

Hillsborough County Public Schools

Sergeant Paul R Smith Middle School



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	16
Positive Culture & Environment	21
Budget to Support Goals	21

Sergeant Paul R Smith Middle School

14303 CITRUS POINTE DR, Tampa, FL 33625

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Robert Kleesattel

Start Date for this Principal: 1/15/2019

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: B (58%) 2017-18: B (59%) 2016-17: B (57%) 2015-16: B (57%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TS&I

* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, [click here](#).

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	16
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	21

Sergeant Paul R Smith Middle School

14303 CITRUS POINTE DR, Tampa, FL 33625

[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	76%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	78%

School Grades History

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

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.

Our Mission

The Sgt. Smith Community will cultivate a learning environment that promotes scholarship, integrity, communication, and excellence.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Our Vision

Our students' journey at Sgt. Smith will produce academically driven, self-confident, responsible citizens who will make positive contributions to the 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
Kleesattel, Rob	Principal	Oversee the development and execution of the SIP plan
Turner, Bobbi	Instructional Coach	Principal's secondary designee for the development and execution of the SIP plan with curriculum and professional development expertise.
Smith, Ashley	Assistant Principal	Assistant Principal Curriculum -Principal's designee for the development and execution of the SIP plan with curriculum.
Anderson, Amy	Other	Principal's designee for the development and execution of the SIP plan with focus of student success.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Tuesday 1/15/2019, Robert Kleesattel

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.*

13

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

48

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: B (58%) 2017-18: B (59%) 2016-17: B (57%) 2015-16: B (57%)
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	287	235	258	0	0	0	0	780	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	21	23	0	0	0	0	54	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	24	37	47	0	0	0	0	108	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	6	0	0	0	0	12	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	4	0	0	0	0	11	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	63	56	67	0	0	0	0	186	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	70	46	5	0	0	0	0	121	

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	11	23	31	0	0	0	0	65	

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	2	1	0	0	0	0	3	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 6/10/2020

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	268	255	229	0	0	0	0	752	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	26	29	35	0	0	0	0	90	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	29	54	0	0	0	0	91	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	42	61	0	0	0	0	107	
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	24	48	65	0	0	0	0	137	

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	5	8	1	0	0	0	0	14
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	268	255	229	0	0	0	0	752
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	26	29	35	0	0	0	0	90
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	29	54	0	0	0	0	91
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	42	61	0	0	0	0	107
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	24	48	65	0	0	0	0	137

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	5	8	1	0	0	0	0	14
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	56%	51%	54%	54%	50%	52%
ELA Learning Gains	56%	52%	54%	53%	53%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	47%	47%	47%	39%	45%	44%
Math Achievement	59%	55%	58%	59%	54%	56%
Math Learning Gains	53%	57%	57%	59%	59%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	45%	52%	51%	51%	51%	50%
Science Achievement	55%	47%	51%	45%	47%	50%
Social Studies Achievement	76%	67%	72%	74%	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	56%	53%	3%	54%	2%
	2018	48%	52%	-4%	52%	-4%
Same Grade Comparison		8%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	50%	54%	-4%	52%	-2%
	2018	52%	52%	0%	51%	1%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison		2%				
08	2019	57%	53%	4%	56%	1%
	2018	49%	54%	-5%	58%	-9%
Same Grade Comparison		8%				
Cohort Comparison		5%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2019	53%	49%	4%	55%	-2%
	2018	49%	48%	1%	52%	-3%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	56%	62%	-6%	54%	2%
	2018	68%	61%	7%	54%	14%
Same Grade Comparison		-12%				
Cohort Comparison		7%				
08	2019	34%	31%	3%	46%	-12%
	2018	33%	29%	4%	45%	-12%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison		-34%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2019	51%	47%	4%	48%	3%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	41%	48%	-7%	50%	-9%
Same Grade Comparison		10%				
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	74%	67%	7%	71%	3%
2018	73%	65%	8%	71%	2%
Compare		1%			
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	83%	63%	20%	61%	22%
2018	89%	63%	26%	62%	27%
Compare		-6%			
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	100%	57%	43%	57%	43%
2018	100%	56%	44%	56%	44%
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	18	32	25	25	38	34	21	52			
ELL	26	49	54	40	55	45	20	68	64		

2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
ASN	92	65		97	68		92	100	100		
BLK	33	42	33	42	30	20	29	83			
HSP	50	54	48	52	50	45	49	68	65		
MUL	65	56		74	53		50	85	100		
WHT	68	64	48	71	64	58	71	84	73		
FRL	50	54	46	53	50	43	48	69	65		
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	40	34	19	45	45	14	13			
ELL	31	54	52	46	62	58	20	59	50		
ASN	87	67		95	72		67	100	100		
BLK	25	48	50	40	60	60	26	56			
HSP	47	53	48	55	67	63	36	77	65		
MUL	59	50		60	69	60	55	73			
WHT	63	62	41	73	63	52	60	82	85		
FRL	46	52	47	54	63	58	37	72	68		
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	21	41	27	22	44	37	16	44	50		
ELL	25	47	49	34	59	66	4	44			
ASN	78	57		84	76		67	91	92		
BLK	47	49	31	43	48	58		83			
HSP	46	49	40	53	58	56	34	67	73		
MUL	64	54		69	63		73	83	92		
WHT	65	61	46	69	60	31	58	87	84		
FRL	47	49	37	53	56	51	39	70	78		

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	60
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	84
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	604
Total Components for the Federal Index	10

ESSA Federal Index	
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	31
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	51
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	88
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	39
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	56
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	69
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	67
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	56
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.

