

Hillsborough County Public Schools

Pierce 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 | 12 |
| Planning for Improvement | 17 |
| Positive Culture & Environment | 19 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 0 |

Pierce Middle School

5511 N HESPERIDES ST, Tampa, FL 33614

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Pablo Gallejo

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2016

| | |
|--|---|
| 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 Asian Students Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students* Economically Disadvantaged Students |
| School Grades History | 2018-19: C (50%) 2017-18: C (52%) 2016-17: C (50%) 2015-16: C (46%) |
| 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 | 17 |
| Title I Requirements | 0 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 0 |

Pierce Middle School

5511 N HESPERIDES ST, Tampa, FL 33614

[no web address on file]

School Demographics

| | | |
|--|---|--|
| <p>School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Middle School 6-8</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>93%</p> |
| <p>Primary Service Type (per MSID File)</p> <p>K-12 General Education</p> | <p>Charter School</p> <p>No</p> | <p>2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p>93%</p> |

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.

Pierce Middle School will provide an environment of Respect, Responsibility and Pride in academics and behavior.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Pierce Middle School will become the hub of the community through student success.

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 |
|------------------------|-----------|---|
| Gallego Alvarez, Pablo | Principal | <p>Along with the Principal, the school leadership team consist of AP, SALs, Academic Coaches, and Team Leaders. Members are included in the decision making in school, and serve a role in developing tools to assist teachers in building their pedagogy.</p> <p>Leadership team is divided into three other teams.</p> <p>A. The Instructional Leadership Team (ILT) Principal Reading Coach Teachers form all three grade levels and different subject areas.</p> <p>The ILT is to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Collaborate and problem solve to ensure the implementation of high quality instructional practices utilizing the RtI/MTSS process: at the core (Tier 1) and intervention/enrichment (Tiers 2/3) levels. 2. Support the implementation of high quality instructional practices at the core (Tier 1) and intervention/enrichment (Tiers 2/3) levels. 3. Review ongoing progress monitoring data at the core to ensure fidelity of instruction and attainment of SIP goal(s) in the curricular domain. 4. Communicate school-wide data to PLCs and facilitate problem solving within the content/grade level teams. <p>B. Team Leaders PLC APA Team leaders form all the different grade levels</p> <p>The team Leaders PLC is to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Collaborate and problem solve to ensure the implementation discipline and attendance plans utilizing the RtI/MTSS process: at the core (Tier 1) and intervention/enrichment (Tiers 2/3) levels. 2. Support the implementation of high quality instructional and behavior practices at the core (Tier 1) and intervention/enrichment (Tiers 2/3) levels. 3. Review ongoing progress monitoring data at the core to ensure fidelity of implementation of the school wide discipline plan and attainment of SIP goal(s) in the discipline and attendance domains. <p>C. Instructional Coaches Team APC All Instructional Coaches. Subject Area Leaders (SALs)</p> <p>Instructional Coaches Team is to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Collaborate and problem solve to ensure the implementation of high quality instructional practices utilizing the RtI/MTSS process: at the core (Tier 1) and |

| Name | Title | Job Duties and Responsibilities |
|------|-------|---------------------------------|
|------|-------|---------------------------------|

- intervention/enrichment (Tiers 2/3) levels.
- 2. Initiating school-wide strategies/verbage- checks within department member's classrooms.
- 3. Establish monthly lists of students with academic student concerns or in need of remediation.
- 4. Assist in professional development creation and execution, encourage department members to be a demonstration classroom.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Friday 7/1/2016, Pablo Gallejo

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.*

4

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.*

14

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

46

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 Asian Students Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students* |

| | |
|--|--|
| | Economically Disadvantaged Students |
| School Grades History | 2018-19: C (50%) 2017-18: C (52%) 2016-17: C (50%) 2015-16: C (46%) |
| 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 | 261 | 261 | 303 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 825 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 43 | 82 | 82 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 207 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 34 | 38 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 74 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 23 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 37 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 15 | 19 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 45 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 41 | 38 | 35 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 114 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 32 | 26 | 53 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 111 |

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 | 0 | 37 | 58 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 95 |

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 | 63 | 27 | 59 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 149 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 |

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 9/28/2020

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 | 306 | 274 | 332 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 912 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 44 | 37 | 53 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 134 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 19 | 4 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 30 |
| Course failure in ELA or Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 23 | 118 | 88 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 229 |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 122 | 108 | 115 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 345 |

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 | 6 | 2 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 |

