Jere L. Stambaugh Middle

2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Jere L. Stambaugh Middle

226 MAIN ST N, Auburndale, FL 33823

http://www.stambaughmiddle.com/

Demographics

Principal: Deneece Sharp

Start Date for this Principal: 6/1/2018

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)	100%
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* Black/African American Students Hispanic Students* Multiracial Students* White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: C (43%) 2017-18: C (41%) 2016-17: D (35%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	
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 Polk 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.](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

Jere L. Stambaugh Middle

226 MAIN ST N, Auburndale, FL 33823

http://www.stambaughmiddle.com/

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	100%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	58%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Polk 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.

Jere L. Stambaugh will empower each student, every day, with knowledge, character and skills to be successful HOUNDS. HOUNDS are Honorable in their actions, Organized for productivity, Understanding of mistakes, Nurturing of others, Determined to achieve their Success! All Staff members will teach, reteach and teach again until students understand they can achieve greatness.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Jere L. Stambaugh Middle School will empower each student, every day, with knowledge, character and skills to be successful HOUNDS.

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
Blankenship, Matt	Principal	Whole School Operations, Reading, Social Studies
Melton, Holly	Assistant Principal	ELA, ESE, ESOL, Scheduling, MTSS
Clay, Leslie	Assistant Principal	Math, Science, Discipline Support, Success Team
Davis, Jennifer	Assistant Principal	Guidance, Science, PBIS, Testing, Attendance
Birdsong, Angela	Dean	Student Discipline, PBIS
Cruz, Ramon	Other	8th Grade Student Success and Mentoring.
Diggs, Emily	Other	6th Grade Student Success and Mentoring. Civics Instructional Coach.
Kowalske, Pattie	Math Coach	Support academic success of Math and Science teachers. New Teacher Induction Program.
Medeiros, Jennifer	Reading Coach	Support academic success of ELA and Reading Teachers. PEC Mentor.
Gonzalez Rodrigez, Carlos	Other	Targeted social groups, proactive interventions, supporting teachers, behavior/success plans

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Friday 6/1/2018, Deneece Sharp

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.*
0

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*
12

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
59

Total number of students enrolled at the school

1,016

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

6

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

13

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	373	299	353	0	0	0	0	1025
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	38	19	36	0	0	0	0	93
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	33	20	51	0	0	0	0	104
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	60	82	109	0	0	0	0	251
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	75	97	145	0	0	0	0	317
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	60	82	109	0	0	0	0	251

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	63	70	111	0	0	0	0	244

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	20	5	17	0	0	0	0	42
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	19	9	15	0	0	0	0	43

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 7/13/2021

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	323	288	371	0	0	0	0	982
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	58	66	92	0	0	0	0	216
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	93	110	115	0	0	0	0	318
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	28	46	0	0	0	0	79
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	28	46	0	0	0	0	79
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	144	133	199	0	0	0	0	476
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	144	133	199	0	0	0	0	476

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	85	101	126	0	0	0	0	312

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	3	0	0	0	0	3
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	9	13	0	0	0	0	29

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	323	288	371	0	0	0	0	982
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	58	66	92	0	0	0	0	216
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	93	110	115	0	0	0	0	318
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	28	46	0	0	0	0	79
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	28	46	0	0	0	0	79
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	144	133	199	0	0	0	0	476
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	144	133	199	0	0	0	0	476

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	85	101	126	0	0	0	0	312

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	3	0	0	0	0	3
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	9	13	0	0	0	0	29

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				28%	48%	54%	27%	46%	53%
ELA Learning Gains				38%	52%	54%	38%	47%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				42%	48%	47%	35%	42%	47%
Math Achievement				28%	50%	58%	25%	49%	58%
Math Learning Gains				41%	50%	57%	41%	51%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				49%	48%	51%	42%	51%	51%
Science Achievement				24%	44%	51%	28%	47%	52%
Social Studies Achievement				56%	72%	72%	78%	86%	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	27%	48%	-21%	54%	-27%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2021					
	2019	27%	42%	-15%	52%	-25%
Cohort Comparison		-27%				
08	2021					
	2019	29%	48%	-19%	56%	-27%
Cohort Comparison		-27%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2021					
	2019	23%	47%	-24%	55%	-32%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2021					

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2019	23%	39%	-16%	54%	-31%
Cohort Comparison		-23%				
08	2021					
	2019	16%	35%	-19%	46%	-30%
Cohort Comparison		-23%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2021					
	2019	23%	41%	-18%	48%	-25%
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	56%	70%	-14%	71%	-15%
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	75%	50%	25%	61%	14%
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	100%	53%	47%	57%	43%

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

2020 - 2021 STAR (ELA and Math) and Quarterly Assessment Data (Science and Civics).

