

Polk County Public Schools

Sleepy Hill Middle School



2021-22 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	18
Positive Culture & Environment	22
Budget to Support Goals	23

Sleepy Hill Middle School

2215 SLEEPY HILL RD, Lakeland, FL 33810

<http://schools.polk-fl.net/shms>

Demographics

Principal: Kendis Clark

Start Date for this Principal: 7/23/2021

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* Asian Students Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students* White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: C (48%) 2017-18: C (49%) 2016-17: C (45%)
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.

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	18
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	23

Sleepy Hill Middle School

2215 SLEEPY HILL RD, Lakeland, FL 33810

<http://schools.polk-fl.net/shms>

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	75%

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.

The Mission of Sleepy Hill Middle School is to create a learning community with a safe, caring, and supportive environment. We will create endless opportunities for achievement and success.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The vision of Sleepy Hill Middle School is to challenge students to achieve academic success with a rigorous and engaging curriculum to reach their full potential within a safe and caring environment.

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
Kowallek, Rebecca	Principal	School overview, curriculum
Campbell, John	Assistant Principal	Facilities, Student Discipline, teacher evaluations
Dyer, Jeni	Assistant Principal	Curriculum follow up, master schedule, ESE, teacher evaluations
Blackman, Cornelius	Dean	Student Discipline
Holt, Kara	Administrative Support	Lea facilitator, ESE compliance

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Friday 7/23/2021, Kendis Clark

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.*

14

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

51

Total number of students enrolled at the school

1,078

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

4

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

16

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	357	388	333	0	0	0	0	1078	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	101	90	0	0	0	0	191	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	123	93	0	0	0	0	216	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	28	18	0	0	0	0	55	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	38	66	0	0	0	0	111	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	64	114	103	0	0	0	0	281	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	73	110	99	0	0	0	0	282	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
	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	73	110	93	0	0	0	0	276

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level														Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12		
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	17	0	0	0	0	19	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	1	0	0	0	0	7	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 6/23/2021

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	444	316	291	0	0	0	0	1051	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	73	107	0	0	0	0	180	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	113	169	0	0	0	0	282	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	3	9	0	0	0	0	18	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	4	9	0	0	0	0	19	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	129	88	100	0	0	0	0	317	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	118	99	90	0	0	0	0	307	

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	3	6	0	0	0	0	13

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	6	1	2	0	0	0	0	9	

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	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	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	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	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	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	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				41%	48%	54%	35%	46%	53%
ELA Learning Gains				51%	52%	54%	43%	47%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				45%	48%	47%	35%	42%	47%
Math Achievement				37%	50%	58%	32%	49%	58%
Math Learning Gains				41%	50%	57%	39%	51%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				41%	48%	51%	46%	51%	51%
Science Achievement				43%	44%	51%	43%	47%	52%
Social Studies Achievement				72%	72%	72%	95%	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	37%	48%	-11%	54%	-17%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2021					
	2019	31%	42%	-11%	52%	-21%
Cohort Comparison		-37%				
08	2021					
	2019	46%	48%	-2%	56%	-10%
Cohort Comparison		-31%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2021					
	2019	37%	47%	-10%	55%	-18%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2021					

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2019	25%	39%	-14%	54%	-29%
Cohort Comparison		-37%				
08	2021					
	2019	13%	35%	-22%	46%	-33%
Cohort Comparison		-25%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2021					
	2019	40%	41%	-1%	48%	-8%
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	69%	70%	-1%	71%	-2%
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	88%	50%	38%	61%	27%
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	86%	53%	33%	57%	29%

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

STAR Reading and Math, Civics and Science Quarterly Exams

Grade 6				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	40	36	36
	Economically Disadvantaged	38	34	31
	Students With Disabilities	8	10	10
	English Language Learners	19	19	27
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	46	40	29
	Economically Disadvantaged	44	35	24
	Students With Disabilities	20	11	15
	English Language Learners	41	31	23

Grade 7				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	34	35	31
	Economically Disadvantaged	33	31	29
	Students With Disabilities	9	9	8
	English Language Learners	16	13	11
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	43	45	35
	Economically Disadvantaged	37	41	28
	Students With Disabilities	27	14	28
	English Language Learners	29	31	21
Civics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	57	46	61
	Economically Disadvantaged	54	40	56
	Students With Disabilities	38	33	47
	English Language Learners	63	51	65