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 | 15 | 26 | 27 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 68 |
| 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 | 306 | 274 | 332 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 912 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 44 | 37 | 53 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 134 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 19 | 4 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 30 |
| Course failure in ELA or Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 23 | 118 | 88 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 229 |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 122 | 108 | 115 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 345 |

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 | 6 | 2 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 |

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 | 15 | 26 | 27 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 68 |
| 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 | 39% | 51% | 54% | 39% | 50% | 52% |
| ELA Learning Gains | 46% | 52% | 54% | 47% | 53% | 54% |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | 43% | 47% | 47% | 42% | 45% | 44% |
| Math Achievement | 49% | 55% | 58% | 45% | 54% | 56% |
| Math Learning Gains | 56% | 57% | 57% | 59% | 59% | 57% |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 48% | 52% | 51% | 52% | 51% | 50% |
| Science Achievement | 32% | 47% | 51% | 28% | 47% | 50% |
| Social Studies Achievement | 51% | 67% | 72% | 52% | 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 | 34% | 53% | -19% | 54% | -20% |
| | 2018 | 31% | 52% | -21% | 52% | -21% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 3% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |

| ELA | | | | | | |
|-----------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 07 | 2019 | 35% | 54% | -19% | 52% | -17% |
| | 2018 | 34% | 52% | -18% | 51% | -17% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 1% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 4% | | | | |
| 08 | 2019 | 39% | 53% | -14% | 56% | -17% |
| | 2018 | 39% | 54% | -15% | 58% | -19% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 0% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 5% | | | | |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|-----------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 06 | 2019 | 39% | 49% | -10% | 55% | -16% |
| | 2018 | 39% | 48% | -9% | 52% | -13% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 0% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 07 | 2019 | 53% | 62% | -9% | 54% | -1% |
| | 2018 | 46% | 61% | -15% | 54% | -8% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 7% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 14% | | | | |
| 08 | 2019 | 15% | 31% | -16% | 46% | -31% |
| | 2018 | 21% | 29% | -8% | 45% | -24% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -6% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | -31% | | | | |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
|-----------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 08 | 2019 | 30% | 47% | -17% | 48% | -18% |
| | 2018 | 28% | 48% | -20% | 50% | -22% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 2% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |

| BIOLOGY EOC | | | | | |
|-------------|--------|----------|-----------------------|-------|--------------------|
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2019 | 0% | 66% | -66% | 67% | -67% |
| 2018 | 0% | 62% | -62% | 65% | -65% |
| Compare | | 0% | | | |

| CIVICS EOC | | | | | |
|--------------|--------|----------|-----------------------|-------|--------------------|
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2019 | 48% | 67% | -19% | 71% | -23% |
| 2018 | 48% | 65% | -17% | 71% | -23% |
| Compare | | 0% | | | |
| 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 | 89% | 63% | 26% | 61% | 28% |
| 2018 | 89% | 63% | 26% | 62% | 27% |
| Compare | | 0% | | | |
| 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 | 27 | 34 | 31 | 27 | 33 | 31 | 17 | 40 | | | |
| ELL | 19 | 46 | 44 | 31 | 53 | 50 | 10 | 36 | 84 | | |
| ASN | 43 | 33 | | 76 | 71 | | | | | | |
| BLK | 43 | 44 | 53 | 43 | 51 | 53 | 25 | 39 | | | |
| HSP | 38 | 47 | 43 | 48 | 56 | 49 | 34 | 52 | 88 | | |
| MUL | 56 | 67 | | 63 | 73 | | | | | | |
| WHT | 40 | 40 | 33 | 50 | 47 | 35 | 30 | 58 | 70 | | |
| FRL | 39 | 46 | 44 | 49 | 55 | 48 | 32 | 52 | 87 | | |
| 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 | 38 | 37 | 19 | 44 | 43 | 13 | 31 | | | |
| ELL | 19 | 45 | 48 | 31 | 54 | 55 | 14 | 38 | 82 | | |
| ASN | 54 | 72 | | 63 | 72 | | 60 | | | | |
| BLK | 23 | 39 | 22 | 32 | 53 | 54 | 12 | 40 | | | |
| HSP | 41 | 52 | 48 | 48 | 55 | 51 | 34 | 55 | 87 | | |

| 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 |
| WHT | 43 | 49 | 50 | 52 | 54 | 50 | 42 | 50 | | | |
| FRL | 39 | 52 | 46 | 47 | 55 | 52 | 33 | 51 | 88 | | |
| 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 | 5 | 37 | 41 | 10 | 40 | 46 | 7 | 16 | | | |
| ELL | 20 | 42 | 42 | 30 | 62 | 62 | 8 | 33 | 88 | | |
| ASN | 57 | 61 | | 70 | 84 | | 69 | 91 | | | |
| BLK | 19 | 31 | 26 | 22 | 47 | 29 | 16 | 45 | | | |
| HSP | 41 | 48 | 42 | 47 | 61 | 57 | 27 | 52 | 83 | | |
| WHT | 31 | 50 | 63 | 33 | 41 | 33 | 26 | 39 | | | |
| FRL | 38 | 47 | 43 | 44 | 59 | 52 | 27 | 51 | 81 | | |