Grade 6				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	66/29	59/28	100/32
	Economically Disadvantaged	41/18	35/17	56/18
	Students With Disabilities	12/5	12/6	18/6
	English Language Learners	7/3	8/4	15/5
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	34/14	39/18	59/20
	Economically Disadvantaged	17/7	18/8	31/11
	Students With Disabilities	9/4	8/4	13/4
	English Language Learners	7/3	5/2	14/5

Grade 7				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	45/18	53/23	78/24
	Economically Disadvantaged	25/10	35/15	48/15
	Students With Disabilities	14/6	7/3	16/5
	English Language Learners	10/4	17/7	17/5
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	29/11	41/20	72/23
	Economically Disadvantaged	16/6	25/12	40/13
	Students With Disabilities	9/4	0/0	13/4
	English Language Learners	6/2	8/4	13/4
Civics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	59	41/20	21/9
	Economically Disadvantaged	21/11	7/3	14/6
	Students With Disabilities	5/3	3/1	4/2
	English Language Learners	7/4	4/2	3/1

Grade 8					
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring	
	All Students	64/30	62/32	81/30	
	Economically Disadvantaged	41/19	43/22	55/20	
	Students With Disabilities	11/5	10/5	8/3	
	English Language Learners	7/3	12/6	14/5	
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring	
	All Students	46/22	27/19	89/35	
	Economically Disadvantaged	30/14	20/14	61/24	
	Students With Disabilities	8/4	5/4	13/5	
	English Language Learners	9/4	5/4	17/7	
Science	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring	
	All Students			11/58	
	Economically Disadvantaged			5/2	
	Students With Disabilities			3/1	
	English Language Learners			2/1	

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	14	25	25	19	25	26	14	44			
ELL	21	32	36	15	27	30	16	44			
BLK	18	29	18	14	32	52	15	43			
HSP	27	33	34	24	32	28	24	57	63		
MUL	9	18		18	23						
WHT	31	38	33	27	30	36	24	56	68		
FRL	24	32	30	20	29	35	23	54	58		
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	17	35	35	18	40	41	14	31			
ELL	8	38	44	8	44	56	6	36			
BLK	18	37	45	17	30	38	13	46	73		

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
HSP	28	39	45	22	43	58	20	56	78		
MUL	35	59		29	53						
WHT	34	37	35	37	44	49	31	60	82		
FRL	26	37	42	24	40	54	20	52	74		

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	13	27	20	13	33	32	10				
ELL	9	33	41	8	33	24	15				
BLK	17	27	31	14	45	48	15		79		
HSP	21	35	37	21	38	32	25	67	64		
MUL	38	39		18	25		50				
WHT	35	43	38	32	42	43	33	86	56		
FRL	24	36	34	22	41	42	25	69	54		

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	37
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	YES
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	7
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	47
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	372
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	94%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	24
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	30
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES

English Language Learners	
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	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	28
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	37
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	17
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	38
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	36
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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?

The trends across grade levels show a dip in 7th grade achievement in both reading and math. In addition, our science scores in 8th grade have historically been well below both the district and state average. Our students with disabilities and English Language Learners have made little progress in meeting the math and reading goals and often fall behind their peers.

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

Our greatest need for improvement include 8th grade science and 7th grade reading and math. In addition, we need to pay particular attention to the success across the board for our students with disabilities and our English Language Learners to ensure they receive the support needed for success.

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

For our 8th grade science, our students have historically not had a teacher in the 6th and 7th grade with experience or stability. This includes high turnover in both grade levels and little to no formal educational preparation for teaching. To make improvements in this area, we need to provide systemic improvement in the areas of 6th and 7th grade science to set the teachers up for success. This includes active recruitment, ongoing support in the classroom with side-by-side coaching for success. For our students with disabilities and English Language Learners, we have historically had high turnover our outright vacancies in these areas. In addition, a majority of the teachers do not have formal educational preparation. In addition, our teachers across all content areas do not have the understanding of how to successfully support these students in the classroom. To help overcome these barriers, we have already found high quality teachers in all positions. To ensure success, we will provide ongoing support in the classroom with side-by-side coaching for success.