Due to COVID-19, we are using the previous year's data. The lowest quartile was flat in ELA and decreased in math by 15% multiple teachers were on leave for multiple months. There were multiple vacancies in VE which hindered services to these students.

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

7th grade math decreased 12 points from the previous year. ELA showed a decline in regards to bottom quartile.

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 lowest quartile performance did not meet the state average. There were multiple vacancies in Math, ELA, and VE which hindered services to those students.

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

Science SSA- 8th grade teachers revised their test prep.

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

The ESW data points to our need to monitor and improve students attendance.

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

1. Increase fidelity of implementation PBIS
2. Responsive planning
3. Grade level RTI and PSLT communication
4. Support our Math Department through coaching
5. Support all teachers implementing reading best practices through coaching

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: We are continuing our focus on reducing unwanted behaviors in the classroom and encouraging students to be respectful to others, themselves and the environment. It is a critical need because for academic growth students must be engaged, respectful and honor their education, themselves and others.

Measurable Outcome: Increase in attendance from FILL THIS IN
Student decrease in one or more suspensions

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Amy Anderson (amy.anderson@hcps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: We are using the district supported PBIS program, which we used last year as well. We saw a drop in classroom referrals in the 2019-2020 school year. Continuing fidelity of implementation will continue to show improved student behaviors and a reduced number of referrals compared to the previous years.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: The district supported PBIS program provided a committee of teachers with a thorough training, the resources needed to implement the program and the progress monitoring tool to guide our implementation.

Action Steps to Implement

The PBIS committee will meet before preplanning to outline our specific goals for the year and the steps to achieve these goals.

Our committee will initiate a student committee that will support and work in conjunction with our faculty committee.

We will continue to support teachers and students using "Shark Fins" which is our monetary reward for positive behaviors.

We will continue to offer our Shark Store monthly for students and teachers.

Person Responsible: Amy Anderson (amy.anderson@hcps.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Professional Learning**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Instructional Planning

Measurable Outcome:

We will see an increase in on level students in Math and Reading based on Good Instructional Planning.

ELA achievement from 56% to 57%

ELA Learning gains from 56% to 57%

ELA Lowest quartile gains from 47% to 50%

Math achievement from 59% to 60%

Math learning gains 53% to 54%

Math Lowest quartile percentile 45% to 46%

Science Achievement 55% to 56%

Social Studies Achievement 76% to 77%

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Ashley Smith (ashleyc.smith@hcps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Instructional Planning

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Teachers using instructional planning show the greatest student growth.

Action Steps to Implement

Teachers will receive continuous instructional planning professional development.

PLC meetings with an instructional planning focus

Walk throughs

Coaching, Demonstration Classrooms, Learning Walks

Person Responsible

Ashley Smith (ashleyc.smith@hcps.net)

#3. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups**Area of Focus
Description and
Rationale:**

Grade Level RTI and PSLT communication

**Measurable
Outcome:**

We want to reduce our a EWS numbers (data retrieved from EdConnect 6/24/2020
Attendance - reduce the number of students with less than 90% attendance from 7%
to 6%
One Or More Suspensions 10% to 9%
Course Failures reduced from 19% to 18%
Students with 2 or more indicators from 8% to 7%

**Person
responsible for
monitoring
outcome:**

Ashley Smith (ashleyc.smith@hcps.net)

**Evidence-based
Strategy:**

Bi-weekly RTI meetings to address student concerns. These concerns will be share
with the PSLT team so that additional interventions can be implemented as needed
and based on student data.
PBIS
Progress Monitoring
Strategic class placement and scheduling
Success Coach Meetings monthly or weekly as needed

**Rationale for
Evidence-based
Strategy:**

Students need to know we care about them and that we are here for them. We have
to provide the with supports to set them up for success.

Action Steps to Implement

PD on RTI implementation with fidelity
Bi-Weekly RTI and PSLT meetings

**Person
Responsible**

Ashley Smith (ashleyc.smith@hcps.net)

#4. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Instructional Coaching

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	The Math Coach will work with all Math teachers to ensure best practices are being implemented. Student will have access to technology to help progress monitor their growth in Mathematics (Pre-Alg, Alg)
Measurable Outcome:	We will increase our on grade level or higher from 59% to 63%
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Michelle Jones (michelleg.jones@dhc.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Instructional Planning Standards Based Lessons Checks for Understanding Teacher Planned Higher Order Thinking Questions Gradual Release Knowing Students for Instructional Planning (data, learning styles, motivation and interests) Teacher Reflection for Instructional Planning (Know and respond to observations and checks for understanding)
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Through administrative walk throughs, teacher observations, data chats, and final conferences, it has been determined that teachers need to use instructional planning which includes knowing their students which promotes excitement for learning.