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 | 49 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students | NO |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 1 |
| Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency | 37 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 488 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 10 |
| Percent Tested | 99% |

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 | 41 |
| English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| 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 | 56 |
| 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 | 44 |
| Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| Hispanic Students | |
| Federal Index - Hispanic Students | 49 |
| 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 | 65 |
| Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| Pacific Islander Students | |
| Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students | |
| Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| White Students | |
| Federal Index - White Students | 45 |
| White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students | |
| Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students | 49 |
| 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.

Science FSA scores for the school are at a 32% level 3 and above. Lack of reading skills from our high population of ELL students.

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

ELA learning gains declined from 52% to 46%. A decrease in attendance from students, and a need to increase reading strategies across curriculum to create the foundations for the current school year.

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.

Social Studies scores in comparison to the state are 51% 3 and above for the school and 72% 3 and above for the state. Lack of reading skills from our high population of ELL students.

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

Math achievement scores increased from 47% to 49%. Improving the PLC format of the department. Archer Zone tutoring during lunch periods.

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

An improvement in attendance from students is crucial to increase student learning in all areas.

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

1. Attendance incentives for students
2. Focus on reading strategies across curriculum
3. Increasing rigor in the classroom
4. Focus on the bottom quartile students
- 5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Other specifically relating to Increase rigor in the classroom with focus on reading and literacy

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Increase rigor in the classroom with focus on reading and literacy. Our ESE students data show under performing in ELA and they are also lacking reading and literacy skills. Large population of ELL students lacking reading and literacy skills.

Measurable Outcome: Improve school-wide scores in all content areas by 5%.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Pablo Gallego Alvarez (pablo.gallegoalvarez@hcps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Maintaining a reading coach through title one funding. The focus of Archer Zone this school year is reading and reading strategies.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Students learning English as a second language as well as our students with learning disabilities will benefit from this strategy by acquiring reading skills.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Reading coach will pull ELL and ESE students in small groups to work on reading skills.
2. Reading coach will work with teachers to provide strategies for teaching literacy in all content areas.
3. Teachers will be able to see and understand the reading levels of every student and monitor their progress.
4. PD will be provided school-wide for all teachers to improve implementation of best practices.
5. Coaches will participate in the subject area PLCs providing support, data, and coaching for all the teachers.

Person Responsible Pablo Gallego Alvarez (pablo.gallegoalvarez@hcps.net)

#2. Other specifically relating to Creating a STEM culture and Industry

**Area of Focus
Description and
Rationale:**

Creating a STEM culture to create a new era of problem solvers that exposes them to STEM related activities.
Students will be introduced to industry certifications to better their knowledge of technology/office resources that may help them later in life.

Measurable Outcome:

STEM culture will be present in all classrooms making connections to their own content area.

Industry certifications will be completed through computer applications and digital information technology.

**Person responsible
for monitoring
outcome:**

Pablo Gallego Alvarez (pablo.gallegoalvarez@hcps.net)

**Evidence-based
Strategy:**

Full implementation of the robotics curriculum
All students will be introduced to computer applications and industry certifications through the wheel and the opportunity to take the course as their elective.

**Rationale for
Evidence-based
Strategy:**

Exposing students to the robotics curriculum and industry certifications will grow their interest in STEM engineering and coding as well as Office Suite.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Collaborating with other neighborhood schools to participate in robotics and STEM activities.
2. Kait pen technology in every math class
3. Providing access to all teachers to STEM related trainings.
4. Entering and participating in Robotics competitions in the district

Person Responsible [no one identified]

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

Student Attendance
Parental Involvement in School

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.

Bring 6th/9th graders back early for orientation
Train a cadre of student ambassadors to help orient other students
Parent information and/or education opportunities
Hold articulation meetings between 5th and 6th grade teachers
Campus visits
Shadow days
Middle school students visit, tutor and or perform at elementary schools
High school students visit, tutor, or perform at middle schools.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

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