232	209	213	0	0	0	0	654
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	32	13	42	0	0	0	0	87
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	7	6	0	0	0	0	28
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	83	78	94	0	0	0	0	255

**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	113	109	110	0	0	0	0	332

**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	2	4	3	0	0	0	0	9
Students retained two or more times	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	29%	51%	54%	25%	50%	52%
ELA Learning Gains	43%	52%	54%	37%	53%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	43%	47%	47%	37%	45%	44%
Math Achievement	29%	55%	58%	25%	54%	56%
Math Learning Gains	40%	57%	57%	34%	59%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	45%	52%	51%	27%	51%	50%
Science Achievement	26%	47%	51%	20%	47%	50%
Social Studies Achievement	47%	67%	72%	42%	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	22%	53%	-31%	54%	-32%
	2018	28%	52%	-24%	52%	-24%
Same Grade Comparison		-6%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	28%	54%	-26%	52%	-24%
	2018	25%	52%	-27%	51%	-26%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2019	27%	53%	-26%	56%	-29%
	2018	26%	54%	-28%	58%	-32%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison		2%				

<b>MATH</b>						
<b>Grade</b>	<b>Year</b>	<b>School</b>	<b>District</b>	<b>School-District Comparison</b>	<b>State</b>	<b>School-State Comparison</b>
06	2019	18%	49%	-31%	55%	-37%
	2018	25%	48%	-23%	52%	-27%
Same Grade Comparison		-7%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	34%	62%	-28%	54%	-20%
	2018	37%	61%	-24%	54%	-17%
Same Grade Comparison		-3%				
Cohort Comparison		9%				
08	2019	18%	31%	-13%	46%	-28%
	2018	13%	29%	-16%	45%	-32%
Same Grade Comparison		5%				
Cohort Comparison		-19%				

<b>SCIENCE</b>						
<b>Grade</b>	<b>Year</b>	<b>School</b>	<b>District</b>	<b>School-District Comparison</b>	<b>State</b>	<b>School-State Comparison</b>
08	2019	23%	47%	-24%	48%	-25%
	2018	26%	48%	-22%	50%	-24%
Same Grade Comparison		-3%				
Cohort Comparison						

<b>BIOLOGY EOC</b>					
<b>Year</b>	<b>School</b>	<b>District</b>	<b>School Minus District</b>	<b>State</b>	<b>School Minus State</b>
2019					
2018					

<b>CIVICS EOC</b>					
<b>Year</b>	<b>School</b>	<b>District</b>	<b>School Minus District</b>	<b>State</b>	<b>School Minus State</b>
2019	44%	67%	-23%	71%	-27%
2018	35%	65%	-30%	71%	-36%
Compare		9%			

<b>HISTORY EOC</b>					
<b>Year</b>	<b>School</b>	<b>District</b>	<b>School Minus District</b>	<b>State</b>	<b>School Minus State</b>
2019					
2018					

<b>ALGEBRA EOC</b>					
<b>Year</b>	<b>School</b>	<b>District</b>	<b>School Minus District</b>	<b>State</b>	<b>School Minus State</b>
2019	65%	63%	2%	61%	4%

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2018	78%	63%	15%	62%	16%
Compare		-13%			
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018	0%	56%	-56%	56%	-56%

**Subgroup Data**

2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	11	47	50	11	38	46	5	20			
ELL	17	33	35	29	57	57	13	50			
ASN	50	67		71	47						
BLK	18	40	43	16	30	35	13	35	59		
HSP	32	43	43	33	51	65	30	52	68		
MUL	41	52		42	31		36				
WHT	45	45	36	46	50	56	52	58	74		
FRL	25	41	41	27	39	43	22	44	70		
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	9	17	26	13	36	44	21	20			
ELL	11	41	48	22	51	48	11	33			
ASN		50			70						
BLK	19	35	41	21	42	58	20	28	63		
HSP	32	40	48	32	50	43	29	45	83		
MUL	47	38		53	71			46			
WHT	46	48	43	53	62	57	62	50	72		
FRL	28	39	45	30	49	55	30	36	74		
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	4	21	28	4	21	27	4	15			
ELL	12	33	33	13	23	13	5	36			
ASN	58	55		58	45						
BLK	17	34	36	17	29	27	13	28	52		
HSP	25	37	33	26	38	22	23	52	56		
MUL	34	28		26	24		23				
WHT	44	52	54	43	49	42	28	61	56		
FRL	24	37	37	23	34	27	19	38	59		

