Southport Middle School

2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Southport Middle School

2420 SE MORNINGSIDE BLVD, Port St Lucie, FL 34952

http://www.stlucie.k12.fl.us/spm/

Demographics

Principal: Susan Seal   Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2014

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
2020-21 Title I School	Yes
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	71%
2020-21 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 (57%) 2017-18: B (57%) 2016-17: B (57%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	LaShawn Russ-Porterfield
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	

> * 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 St. Lucie 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

Southport Middle School

2420 SE MORNINGSIDE BLVD, Port St Lucie, FL 34952

http://www.stlucie.k12.fl.us/spm/

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	**2020-21 Title I School**	**2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
Middle School 6-8	Yes	63%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	66%

School Grades History

Year	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18
Grade		B	B	B

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the St. Lucie 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 is to inspire and empower compassionate, global learners who are committed to creating a better and more peaceful world.

Provide the school's vision statement.

In partnership with parents and community, Southport will become the premier center of knowledge that is organized around students and the work provided to them. Southport's name will be synonymous with continuously improving student achievement and the success of each individual. Our school's promise is to move from good to great, focusing on our core business, the creation of challenging, engaging and satisfying work for each student, every day. This is the St. Lucie Way!

School Leadership Team

Membership
Identify the name, email address, position title, and job duties/responsibilities for each member of the school leadership team.**:**

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Telese, Nicole	Principal	
Manchester, Kathleen	Assistant Principal	
Alvarez, Kristin	School Counselor	
Parks, Yolanda	Dean	
Cusa, Anthony	Teacher, K-12	
Bernard, Mildred	School Counselor	
Altizer, Tammy	Teacher, ESE	
Bargeron, Carla	Instructional Coach	
Hawkey, Patricia	Other	
Nicholas, Kimberly	Teacher, K-12	
Carey, Nicholas	Dean	
Johnson, Eric	Teacher, K-12	
Brugnone, Diana	Teacher, ESE	
Mananowski, Vivana	Administrative Support	

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Tuesday 7/1/2014, Susan Seal

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.*

5

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.*

11

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

38

Total number of students enrolled at the school

798

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2020-21 school year.

2

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2021-22 school year.

4

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

2021-22

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	254	286	294	0	0	0	0	834
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	51	60	57	0	0	0	0	168
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	36	47	50	0	0	0	0	133
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	19	23	0	0	0	0	57
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	25	17	0	0	0	0	56
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	43	71	53	0	0	0	0	167
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	77	63	78	0	0	0	0	218
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	2	3	0	0	0	0	6
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	1	0	0	0	0	4

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 8/24/2021

2020-21 - 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	227	257	269	0	0	0	0	753
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	39	53	58	0	0	0	0	150
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	29	44	0	0	0	0	79
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	40	45	38	0	0	0	0	123
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	49	60	61	0	0	0	0	170

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	39	54	56	0	0	0	0	149

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

2020-21 - 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	227	257	269	0	0	0	0	753
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	39	53	58	0	0	0	0	150
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	29	44	0	0	0	0	79
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	40	45	38	0	0	0	0	123
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	49	60	61	0	0	0	0	170

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	39	54	56	0	0	0	0	149

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data Review
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	2021			2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement				50%	44%	54%	50%	43%	53%
ELA Learning Gains				52%	51%	54%	55%	52%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				48%	45%	47%	51%	48%	47%
Math Achievement				56%	45%	58%	52%	46%	58%
Math Learning Gains				57%	51%	57%	57%	55%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				48%	51%	51%	45%	50%	51%
Science Achievement				51%	41%	51%	55%	42%	52%
Social Studies Achievement				69%	64%	72%	75%	70%	72%

Grade Level Data Review - State Assessments
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	2021					
	2019	55%	51%	4%	54%	1%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2021					
	2019	47%	49%	-2%	52%	-5%
Cohort Comparison		-55%				
08	2021					
	2019	45%	54%	-9%	56%	-11%
Cohort Comparison		-47%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2021					
	2019	50%	47%	3%	55%	-5%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2021					
	2019	46%	50%	-4%	54%	-8%
Cohort Comparison		-50%				
08	2021					
	2019	37%	34%	3%	46%	-9%
Cohort Comparison		-46%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2021					
	2019	50%	48%	2%	48%	2%
Cohort Comparison						

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019					
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	68%	67%	1%	71%	-3%

HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019					
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	82%	51%	31%	61%	21%
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	100%	55%	45%	57%	43%

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

Provide the progress monitoring tool(s) by grade level used to compile the below data.