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

Our areas that showed the greatest improvement is Math across all grade and achievement levels. This includes our students making learning gains in math, both overall and the bottom 25%. In addition, our bottom 25% of ELA showed tremendous improvement.

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

For math, our teachers have been successful at implementing the gradual release model in the classroom to ensure students know what to do and how to do it. In addition, the teachers have developed a systemic way to provide formative assessments for students to give the teacher real time information of understanding. To grow this, we have implemented a Professional Learning Community framework during planning where teachers focus on learning learning and assessment strategies and implementing them in the classroom. In addition, teachers are given paid time monthly to plan instruction in small groups and one-on-one with the school based math coach. For ELA, our bottom 25% were closely monitored and strategically identified for teachers as needing additional support and small group learning.

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

In order to accelerate learning loss of students, we will need to increase our focus school wide on the gradual release model and developing formative assessments to monitor learning. This will allow our teachers to move the work from them to the student along with monitoring student learning in real time.

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.

Teachers will need professional development in the following areas: (1) Gradual Release Model; (2) building formative assessments; (3) English Language Learner instructional strategies; (4) Students with disabilities support

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

To support our student success, we will continue (1) math/science and Literacy Coach; (2) student success coaches; (3) family outreach; (4) Relationship Activities; and (5) additional technology. To continue student success, we will add (1) additional success coach; (2) increase time for professional development in multiple formats; (3) time for teacher planning; and (4) accountability for all staff.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Student Engagement	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	From our data, we need to move the instructional activities from teacher focused to student focused. This was done extensively in math the past three years and has shown to be successful. To accomplish this, we will focus on three areas for student engagement. (1) Gradual release model to move the thinking from the teacher to the student in a systemic way to build understanding; (2) Focus on building formative assessments that quickly identify areas of student understanding and misunderstanding to support student learning; and (3) appropriate supports for students with disabilities and English Language Learners. In addition, we will focus on implementing "processing activities" school wide to move the thinking and actions from the teacher to the student. This will work to increase the engagement in the classroom for all learners.
Measurable Outcome:	Based on this goal, we plan to increase student achievement and learning gains. This includes: ELA Achievement to 32% (from 28%), ELA Learning Gains to 43% (from 38%), Math Achievement to 32% (from 28%); Math Learning Gains to 46% (from 41%), Science Achievement to 30% (from 24%) and Civics Achievement to 70% (from 56%).
Monitoring:	This goal will be monitored through administrative walkthroughs, common planning meetings and PLC discussions of formative assessments.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Matt Blankenship (matthew.blankenship@polk-fl.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	The evidence based is Gradual Release model.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	This was chosen as the main strategy because it allows for a focus to shift from teacher directed instruction through collaboration and ultimately a focused on student independent work. We will incorporate a focus on "processing activities" and formative assessment throughout each step to ensure students are engaged in the learning at hand and not passively watching a teacher work. In addition, it provides a framework schoolwide for discussion to allow for productive collaborative planning and learning.

Action Steps to Implement

Train the leadership team on gradual release model to ensure a common understanding among school leaders as we individually work with staff to improve instruction. .

Person Responsible	Matt Blankenship (matthew.blankenship@polk-fl.net)

Utilize an early return day (1 day) to introduce the gradual release model and develop common planning norms and expectations for staff. In addition, academic coaches and other leadership team members will provide side-by-side coaching during planning to help teachers plan in the gradual release model.

Person Responsible	Matt Blankenship (matthew.blankenship@polk-fl.net)

Create template for common board configuration and hold teachers accountable for implementation that focuses on the Gradual Release Model steps and identifies the standard and learning target for the lesson.