**ESSA Data**

This data has been updated for the 2018-19 school year as of 7/16/2019.

<b>ESSA Federal Index</b>	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	TS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	41
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	5
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	44
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	413
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	99%
<b>Subgroup Data</b>	
<b>Students With Disabilities</b>	
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
<b>English Language Learners</b>	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	37
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
<b>Native American Students</b>	
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
<b>Asian Students</b>	
Federal Index - Asian Students	59
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
<b>Black/African American Students</b>	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	32
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	46
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	40
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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	51
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	40
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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.**

ELA is still an area of concern for growth, as it is one of our lowest data components. Teachers are inconsistent with their task alignment to grade-level standards; thus, students struggle to show mastery on assessments. Just over 50% of students did not demonstrate proficiency mid-year assessment in 2019.

When considering our student subgroups, several root factors appear to contribute to their pattern of underachievement. Specifically, our students come from families and communities characterized by generational poverty and trauma. They are transient and attend multiple (and possibly even low achieving) elementary schools throughout their educational careers, resulting in significant gaps in

their foundational academic skills that are not adequately remediated prior to and while attending our campus. Additionally, McLane has inconsistently implemented social-emotional learning programs, which research has shown can positively impact academic achievement in addition to personal well-being outcomes.

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

Math Learning Gains and Math Lowest 25th Percentile components showed the greatest decline from 2018. During the 2019-20 school year, McLane lost our Math Coach who was instrumental in supporting students and teachers in prior years. Current seventh graders' performance on 2019 mid-term exams were consistent with district expectations; sixth graders were significantly below.

**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.**

The Math Achievement component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average. The majority of our students leave elementary school performing multiple years below grade-level expectations. We need a better system of providing supplemental and intensive intervention supports to boost their foundational math skills and to assist them in higher-level application of learned knowledge. For the 2020-21 school year, we are providing an Intensive Math class for most bottom quartile Level 1 performing sixth graders as part of our master plan to remediate skills.

ESE students are consistently our largest gap. We monitored lessons, student placement, and assessments and noticed that we needed to work on teacher belief systems. As we move forward, we are making adjustments to scheduling of our ESE students. We are also holding data conversations with the entire staff, not just ESE teachers, to impact change and student academic outcomes. We hosted a book study using the "Poor Students, Rich Teaching" and "Fostering Resilient Learners" in the Spring of 2019 to address their mindsets and will facilitate a second one with the remainder of the staff in the Fall/Winter 2020.

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

Civics data was showing gains in multiple assessments. Exam data for science was also above district, but our other school assessments showed inconsistency. Civics however, had strong planning and progress monitoring with teachers using standard based activities on a daily basis and looping content to keep previous content benchmarks current with students.

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

Students with 1 or more suspensions is still an area of focus. We are currently doing book studies across campus to improve our classroom culture (e.g., Fostering Resilient Learners, Poor Students, Rich Teaching) to create more culturally relevant and engaging classrooms. The overwhelming majority of our disciplinary referrals are generated in the classrooms. We need to establish consistent Tier 1 practices for academics and behaviors, as well as incorporating more Social Emotional Learning (SEL) and restorative practices to prevent, to resolve and to repair harm caused by conflict on campus.