ELA and Math data used for progress monitoring for K-8 was iReady Diagnostics. Science and Civics progress monitoring data was District created Unit Assessments.

Grade 6				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	53	51	51
	Economically Disadvantaged	49	47	46
	Students With Disabilities	19	29	25
	English Language Learners	10	17	17
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	55	60	62
	Economically Disadvantaged	52	55	59
	Students With Disabilities	27	39	24
	English Language Learners	23	31	39

Grade 7				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	48	51	58
	Economically Disadvantaged	47	43	42
	Students With Disabilities	14	17	19
	English Language Learners	0	0	29
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	54	59	56
	Economically Disadvantaged	53	55	52
	Students With Disabilities	17	27	22
	English Language Learners	11	18	18
Civics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	43	34	36
	Economically Disadvantaged	40	33	37
	Students With Disabilities	19	0	51
	English Language Learners	18	9	19

Grade 8				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	55	57	67
	Economically Disadvantaged	47	57	66
	Students With Disabilities	14	22	27
	English Language Learners	0	18	36
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	16	25	21
	Economically Disadvantaged	30	31	39
	Students With Disabilities	0	9	13
	English Language Learners	25	13	37
Science	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	43	54	50
	Economically Disadvantaged	37	49	45
	Students With Disabilities	36	24	10
	English Language Learners	13	13	18

Subgroup Data Review

2021 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 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
SWD	19	39	39	23	35	35	23	50			
ELL	38	43	43	34	35	24	19	40	40		
ASN	40			70							
BLK	37	38	33	34	31	30	40	55	56		
HSP	51	45	36	43	38	41	52	56	57		
MUL	41	36	20	30	32	30	43	70			
WHT	56	48	35	51	44	44	55	74	76		
FRL	46	45	35	38	36	32	45	61	55		
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	13	33	39	22	42	38	17	50			
ELL	33	57	57	45	55	40	20	50			

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	75	67		75	83						
BLK	45	52	47	48	53	37	39	64	81		
HSP	52	55	46	55	56	54	46	64	86		
MUL	48	45		55	55	50	57	67			
WHT	51	50	47	60	59	50	61	76	78		
FRL	45	50	46	50	55	45	43	64	80		

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	41	43	17	43	38	23	43			
ELL	36	55	56	34	62	52	42	54	58		
ASN	82	64		91	100						
BLK	37	55	53	35	49	39	31	69	65		
HSP	48	57	56	46	53	48	53	80	76		
MUL	57	62	60	61	63		75	58	91		
WHT	54	52	43	62	62	49	66	77	79		
FRL	44	53	52	47	56	44	47	72	73		

ESSA Data Review

This data has been updated for the 2021-22 school year as of 10/19/2021.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	47
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	4
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	38
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	466
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	95%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	33
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	

English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	35
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	
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%	
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	55
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
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%	
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%	
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	38
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	
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%	
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	54
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	43
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Analysis

Data Analysis
Answer the following analysis questions using the progress monitoring data and state assessment data, if applicable.

What trends emerge across grade levels, subgroups and core content areas?

One major trend that emerges is our bottom quartile underperforming in ELA and Math. in 20-21, our ELA Bottom Quartile dropped to 35% and Math 38%, due to challenges of virtual learning. Based on our ESSA data, we also see a trend for our SWD underperforming in all core content areas, 13% proficient in ELA and 22% proficient in Math. In ELA, our 7th and 8th grade in particular will be an area for focused improvement, as that grade level has underperformed as compared to 6th grade for the past couple of years.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

Our greatest need for improvement is in our bottom quartile students in ELA and Math, which often is comprised of our SWD subgroup as the majority of our bottom quartile base. Our SWD in ELA is 13% proficient and Math 22% proficient. 2019 data was ELA BQ 48% proficient and Math BQ 48% proficient and dropped in 2021 to ELA BQ 35% and Math BQ to 38%.

What were the contributing factors to this need for improvement? What new actions would need to be taken to address this need for improvement?

There are many complexity factors that contribute to this, as many students come to us from elementary school with a significant existing discrepancy between their level of performance and the expectations for their grade. In addition to the existing performance deficits, many of these students were on virtual learning for a significant portion of the last two school years, which was a detriment to their growth.