Grade 8				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	46	43	44
	Economically Disadvantaged	42	35	41
	Students With Disabilities	14	27	10
	English Language Learners	25	25	24
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	41	58	44
	Economically Disadvantaged	40	53	39
	Students With Disabilities	18	34	36
	English Language Learners	30	39	44
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	66	55	59
Science	Economically Disadvantaged	61	50	53
	Students With Disabilities	38	33	47
	English Language Learners	69	56	63
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	66	55	59
	Economically Disadvantaged	61	50	53

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	22	23	16	24	22	21	55			
ELL	24	41	41	25	28	32	29	62	48		
ASN	75	79		73	31						
BLK	29	38	29	20	27	31	28	70	47		
HSP	30	42	40	29	28	31	40	70	53		
MUL	50	46		41	26						
WHT	40	46	42	36	30	33	46	81	52		
FRL	31	39	37	27	28	33	34	69	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
SWD	20	41	38	22	38	38	22	48	18		
ELL	18	42	43	24	35	40	21	49	24		

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	86	93		86	64				70		
BLK	29	46	42	21	34	36	37	75	40		
HSP	40	50	44	36	42	44	34	65	48		
MUL	42	44		44	47		57	64			
WHT	50	55	46	50	43	49	59	79	70		
FRL	35	47	45	34	38	41	36	70	51		
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	10	28	29	14	41	45	18				
ELL	15	31	33	19	34	40	13				
ASN	71	71		86	86						
BLK	24	38	36	22	36	42	27	85	70		
HSP	33	40	31	28	36	47	40	100	68		
MUL	47	52		32	34				77		
WHT	48	50	44	47	45	51	59	96	69		
FRL	32	41	36	29	37	45	38	93	71		

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	38
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	YES
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	5
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	12
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	382
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	89%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	25
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	34
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	65
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	35
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	41
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	45
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	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?

Our Math scores have the largest room for improvement based on the 2019 data. In particular, the Math achievement is significantly lower with our ELL (24%), SWD (24%) and our BLK (21%) subgroups compared to the overall school Math achievement percentage of 37.

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

Lowest 25% learning gains in Math for both SWD and for BLK students.

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

Our students were not provided targeted differentiated support. Additionally, school wide our students did not have consistent support due to teaching vacancies.

STAR data and Module assessments will be used to ensure proper students are in intensive math classes, monitor student progress and to drive differentiated instruction.

Math coach and Interventionist will oversee and provide small group instruction to address skill deficits.

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

SWD and ELL learning gains in ELA. Recognizing the need for student support, the ELL students were included in targeted differentiated support with the students in the bottom 25. Students in these groups were targeted for after school tutoring to provide skills based instruction based on standards needing more emphasis and understanding.

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

Students in these groups were targeted for after school tutoring to provide skills based instruction based on standards needing more emphasis and understanding.

These students also received small group instruction in the classroom and were also provided additional support by the reading coach. Student data was consistently monitored and discussed.

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

Teachers will need explicit training on relationship building and engagement strategies to enhance the learning experience in the classroom and transition from a teacher centered classroom to a

student centered classroom. Additionally, data analysis will be reinforced to assist with understanding which engagement strategies are working for their group of students.

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.

Teacher will receive training on how to teach students in poverty, engagement strategies will be introduced during planning, modeled and practiced. Teachers will also receive training to understand the Classroom Teacher EPC rubric in order to provide clear expectation in the delivery of the engagement strategies.

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

School leadership will also focus on building positive relationships with stakeholders and parents through initiatives sponsored by the school. Involvement of the community is pivotal to the success of the students and the school.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Black/African-American

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Black/African American students performed the second lowest in Math in all three categories. Math Achievement 21%. Math Learning gains 34% and Math Learning Gains for bottom quartile 36%. Additionally, this sub group represents 57% of the students with 20 or more absences and 40% have three or more OSS discipline incidents.

Measurable Outcome: African American students will increase attendance by 10% and decrease the number OSS incidents by 10%. Mathematics proficiency will increase to 26%.

Monitoring: Progress will be monitored using STAR data, classroom assessments and discipline data.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Rebecca Kowallek (rebecca.kowallek@polk-fl.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Students will be identified through initial test scores, STAR scores and the data from the early warning system. The MTSS team will monitor the indicators and provide interventions.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Data on Black/African American students and district early warning system data indicates that this subgroup has a significant number of students that are absent more than 20 days. Additionally 40% of these students have from 3 to 11 OSS discipline incidents

Action Steps to Implement

1. Success Coach will identify African American students with high absenteeism (more than 20 days) and set up a meeting with the family to establish school parent communication.
2. Success Coach will call families when the students reach their 5th absence.
3. APA will work with Success Coach and two teacher volunteers to create a mentoring group that meets before school to increase interest in school and provide conversations and support on the importance of coming to school.
4. Student Incentives will be utilized throughout the year to increase student involvement and excitement in school.
6. Any student in this category that also receives services through the ESE department will be included in the Check and Connect program.