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

1. ELA gains and proficiency
2. Math gains and proficiency



- 3. Reduction of suspensions
- 4. Improving campus and classroom climate to create a more inclusive and positive school culture

## Part III: Planning for Improvement

### Areas of Focus:

#### #1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** Teachers will continue to grow in planning to the depth of the standard and improving task alignment and progress monitoring student work. Student data will be the focal point of driving instruction.

**Measurable Outcome:** ELA proficiency will be at 40% and learning gains at 40%. We want to target our subgroups and increase them by 5% (ESE, ELL, African-American).

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** Melissa FreemanGray (melissa.freemangray@sdhc.k12.fl.us)

**Evidence-based Strategy:** Inquiry Cycle during PLC's to ensure consistent review of student work and data. Weekly classroom visits to provide feedback to teachers. We are working on student scales and our classroom culture by on going PD on PBIS and CCEIS.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** Teachers need time to reflect on their practice and collaborate with others on improvement. There needs to be celebration on successes to build on what they do right with small adjustments on improving their craft.

#### Action Steps to Implement

Teachers are doing a virtual planning session for 2 weeks in June to focus on quarter 1 assessments, progress monitoring, task alignments.

**Person Responsible** Melissa FreemanGray (melissa.freemangray@sdhc.k12.fl.us)

Weekly PLC's to work through data driven instruction (Academic Moves) and Culturally relevant classroom

**Person Responsible** Melissa FreemanGray (melissa.freemangray@sdhc.k12.fl.us)

Walk through to provide feedback and support

**Person Responsible** Brandon Glenn (brandon.glenn@hcps.net)

As a whole, our campus is working to increase fidelity and effectiveness of Tier 1 instructional practices by using walkthrough data to coach teachers and to assess professional development needs. Our Instructional Leadership Team (ILT) is helping to revamp our Professional Learning Communities (PLCs) by relying on data-based decision making and problem-solving processes. The Teacher Talent Developers (TTDs) are working with teacher teams to assist with lesson planning, student engagement, and task alignment. This will be for our economically disadvantage group as well as our multiracial subgroups. We will continue to progress monitor and track Achieve 300 usage and data to drive instruction.

**Person Responsible** Brandon Glenn (brandon.glenn@hcps.net)

## #2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

### Area of

### Focus

Teachers struggled with implementing small group instruction. This was a focus to help differentiate the learning. Teachers of ESE students needed to improve classroom expectations so that all students were expected to be on grade level.

### Description and

### Rationale:

### Measurable

### Outcome:

Math proficiency 40% and math gains 40% ESE students improve 5+% in district exam data and in FSA data

### Person

### responsible

### for

### monitoring

### outcome:

Brandon Glenn (brandon.glenn@hcps.net)

### Evidence-based

### Strategy:

Data driven instruction is a focus here. Teacher task alignment and pacing was an area of focus and we believe growth is happening here. Moving forward we are modifying student placements and moving more students with gen ed peers. Also adjusting the tutoring that happens during lunch to a more structure data based small group with an assessment to add to the progress monitoring tool that is built in 365

### Rationale

### for

### Evidence-

### based

### Strategy:

Data driven instruction has a big impact on student learning and achievement.

## Action Steps to Implement

Provide coaching and support in data driven instruction weekly-reflection and classroom visits

### Person

### Responsible

Brandon Glenn (brandon.glenn@hcps.net)

As a whole, our campus is working to increase fidelity and effectiveness of Tier 1 instructional practices by using walkthrough data to coach teachers and to assess professional development needs. Our Instructional Leadership Team (ILT) is helping to revamp our Professional Learning Communities (PLCs) by relying on data-based decision making and problem-solving processes. The Teacher Talent Developers (TTDs) are working with teacher teams to assist with lesson planning, student engagement, and task alignment. We received schoolwide licenses for IXL which will be utilized as Tier 2 and 3 interventions with inherent progress monitoring tools embedded within each program. Student performance will be tracked on a weekly, which is a more frequent progress monitoring schedule than our school has implemented in the past. Using the data from IXL, teachers will pull small groups of students and use direct, explicit supplemental instruction to target the standards and skills. Economically disadvantage and multiracial.