New actions that will be taken to address improvement will be targeted small-group differentiated instruction in Math at an increased frequency, along with supplemental instruction using iReady. For ELA, students with a need for improvement will be given an additional differentiation period for ELA and will be supplemented with Reading Plus instruction to improve fluency, vocabulary, and overall comprehension. These students will also receive targeted small-group differentiation at an increased frequency.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

Our overall math proficiency and Bottom Quartile Learning Gains showed the most significant improvement in 2019, improving from 52% proficiency to 56% proficiency, and improving from 45% BQ Learning gains to 48% BQ Learning gains.

What were the contributing factors to this improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

We increased the amount of instructional time for math, as well as implemented consistent small group targeted instruction.

What strategies will need to be implemented in order to accelerate learning?

As noted, we will focus on improving the quality of our targeted small-group instruction and monitor efficacy. In addition, our Math teachers will gear their deliberate practice towards increasing overall engagement and productive struggle.

Based on the contributing factors and strategies identified to accelerate learning, describe the professional development opportunities that will be provided at the school to support teachers and leaders.

Book Studies:
-Leadership Team - Becoming a Person of Influence
-How to Differentiate Instruction in Mixed-Ability Classrooms
-Strategies for differentiation in the content Areas
-Teaching with the Brain in mind
-Engaging students with poverty
-Visible Learning for Mathematics
-Changing Today's Classrooms Culturally, Academically, & Emotionally

Pre-School PD:
-Social Emotional Learning
-PBIS
-CHAMPS
-Leadership Summit

Ongoing PD:
-Collaborative Planning for Standards Based Instruction
-Engagement Strategies
-Tough Kids Toolbox
-Framework for Quality Teaching and Learning
-Get Better Faster

Provide a description of the additional services that will be implemented to ensure sustainability of improvement in the next year and beyond.

New Educator Support Team, Teaming Structure with Team Leaders on all teams to support effective classroom management practices and social/emotional learning.

Interventionist in Reading and Math.

Administrators in Coaching support in Collaborative Teams.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Our overall achievement in ELA is 50% (2019) and 49% (2021) compared to the state at 54%. We continue to underperform in comparison to the state. In particular, we have a great gap in ELA Achievement within our SWD subgroup that is at 13% proficient.
Measurable Outcome:	We will increase our ELA proficiency from 49% (2021) to 52% school-wide.
Monitoring:	ELA classes will have weekly walkthroughs to see efficacy of implementation. Small groups will be monitored through plans and observations. Data will be pulled on a regular basis, including: Reading Plus, iReady diagnostics, and unit assessments.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Kimberly Nicholas (kimberly.nicholas@stlucieschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	We will increase the effectiveness of our small group differentiated instruction and supplement in with computer-based instruction.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Our school-improvement data indicates that our efforts with small-group differentiated instruction were effective in improving our math achievement which was an area of focus last school year. In addition, if you look at our performance by grade level, our 8th grade cohort was the only cohort that was not able to implement this strategy last year with fidelity due to constraints within the master schedule. As you can see from the data, this was the grade level cohort with the most significant deficiency and greatest decline.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Allocate 2 positions for - ELA 8th grade intervention
2. Allocation for 45 minute intervention period for ELA non-proficient students in 7th grade.

Person Responsible	Nicole Telese (nicole.telese@stlucieschools.org)

#2. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Social Emotional Learning	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	As per student survey data and EWS data, our students are lacking critical competencies that will enable them to become compassionate, global learners. These deficits have negative implications on overall achievement and will be pivotal to their success.
Measurable Outcome:	We will reduce the number of suspensions by 5% school-wide.
Monitoring:	Review survey data from our school Panorama Ed surveys. Incorporate Ripple Effects in our interventions for student behavior. Monitor discipline data through PBIS meetings and share data with Teams to review.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Yolanda Parks (yolanda.parks@stlucieschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Consistent facilitation of SEL lessons/curriculum in all core content areas classes.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	There is a significant amount of research that suggests that implementing SEL curriculum with fidelity leads to a significant decrease in suspension rates and an overall increase in student achievement.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Lion's Quest PD
2. Mindset Curriculum/Service Projects
3. School-wide SEL schedule for lesson implementation
4. Tier I/II data monitoring via PBIS Core Team
5. ALTOS/Restorative Practices
6. Ripple Effects

