

The School Board of Highlands County

Sebring 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	24
Budget to Support Goals	24

Sebring Middle School

500 E CENTER AVE, Sebring, FL 33870

<http://www.highlands.k12.fl.us/~sms/>

Demographics

Principal: Angie Spencer

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2019

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Middle School 6-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
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 (49%) 2017-18: C (53%) 2016-17: B (58%)
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 Highlands 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	24

Sebring Middle School

500 E CENTER AVE, Sebring, FL 33870

<http://www.highlands.k12.fl.us/~sms/>

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	97%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	49%

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 Highlands 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 provide quality instruction and real-world learning experiences that will allow our students to succeed in middle school, be prepared for rigorous high school courses, and become productive citizens.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Philosophy and Vision – One Team, One Family, One Streak-Together We Make a Difference!

Members of the Sebring Middle School community will provide a safe nurturing environment in which open communication, respect, and trust are cornerstones for learning and development. The diversity of people will be valued through acceptance and individuality. Recognizing the middle school student as a complex individual, the staff will create a sensitive and caring atmosphere – incorporating humor and compassion. As a staff, we believe that Routines + Relationships lead to Real Learning. The community will act as a mutual resource and support the development of each student's full potential.

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
West, Shawn	Principal	
Spencer, Angie	Assistant Principal	
Johnson, Gayle	Reading Coach	
Tucker, Susie	Instructional Coach	
Lakes, Linda	Teacher, K-12	
Porter, Angie	Teacher, K-12	
Germaine, Courtney	Dean	
Bova, Stephanie	Teacher, K-12	
Miller, Sarah	Teacher, K-12	
Smith, Lisa	Teacher, K-12	
Hitt, Gina	Teacher, ESE	
George, Koyal	Dean	

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 7/1/2019, Angie Spencer

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

4

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

21

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

41

Total number of students enrolled at the school

802

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

10

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

10

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	231	279	292	0	0	0	0	802
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	93	89	106	0	0	0	0	288
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	24	27	31	0	0	0	0	82
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	94	39	0	0	0	0	136
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	57	107	0	0	0	0	168
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	31	62	68	0	0	0	0	161
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	40	59	70	0	0	0	0	169
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	69	108	134	0	0	0	0	311

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	3	5	7	0	0	0	0	15
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5	8	0	0	0	0	19

Date this data was collected or last updated

Sunday 8/22/2021

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	293	252	250	0	0	0	0	795
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	47	43	47	0	0	0	0	137
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	54	61	53	0	0	0	0	168
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	88	59	86	0	0	0	0	233
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	87	88	77	0	0	0	0	252
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	81	63	72	0	0	0	0	216
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	96	51	62	0	0	0	0	209

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	106	84	98	0	0	0	0	288

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	1	5	0	0	0	0	6
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	9	6	0	0	0	0	22

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	293	252	250	0	0	0	0	795
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	47	43	47	0	0	0	0	137
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	54	61	53	0	0	0	0	168
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	88	59	86	0	0	0	0	233
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	87	88	77	0	0	0	0	252
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	81	63	72	0	0	0	0	216
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	96	51	62	0	0	0	0	209

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	106	84	98	0	0	0	0	288

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	1	5	0	0	0	0	6
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	9	6	0	0	0	0	22

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				48%	45%	54%	53%	47%	53%
ELA Learning Gains				48%	47%	54%	50%	50%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				32%	36%	47%	37%	44%	47%
Math Achievement				59%	52%	58%	62%	52%	58%
Math Learning Gains				52%	52%	57%	57%	53%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				39%	40%	51%	44%	43%	51%
Science Achievement				43%	42%	51%	49%	45%	52%
Social Studies Achievement				56%	63%	72%	54%	56%	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	47%	44%	3%	54%	-7%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2021					
	2019	44%	40%	4%	52%	-8%
Cohort Comparison		-47%				
08	2021					
	2019	50%	46%	4%	56%	-6%
Cohort Comparison		-44%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2021					
	2019	55%	44%	11%	55%	0%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2021					
	2019	56%	49%	7%	54%	2%
Cohort Comparison		-55%				
08	2021					
	2019	35%	44%	-9%	46%	-11%
Cohort Comparison		-56%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2021					
	2019	43%	41%	2%	48%	-5%
Cohort Comparison						