### Person

### Responsible

Brandon Glenn (brandon.glenn@hcps.net)

**#3. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Discipline**

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** Reduce student suspension but we are looking more at the disproportionate data with ESE students and African American students.

**Measurable Outcome:** To reduce the amount of suspensions with a specific focus on African American students and ESE students.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** Alana Lawson (alana.lawson@sdhc.k12.fl.us)

**Evidence-based Strategy:** CCEIS and Tier I intervention and strategies. Schoolwide PBIS plan.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:**

**Action Steps to Implement**

CCEIS team formed in March 2020

**Person Responsible** Alana Lawson (alana.lawson@sdhc.k12.fl.us)

PPT presented to faculty by teams in May 2020 about disproportionate data and then in May also working with parent group and student group to provide insight and gain feedback from multiple stakeholders

**Person Responsible** Alana Lawson (alana.lawson@sdhc.k12.fl.us)

Utilize classroom walks to provide feedback for teachers on classroom management and procedures.

**Person Responsible** Alana Lawson (alana.lawson@sdhc.k12.fl.us)

Review discipline data biweekly and also share with stakeholders as established with CEIS

**Person Responsible** Alana Lawson (alana.lawson@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.

**With the pending changes to our master schedule in October of 2020, we will be strategically scheduling low performing students with our higher performing teachers. We also will monitor class size to provide the lowest teacher-to-pupil ratio possible.**

**As a whole, our campus is working to increase fidelity and effectiveness of Tier 1 instructional practices by using walkthrough data to coach teachers and to assess professional development needs. Our Instructional Leadership Team (ILT) is helping to revamp our Professional Learning Communities (PLCs) by relying on data-based decision making and problem-solving processes. The Teacher Talent Developers (TTDs) are working with teacher teams to assist with lesson planning, student engagement, and task alignment. We received schoolwide licenses for IXL and Achieve3000, which will be utilized as Tier 2 and 3 interventions with inherent progress monitoring tools embedded within each program. Student performance will be tracked on a weekly basis, which is a more frequent progress monitoring schedule than our school has implemented in the past. Using the data from IXL and Achieve 3000, teachers will pull small groups of students and use direct, explicit supplemental instruction to target the standards and skills that they are struggling with the most.**

**Our schoolwide Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports (PBIS) team is working with the district Comprehensive Coordinated Early Intervention Services (CCEIS) team to reduce the disproportionality of our student discipline data. We are reviewing our current practices to enhance classroom management and student engagement factors to reduce the number of behavioral incidences that result in Office Discipline Referrals (ODRs). The PBIS team is also incorporating incentives for students and staff to boost school spirit, school engagement, and staff morale.**

## 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 are actively increasing engagement with our students, parents and communities partners. McLane created additional social media accounts, hosted virtual conferences, increased awareness of school-wide events by publishing their dates at least two weeks in advance, and published a quarterly ESOL newsletter to better communicate with our Spanish-speaking families. Other forms of communication include PeachJar, Parent Links, and positive in-person interactions.

We've hosted focus groups with teachers and students, respectively, to gain insight into their experiences

and expectations for our school. We implement school-wide positive behavioral supports (SWPBIS), but would like to increase our fidelity with the framework. Examples of supports include classroom behavior management systems and incentives, school-wide activities, positive referrals for outstanding character and behavior, and weekly character building/social emotional learning (SEL) lessons (i.e., Viking Strength Trainers).

Our school is also incorporating a restorative practices model, which emphasizes relationship and community building, fostering mutual respect and rectifying harm done to others through proactive/ responsive circles, peer mediations, restorative conversations, and re-entry interviews for serious behavior infractions.

**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: ELA	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math	\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Discipline	\$0.00
<b>Total:</b>			<b>\$0.00</b>