Person Responsible	Holly Melton (holly.melton@polk-fl.net)

Employee and utilize Reading and Math Coach to work one-on-one and in small groups of teachers to plan for gradual release.

| **Person Responsible** | Matt Blankenship (matthew.blankenship@polk-fl.net) |

Implement a needs assessment for all teachers to measure what they know, what they believe and what they self-identify as necessary learning to improve in utilizing the gradual release model.

| **Person Responsible** | Pattie Kowalske (pattie.kowalske@polk-fl.net) |

Complete regularly scheduled walkthroughs using the "SMS Planning and Implementation Model" to provide non evaluative feedback to teachers on classroom instruction.

| **Person Responsible** | Matt Blankenship (matthew.blankenship@polk-fl.net) |

Complete three district led instructional reviews (one in October, one in January, one in March) to provide fresh eyes and outside perspective and plan for improvement.

| **Person Responsible** | Matt Blankenship (matthew.blankenship@polk-fl.net) |

Provide regularly scheduled professional development to all staff members afterschool (paid) that focuses on instructional strategies, supporting student needs (ELL and SWD) and formative assessment.

| **Person Responsible** | Matt Blankenship (matthew.blankenship@polk-fl.net) |

#2. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Based on schoolwide review of attendance, discipline and academic data, we need to provide an increased focused on teaching positive behaviors, reinforcing positive behaviors and providing supports to those not meeting them.

Measurable Outcome:	To measure success in this area, we will look at attendance rates, suspensions and student retentions. 37.31% of the student body missed more than 90% during the 2020 - 2021 School Year. We will reduce that to 25%. 32.28% of students in the 2020 - 2021 school year had one or more suspensions. We will reduce that to 20%. At the end of the 2020 - 2021 school year, 6.13% of students were retained due to lack of course completions. We will reduce that to 4%.
Monitoring:	This area of focus will be monitored through regularly scheduled leadership team meetings. The Assistant Principal in Charge of Attendance will submit monthly reports of attendance rates and action steps. The Assistant Principal in Charge of Discipline will submit monthly reports identifying students and action patterns. Assistant Principal in Charge of Curriculum will submit students in high need of retention.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Matt Blankenship (matthew.blankenship@polk-fl.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	All actions will be set within the PBiS framework to teach students the appropriate behaviors, reward students for making positive decisions and provide supports for students not meeting expectations. A PBiS Team will be utilized composed of classroom based and non classroom based teachers to identifying Tier 1, 2 and 3 supports in attendance, behavior and academics.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	This strategy was picked because it provides holistic support for all three areas of student success and allows us to provide both broad system wide supports along with individualized student supports.

Action Steps to Implement	

A Student Success Team will be established made up of all three APs, Student Success Coaches, Guidance, Behavior Interventionist and the dean that will meet regularly to identify both school or grade level trends along with identifying students needing tier 2 and tier 3 supports. Action plans for tier 2 and tier 3 students will be made to address needs identified. Tier 1 items will be referred to the PBiS team.

Person Responsible	Leslie Clay (leslie.clay@polk-fl.net)

A PBiS team will be established to review trends found by the student success team and develop action plans to address tier 1 issues. In addition, they will work with new and struggling teachers implementing a classroom based and school wide PBiS programs.

Person Responsible	Jennifer Davis (jennifer.davis@polk-fl.net)

Student success coaches will review student grades weekly and pull students not making adequate progress in courses for remediation. Students will work one-on-one or in small groups on lessons and work to both master the material and complete missing assignments. At the end of each quarter, the

success coaches will identify students needing grade recovery and develop and implement a plan of action for students to complete courses needed for promotion.

Person Responsible Leslie Clay (leslie.clay@polk-fl.net)

The behavior interventionist will monitor student referrals for individual student patterns and identify students needing specific supports for success. Students will be referred to prosocial groups, individual sessions and appropriate guidance referrals as needed. In addition, the behavior interventionist will train individual teachers on implementation of Positive Behavior Interventionist Plans required by 504s or IEPs to ensure appropriate implementation.

Person Responsible Angela Birdsong (angela.birdsong@polk-fl.net)

Student success coaches will chair parent conferences with teachers and families to ensure a plan of action is developed, monitored and adjusted as needed.

Person Responsible Leslie Clay (leslie.clay@polk-fl.net)

Each classroom teacher will submit a classroom level PBiS plan and Classroom Management plan during planning week. These will be reviewed by the Assistant Principals in charge of these areas for feedback and suggestions. Through non evaluative and evaluative walkthroughs, APs and Principal will provide feedback.

Person Responsible Angela Birdsong (angela.birdsong@polk-fl.net)

Our student success coaches and behavior interventionist will facilitate a peer to peer mentoring program and adult to student mentoring program in order to provide a positive influence in student lives and help support those who are not being successful at Stambaugh.