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	0%	54%	-54%	67%	-67%
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	53%	60%	-7%	71%	-18%

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	92%	52%	40%	61%	31%
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	90%	55%	35%	57%	33%

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

6th Grade ELA: iReady Diagnostic
 7th Grade ELA: iReady Diagnostic
 8th Grade ELA: iReady Diagnostic
 6th Grade Math: iReady Diagnostic
 7th Grade Math: iReady Diagnostic
 8th Grade Math: iReady Diagnostic
 7th Grade Civics: Baseline
 8th Grade Science: Baseline

Grade 6				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	107/44%	99/38%	110/42%
	Economically Disadvantaged	57/37%	51/31%	53/33%
	Students With Disabilities	20/36%	19/32%	19/32%
	English Language Learners	3/12%	3/11%	3/18%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	103/41%	109/43%	103/39%
	Economically Disadvantaged	54/35%	49/30%	42/26%
	Students With Disabilities	25/45%	22/37%	21/36%
	English Language Learners	6/22%	4/14%	3/11%
Grade 7				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	75/34%	89/34%	67/28%
	Economically Disadvantaged	7/5%	11/7%	10/7%
	Students With Disabilities	9/14%	11/13%	9/12%
	English Language Learners	0/0%	0/0%	0/0%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	91/39%	82/31%	75/30%
	Economically Disadvantaged	8/6%	6/4%	6/4%
	Students With Disabilities	11/16%	10/12%	9/12%
	English Language Learners	0/0%	0/0%	0/0%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Civics	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			

Grade 8				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	70/36%	78/36%	79/40%
	Economically Disadvantaged	29/28%	15/31%	32/29%
	Students With Disabilities	15/31%	18/31%	17/32%
	English Language Learners	1/17%	1/14%	1/14%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	92/45%	93/42%	93/43%
	Economically Disadvantaged	37/33%	36/29%	37/30%
	Students With Disabilities	19/37%	20/35%	17/32%
	English Language Learners	1/20%	1/14%	1/17%
Science	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	47/24%	65/47%	134/61%
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			

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	10	23	23	14	26	28	17	25			
ELL	17	36	37	24	38	42	15	22			
BLK	25	36	25	27	35	41	21	38			
HSP	31	39	36	42	45	42	27	47	48		
MUL	29	31	20	40	48	36		27			
WHT	50	50	37	63	54	52	54	57	76		
FRL	29	37	32	41	43	41	26	44	48		
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	11	32	33	24	41	38	6	27			
ELL	7	27	28	28	32	32	9				
BLK	26	37	29	36	37	23	13	40			

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	43	46	37	53	48	40	36	58	59		
MUL	42	57		58	45						
WHT	56	51	26	66	58	48	52	58	62		
FRL	40	43	30	52	48	35	34	51	53		
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	20	33	27	23	34	23	26	26			
ELL	20	40	50	40	46	35		25			
BLK	31	40	46	34	45	43	15	37	90		
HSP	46	47	34	60	59	37	40	47	64		
MUL	40	37		70	68						
WHT	60	53	37	69	57	49	59	59	74		
FRL	47	46	36	57	55	42	38	48	64		

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	45
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	6
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	27
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	452
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	96%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	21
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	29
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	31
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	38
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	33
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	55
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?

Unfortunately, our proficiency has been on a downward trend in math and ELA. We did make some positive progress in learning gains of the lowest 25% on the 2021 FSA. Our white and Hispanic sub-populations have maintained, but our black sub-population is not showing the improvement that is necessary to narrow the achievement gap.