Person Responsible	Kathleen Manchester (kathleen.manchester@stlucieschools.org)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Our Math achievement and Math BQ continue to underperform in comparison to the state. With Math achievement at 57% (2019) and 44% (2021) and Math BQ at 48% (2019) and 38% (2021) both of which dropped below the state at 51%. In particular, we have a great gap in Math Achievement within our SWD subgroup of 22% proficient.
Measurable Outcome:	We will increase our Math Learning Gains, Bottom Quartile to 60% school-wide.
Monitoring:	Math classes will have walkthroughs to monitor implementation of small groups through plans and observations. Data will be pulled on a regular basis, including: iReady usage, iReady diagnostics, and unit assessments. Math Coach will meet with teachers that need support with small group implementation.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Carla Bargeron (carla.bargeron@stlucieschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	We will increase the effectiveness of our small group differentiated instruction and supplement in with computer-based instruction
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Our school-improvement data indicates that our efforts with small-group differentiated instruction were effective in improving our math achievement which was an area of focus last school year. This strategy will be used to focus on the Math bottom quartile students.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Teachers will work through data to see what students fall in the bottom quartile for Math.
2. Teachers will work with Math Coach to make schedule for small-group differentiation.
3. Teachers will have PD on using iReady Math differentiation program.

Person Responsible	Kathleen Manchester (kathleen.manchester@stlucieschools.org)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the SafeSchoolsforAlex.org, compare the discipline data of the school to discipline data across the state and provide primary or secondary areas of concern that the school will monitor during the upcoming school year. Include how the school culture and environment will be monitored through the lens of behavior or discipline data.

Our School Incident data shows that our report shows 2.4 incidents per 100 students. When compared to all middle/junior schools statewide, it falls in the low category. The data for Total Reported Suspensions for 19-20 shows "high" compared to the state. For our school this shows a decrease of 63 In-School Suspensions and a decrease of 63 Out-of-School Suspensions.

We use our PBIS core team to monitor the efficacy of our PBIS and champs implementation. Our core team meets monthly for our Tier I implementations. Data is reviewed by grade, race, gender, referral occurrence, referral type.

The PBIS Tier 2 and 3 meets monthly to monitor data to monitor the interventions in place. Tier 2 being our check in/check in out process to monitor individual students that are on Tier 2 intervention. There is also a parent communication part of giving feedback on how their child is doing with the intervention. Tier 3 is reviewed to see how their interventions are working and being successful.

We also have developed our SEL Action plan where we will meet monthly with our SEL team to monitor and develop new strategies to support the students SEL and staff SEL.

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.

Southport Middle School strives to build positive relationships with parents, families and other community stakeholders. We start from day one welcoming our new 6th grade students and families during our earlier virtual open house, which allows us to introduce them to our school without the other grade levels.

The first week of school, all teachers facilitate a school-based curriculum that helps teach students about the impact of mindset and effort on achievement. This curriculum is facilitated each period in all content areas and incorporates a variety of team-building, self-reflection and goal-setting activities. We then provide routine SEL instruction using the Lion's Quest curriculum in all of our classes. On Monday of each school week, our Math teachers facilitate a comprehensive lesson that focuses on one of the 5 core SEL competencies, then the Literacy,

Science and Social Studies teachers facilitate follow-up mini lessons during the remainder of the week to support the development of that same competency. Our guidance counselors meet with all students the second week of school by doing classroom visits and discussing the services that are available. For students who need additional behavior supports, we offer a Check-in/Check-out Tier II intervention which allows a team of professionals to reinforce stated goals or targeted behaviors on a period by-period basis. Further, students who have been identified on our risk profile (potential at risk/dropout) are paired with adult mentors to provide them with encouragement and support. We also have an on-campus New Horizons counselor that is available for any student that exhibits those needs/tendencies.

We have Team based and School-wide PBIS events that students can earn for showing our positive school wide expectations. Teams can decide which criteria the students will work on based on our data.

We have implemented "Positive Office Referrals". This is where a teacher can recognize students for following our school rules and expectations. The student is called up to administration, given a positive phone call home, and given a treat from our local business partner.

Southport Middle School establishes local business partnerships to support PBS incentives (Student of the Month, Honor Roll, Carnival, March Madness, attendance incentive, etc.). In return, Southport advertises for these businesses in our monthly parent newsletter. We also have Spirit Nights at local restaurants to promote their businesses and inspire a sense of community among parents, students, and local community organizations. In addition, local organizations are encouraged to attend our monthly SAC meetings (virtually) to stay abreast of what is going on at the school level and provide them an opportunity to provide parents with information regarding what is going on in the local community.