Person Responsible Leslie Clay (leslie.clay@polk-fl.net)

Provide on going PD to all teachers as demonstrated by teacher self selection and tiered support needs in the areas of PBiS implementation and Classroom Management. This will include embedded one-on-one coaching with leadership team members and department chairs along with model classrooms. Model classrooms will be identified by the Instructional Coaches and administrator non evaluative walkthroughs utilize the SMS planning and implementation guide.

Person Responsible Pattie Kowalske (pattie.kowalske@polk-fl.net)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Differentiation

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Based on our ESSA subgroup data, we show three subgroups are performing below expectations which include Students with Disabilities, English Language Learners, and our Black/African American students. In an effort to close the achievement gap within these subgroups we must follow the Multi-Tiered System of Supports with fidelity. This will allow us to identify specific needs within our subgroups, provide targeted interventions, and monitor for success or the need for alternative strategies.
Measurable Outcome:	1. The subgroup of SWD will move on the Federal Index from 33% to 38%. 2. The subgroup of ELL will move on the Federal Index from 31% to 36%. 3. The subgroup of Black/African American will move on the Federal Index from 35% to 40%.
Monitoring:	Administration will create a MTSS team consisting of the three Assistant Principals, Guidance Counselors, Success Coaches, Behavior Interventionist, Dean, and School Psychologist. This group will meet monthly, distribute individual responsibilities to assure implementation of tiered supports, review teacher requests for targeted interventions, and monitor progress.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Holly Melton (holly.melton@polk-fl.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	The evidence-based strategy being implemented for this area of focus is MTSS Tiers and MTSS Interventions that will focus on our SWD, ELL, and Black/African American subgroups.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Utilizing the MTSS framework with fidelity will allow for both academic and behavior systems to be implemented on a tiered support level. District level support is also provided through the MTSS manual and personnel that are assigned to specific schools. This process allows for school-wide culturally responsive systems of support, classroom and small group strategies, along with targeted/intensive individual interventions.

Action Steps to Implement

Assign leadership members to the MTSS team and facilitate monthly meetings.

Person Responsible	Holly Melton (holly.melton@polk-fl.net)

Provide an overview of the MTSS framework and SIP goal for faculty/staff.

Person Responsible	Holly Melton (holly.melton@polk-fl.net)

Create and distribute MTSS Referral Form that can be submitted to the team for review.

Person Responsible	Holly Melton (holly.melton@polk-fl.net)

Monitoring of attendance for trends, high risk students, and needed interventions.

Person Responsible	Jennifer Davis (jennifer.davis@polk-fl.net)

Monitoring of academic success for trends, high risk students, and needed interventions.

Person Responsible	Leslie Clay (leslie.clay@polk-fl.net)

Monitoring of discipline for trends, high risk students, and needed interventions.

| **Person Responsible** | Angela Birdsong (angela.birdsong@polk-fl.net) |

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.

The data posted to SafeSchoolsForAlex.org shows a need to implement a positive behavior program across school to teach expected behaviors and provide needed supports for improvement. This is accomplished through our goal above.

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.

A positive school culture and environment is essential to student success. On the student level, we focus our conversations on growth mindset and recognize positive behaviors. Even if a student is not being successful in attendance, behavior or academics, our conversation focuses on not yet to ensure our students know we have not given up on their success. In addition, we provide several items that allow our students to build relationships with faculty and staff. This includes regularly scheduled interest groups for students to complete non academic tasks with staff members around a common interest, student of the month recognitions, behavior incentives, academic incentives and random rewards throughout the year. In addition, our ITV program highlights the positive news occurring around campus to ensure our students are recognized. Next year we will begin to recognize student birthdays throughout the year and post pictures of student success across campus. On the adult level, we have implemented several items to build a family environment that builds a strong culture of commitment. This includes regular staff only events, pot luck dinners, friendly competitions and group support in times of need. Next year we are planning to implement a robust staff member of the month, model classroom recognitions and random rewards for staff members "all in" for student success. The leadership team also focuses biweekly on writing a personalized note of encouragement or recognition to staff members so they know we are successful as a team.

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

Administration - promoting of positive school culture focused on accountability and team work.
Academic Coaches - promotion of positive school culture focused on growth in instructional strategies and student engagement.
Student success coaches - promotion of positive school culture focused on "not yet" for students working to be successful. Coordinator of mentoring program and students of the month.
Department Chairs - promotion of positive school culture by meeting the needs of staff through celebrations and shout outs along with mentorship.