Person Responsible: John Campbell (john.campbell01@polk-fl.net)

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to English Language Learners

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Data represents an increase in ELA achievement for ELL students with overall proficiency at only 18 percent. Math achievement overall increased 5%, however learning gains increased only 1% and the bottom 25% learning gains remained the same. Students will need additional strategies in order to maintain continuous growth.
Measurable Outcome:	English Language Learners will be proficient in utilizing content specific dictionaries, teachers will utilize collaborative strategies to engage students and ELA proficiency will increase to 21%.
Monitoring:	Once students have been identified and intentionally scheduled, they will be monitored through STAR and quarterly assessments. APC will monitor ESOL professional development and implementation of content specific dictionaries with the teachers.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Rebecca Kowallek (rebecca.kowallek@polk-fl.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Students will be identified through initial test scores, Access for ELL's and monitored.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Data on English Language Learners and district early warning system data shows that ELL students need additional support to

Action Steps to Implement

1. Student's will be identified based on their current proficiency levels and strategically scheduled for support in academic instruction as well as for peer support.
2. Student will receive support in utilizing content specific dictionaries within the content area classroom to assist with content specific support.
3. Instructional coaches will provide professional development to their specific content area on strategies to incorporate the content specific dictionaries and other ESOL strategies in the classroom.
4. LF follow up plans will be structured and monitored for continued academic achievement.
5. Science coach will support the use of content glossaries in the Science curriculum to assist ELL students in the Science classroom.

Person Responsible Jeni Dyer (jeni.dyer@polk-fl.net)

#3. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Our students with disabilities are underperforming in multiple tested areas including scoring the lowest in Math Learning Gains at 41% and the bottom quartile learning gains at 38%. Based on these test scores and local school data, there is a need to restructure the department with a focus on providing student services with fidelity.

Measurable Outcome: Students will receive the appropriate services on their IEP which will increase learning gains in Math to 45% and the Math Learning Gains for bottom quartile to 42%

Monitoring: VE teachers will monitor students, and will complete logs indicating strategies used to achieve success. Likewise, STAR data will be used to monitor student needs.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Rebecca Kowallek (rebecca.kowallek@polk-fl.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Students will be intentionally scheduled and monitored to ensure the data is used to allocate appropriate resources and support to obtain student achievement.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Data on student with disabilities and district early warning system data through the MTSS processes and procedures

Action Steps to Implement

1. Students will be scheduled into the appropriate courses according their IEP
2. Principal and APC will work with LEA to create an accountability structure with roles, responsibilities, and expectations for the department.
3. LEA will be trained in compliance and how to support the teachers and students of the department.
4. VE Teachers will be trained in IEP compliance, provided clear expectations and professional development in providing student services in an inclusion classroom.
5. Progress monitoring data will be used to monitor student growth throughout this process.

Person Responsible Jeni Dyer (jeni.dyer@polk-fl.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the [SafeSchoolsforAlex.org](https://www.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.

Sleepy Hill was ranked very high in Violent Incidents, Property Incidents, and Drug/Public Order Incidents. Great effort was put into utilizing positive language and expectations to mold student behavior instead of the use of deficit language. This training will continue into the new school year with emphasis on maintaining a positive learning environment and setting clear expectations for student behavior. Additional training will be provided to the discipline department to ensure proper progression and coding is enforced.

Data will be collected on a weekly basis to make adjustments to supervision and teacher support and through this process we will be able to monitor student behavior and teacher frustration which will directly impact school culture.

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.

Our focus is creating a culture where students, staff, families and stakeholders feel accepted and are helping the students focus on doing their best work. To build a safe and inclusive school community, the leadership team will take the following steps: (1) create grade level teams and appoint chairs to share leadership and support collaborative efforts throughout the school; (2) use the school advisory council to communicate improvement strategies with community stakeholders; (3) implement both academic and festive school functions that result in family and community engagement and support. (4) Provide model classrooms (5) Offer new teacher meetings which will offer additional support

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

SAC is an important part of Sleepy Hill Middle. We invite parents, community members, etc. to our quarterly SAC meetings. During the meetings we ask for feedback from the parents and community members about the school performance. Also during these meetings, funding is approved to alleviate the cost of materials and resources to make sure all students have equal access to a high quality education.

Part V: Budget

The approved budget does not reflect any amendments submitted for this project.

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Black/African-American	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: English Language Learners	\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00