For Staff, we have built an SEL room where staff can go to experience some "zen" and take care of themselves. We also incorporate events to reward our staff for all their hard work.

SEL Action Plan:
Teacher-led PD during pre-school on community circles.
-First Week school-wide curriculum (School-wide Expectations/Mindset/SEL). Add opening activity with mission statement.
-Maintain daily SEL schedule by content area - Monday (Math), Tuesday (ELA), Wednesday (Science), Thursday (SS), Friday (Elective)
-Community circles
*Revisit Training on Signature Practices (Playbook) through our Learning Labs (relate to elements of Framework)
-Welcoming/inclusion activities tied to Establishing and Maintaining Effective Relationships in a Student-Centered Classroom
-Engaging Strategies tied to Engagement Strategies & Organizing Students to Interact with New Content
-Optimistic Closure tied to Helping Student Revise Knowledge and Using Formative Assessment to Track Progress
-Incorporate Nearpod for Purposeful Talk (led by ELA to all teachers)
-Intensify our focus on coping skills lessons and role play. Also match individuals to Too Good for Violence based on survey data.
-Target Emotional Regulation by incorporating explicit instruction on identifying emotions (develop emoji scale with associated grade level vocabulary to describe a range of emotions at each level).
-Target School Climate by Incorporating monthly SEL Themes.
-Target School Climate by revisiting use of FAST procedures and ramping up implementation of Restorative Practices.
-Target Sense of Belonging by Reinstituting the 6th grade Retreat at beginning of the year, and adding/

creating a modified version for 7th and 8th grade.
-Target Sense of Belonging by targeting multiple levels of belonging (e.g. classroom building, animal team building, friendly competitions between same grade level teams, etc.
-Target Sense of Belonging by developing a group of student "Welcome Ambassadors" on each team for newly arriving students. (Pull from Peer Tutors).
-Target Sense of Belonging - Team Shirts
-Target Sense of Belonging by adding a large variety of interest-based clubs and service projects

Identify the stakeholders and their role in promoting a positive culture and environment at the school.

PBIS Core Team:
Nicole Telese & Kathleen Manchester - Administration
Kristin Alvarez & Mildred Bernard - Guidance
Jessica Vittorino - School Psychologist
Leanne Arthur-Simmons - Social Worker
Yolanda Parks & Nicholas Carey - Deans
Kristine DiGiacomo - Chair Person
Hoffman, Robinson, Schwietzer, Nicholas, Caissy, Dakin, Pritchard, Bonner - Teacher/Team Ambassadors
Hawkey, Bargeron - NCT reps

SEL Team:
Nicole Telese - Admin Rachel Van Orden - 8th grade Pre-Algebra
Kathleen Manchester - Admin Ocella Davis - 8th grade Algebra
Christine Richards - 6th grade ELA Myron Varn - 7th grade Math
Kim Nicholas - 7th grade ELA Colleen Schweitzer - 7th grade Math
Maureen Dakin - 8th grade ELA Jenna Pritchard - ESE Support Facilitator
Yessenia Nieves - 8th grade ELA Sam DGiacomo - 6th grade Science
Solange Soledad - Interventionist LakeArnetta Reed - Support Staff
Melody Fletcher - ESE ELA
Carla Bargeron - Math Coach/Math Resource
Andrea Stephens - 7th grade Civics

Leadership Team:
Nicole Telese and Kathleen Manchester - Administration
Mildred Bernard - Guidance
Yolanda Parks - Deans
Tammy Altizer - ESE Teacher
Diana Brugnone - ESE Chair
Eric Johnson - Science Department Chair
Carla Bargeron - Math Department Chair
Anthony Cusa - Social Studies Department Chair
Kimberly Nicholas - ELA Department Chair
Patricia Hawkey - Testing Coordinator
Linda Nelson - CU representative
Dana Hochberg - CTA reprsentative
Christine Richard, Krista Page, Solange Soledad, Shernice Chavis, Ocella Davis, Nicholas Zoerhof, Melody Fletcher - Team Leaders
Jenna Pritchard, Nancy Filippini, Marybell Martinez - Teacher representatives

SAC Team:
Nicole Telese and Kathleen Manchester - Administration
Linda Nelson - SAC Chair

Lisa Lima - Community Member
Michael Carrocoeli - Community Member
Tara Guerin- Parent
MaryAnn Walser - Community Member

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: Culture & Environment: Social Emotional Learning	$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math	$0.00
		Total:	**$0.00**