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

Our ELA proficiency and learning gains overall have the greatest need to improvement. Our ELA scores have consistently lost ground the last several years on statewide assessments. Also, our sub-populations (with the exception of Hispanic students) have not made the gains necessary to close the achievement gaps that exist for most of our sub-populations.

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

Contributing factors to the lack of an increase in ELA proficiency are changing standards, curriculum not always fully-aligned to the standards, and inconsistent access to grade-level, complex text for all students.

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

Based on progress monitoring our 8th grade science baseline scores, showed the most growth ending the year with 61% of students proficient. This was not the case with the 2019 assessment because this was a different group of students.

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

Our science team was invested in the PLC process in both maintaining pacing and analyzing data from common assessments. They also have continued to utilize the 5E model to plan lessons aligned to effective science instruction.

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

In all of the four content areas, we are utilizing the PLC process and have worked to more effectively implement this process particularly with common assessments.

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.

- BEST Standards for ELA Teachers
- PLC Coaching Sessions with Content Leaders and Administration
- Kagan Training (Day 1) for All Teachers
- Continued professional development in Effective Literacy Framework

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

- Additional Dean
- Intervention Programs (SpringMath)

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus	While our proficiency decreased as well, focusing on learning gains allows us to focus on all students making gains, and of course, our students being critical readers of on grade level, complex text is critical to their success as students as they continue to high school.
Description and Rationale:	
Measurable Outcome:	Increase the percentage of students making learning gains on the FSA ELA from 48% to 53%.
Monitoring:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Diagnostic iReady Reading: Fall, Winter, and Spring -Monitoring of Tier 2 students through AIMSWEB Plus -Common Assessments
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Gayle Johnson (johnsong@highlands.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Ensure the implementation of quality ELA instruction in every ELA classroom through the use of the Instructional Practice Guide (IPG) which requires all students to be engaged in high-quality, complex text. -Utilize Professional Learning Communities (PLC) to ensure students achieve mastery of standards through the process of planning, common assessments, and remediation. -Daily (8th Grade) and every other day(6th/7th Grade) support facilitation for students with disabilities in ELA classes. -Also, our lowest performing students will receive reading instruction with a focus on phonics, fluency, and comprehension in an additional 60-minute class every day. Our students with disabilities will also focus on those same foundational skills in their learning strategies class.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	The PLC process, the IPG, and effective reading instruction are grounded in and supported by research as well as being district-wide initiatives.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Common Planning using IPG and PLC process.
2. Common Assessments
3. Support for ESE and ELL students by support facilitators and ELL para in ELA classes. (ELL Sub-Pop below 41%)
4. Small group instruction in Reading Support classes
5. Data-tracking of struggling students through the MTSS process (SWD Sub-Pop below 41-These students are tracked through the MTSS process).
6. Progress Monitoring of Black/African-American Sub-Pop to track progress.

Person Responsible Gayle Johnson (johnsong@highlands.k12.fl.us)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Our math proficiency has continued to decline over the last few years and there was no progress this past year either.

Measurable Outcome: Increase our percentage of students making learning gains on the FSA Math from 52% to 57%.

Monitoring:

- Diagnostic iReady Reading: Fall, Winter, and Spring
- Monitoring of Tier 2 students through AIMSWEB Plus
- Common Assessments

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: [no one identified]

Evidence-based Strategy:

- Ensure the implementation of quality math instruction in every math classroom through the use of the Instructional Practice Guide (IPG).
- Utilize Professional Learning Communities (PLC) to ensure students achieve mastery of standards through the process of planning, common assessments, and remediation.
- Daily (8th Grade) and every other day (6th/7th Grade) support facilitation for students with disabilities in math classes.
- Also, our lowest performing students will receive math instruction with a focus on closing gaps in skills in an additional 58-minute class every day. Our students with disabilities will also focus on those same foundational skills in their learning strategies classes.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: The PLC process, the IPG, and effective math instruction are grounded in and supported by research as well as being district-wide initiatives.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Common Planning using IPG and PLC process.
2. Common Assessments
3. Support for ESE and ELL students by support facilitators and ELL para in math classes. (ELL Sub-Pop below 41%)
4. Small group instruction in math support classes
5. Data-tracking of struggling students through the MTSS process. (SWD Sub-Pop below 41-These students are tracked through the MTSS process).
6. Progress Monitoring of Black/African-American Sub-Pop to track progress.