Action Steps to Implement

Teachers will be trained in on-line programs as well as current curriculum.
Teachers will work together in PLC/RTI committees to address student concerns and needs.
Walk Throughs
Coaching, Demonstration Classrooms, Learning Walks

Person Responsible Michelle Jones (michelleg.jones@dhc.k12.fl.us)

#5. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Instructional Coaching

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	The Reading Coach will support teachers through data chats, modeling/co-teaching, professional developments and coaching cycles to ensure student success. Tier 2 and 3 Reading students will have access to technology to work towards achieving on grade level performance.
---	---

Measurable Outcome: Raise our ELA bottom quartile from 47% to 50%

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Bobbi Turner (bobbi.turner@sdhc.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy: Instructional Planning
Standards Based Lessons
Checks for Understanding
Teacher Planned Higher Order Thinking Questions
Gradual Release
Knowing Students for Instructional Planning (data, learning styles, motivation and interests)
Teacher Reflection for Instructional Planning (Know and respond to observations and checks for understanding)

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Through administrative walk throughs, teacher observations, data chats, and final conferences, it has been determined that teachers need to use instructional planning which includes knowing their students which promotes excitement for learning.

Action Steps to Implement

Teachers will be trained in on-line programs as well as current curriculum.
Teachers will work together in PLC/RTI committees to address student concerns and needs.
Walk Throughs
Coaching, Demonstration Classrooms, Learning Walks

Person Responsible Bobbi Turner (bobbi.turner@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.

The leadership team includes the ESE specialist, who continues to work closely with our ESE teachers and paras to provide professional development, data chats and support to insure student success. The ESE teams has implemented monthly Behavior Intervention Team meetings which are supported by a district behavioral analyst. In addition, we have monthly meetings with district support staff to support our highest needs students.

We are beginning our 2nd year of implementing PBIS, work closely with our Success Coach and counselors to increase student attendance.

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 have planned special events to support our ELL, ESE, and school community to provide information and resources to parents/students.

Implementing a PBIS Student Advisory Counsel facilitated by our success coach.

We are working on building our school and community business partnerships.

The PTSA has a new executive board and they will hold general meetings in the evening so more parents can attend.

Our PBIS implementation will increase rewarding positive behavior in the classroom. . We will have monthly shark stores, student events, spirit week, and monthly "fins" incentives.

New PTSA executive board.

Student led community service projects

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: Culture & Environment: Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports				\$0.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
			0074 - Sergeant Paul R Smith Middle School	Title, I Part A	1.0	\$0.00
			Notes: Reading Coach will provide support to faculty and students through PD including but not limited to, best practices in Literacy, Differentiation and family/student support, Coaching Sessions, Data Chats, Small groups, RTI, and Individual consultations. The Coach will work with all students and faculty in some capacity but mostly with lower quartile students and			

			their teachers so over 800 people. The Reading Coach will be provided through Title 1 funding.			
			0074 - Sergeant Paul R Smith Middle School	Title, I Part A	0.5	\$0.00
			Notes: Math Coach will provide support to faculty and students through PD including but not limited to, best practices in Math differentiation and family/student support, Coaching Sessions, Data Chats, Small groups, RTI, and Individual consultations. The Coach will work with all students and faculty in some capacity but mostly lower quartile Math students and their Math teachers so over 800 people. The Math Coach will be provided through Title 1 funding.			
			0074 - Sergeant Paul R Smith Middle School	Title, I Part A	1.0	\$0.00
			Notes: Success Coach will provide support to students/their teachers/their families through Individual consultations, data chats, conferencing in reference to how to support the students so that they can be successful. The Coach will work with all students and faculty in some capacity but mostly with lower quartile students who have multiple at-risk factors (approx 100 students) and their teachers, so over 800 people. The Success Coach will be provided through Title 1 funding.			
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Professional Learning				\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups				\$0.00
4	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Instructional Coaching				\$0.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
			0074 - Sergeant Paul R Smith Middle School	Title, I Part A		\$0.00
			Notes: Computers (These will be used by both Reading and Mathematics) 3AD02AV-HCPS-HP Desk Tops \$522.87 50 each MS Operating and MS Office \$75.00 50 each Lenovo 300e \$350.34 50 each Microsoft EES Agreement- MS Operating & Office \$75.00 \$51,160.50			
5	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Instructional Coaching				\$0.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
			0074 - Sergeant Paul R Smith Middle School	Title, I Part A		\$0.00
			Notes: Computers (These will be used by both Reading and Mathematics) 3AD02AV-HCPS-HP Desk Tops \$522.87 50 each MS Operating and MS Office \$75.00 50 each Lenovo 300e \$350.34 50 each Microsoft EES Agreement- MS Operating & Office \$75.00 \$51,160.50			
Total:						\$0.00