Person Responsible [no one identified]

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Our science proficiency decreased to 43% this year. This is below both the district and state averages.

Measurable Outcome: Increase the percentage of students achieving proficiency on the FL Science Assessment from 43% to 48%.

Monitoring:
-Baseline 1 (Fall), Baseline 2 (Winter), and Baseline 3 (Spring)
-Common Assessments

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:
Angie Porter (portera@highlands.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy: Common planning using the Instructional Pacing Guide (IPG), using the 5E model to drive daily instruction, and four driving questions for professional learning communities.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: The IPG, 5E model, and the PLC process are district-wide, research-based strategies implemented across the district. Science teachers and lead science teachers have been provided professional development led by the district resource teacher for science in order to implement the 5E model as well as the literacy components contained in the IPG.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Common Planning using IPG/5E and PLC process.
2. Common Assessments
3. Support for ESE and ELL students by support para-professional.(ELL and SWD Sub-Pop below 41%)
4. Progress Monitoring of Black/African-American Sub-Pop to track progress.

Person Responsible Angie Porter (portera@highlands.k12.fl.us)

#4. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Social Studies**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Our proficiency rate decreased and our overall proficiency is well below the state and district averages.

Measurable Outcome: Increase our percentage of students achieving proficiency on the Civics EOC Assessment from 56% to 61%.

Monitoring:
-Baseline 1 (Fall), Baseline 2 (Winter), and Baseline 3 (Spring)
-Common Assessments

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:
Linda Lakes (lakesl@highlands.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy:
Our entire social studies department, including the civics teachers, will be continuing using the Professional Learning Communities (PLC) process. This involves 1/2 day planning times once a month as well as common planning time twice a week in the morning. It centers on the 4 Big Questions of the PLC process. The primary focus at this point in the process is identifying the most essential standards/content to teach and common assessments to help identify mastery.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:
The PLC process is a district-wide implementation across all content areas. In addition, the focus on essential standards and literacy in the content areas is essential to increasing proficiency in civics.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Identify Essential Standards.
2. Use common planning to identify essential civics content.
3. Use common assessments to drive instruction.
4. Support for ESE and ELL students by support para-professional.(ELL and SWD Sub-Pop below 41%)
5. Progress Monitoring of Black/African-American Sub-Pop to track progress.

Person Responsible Linda Lakes (lakesl@highlands.k12.fl.us)

#5. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Student Attendance

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Our percentage of students who attended school greater than 90% of the time was only 62%. This is unacceptable and was an obvious critical need for our school.
Measurable Outcome:	Increase the percentage of students attending school >90% from 62% to 67%.
Monitoring:	-Weekly reports to monitor students who fall above 10% of days missed. -Monthly SARC Meetings with parents, social worker, and attendance liaison with Youth and Families.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	[no one identified]
Evidence-based Strategy:	-Student and Parent education utilizing resources from AttendanceWorks.org. -Weekly check-ins with designated staff member for students with chronic absenteeism.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	-Parent and student education from AttendanceWorks.org is a district provided resource. -A trusted adult having regular and positive interaction with a struggling student has been proven to improve school attendance.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Weekly Review of Attendance Reports
2. Conferences/Check-ins with Previous Year SARC Students
3. Monthly SARC Meetings
4. Documentation of Parent Contact
5. Monitoring of attendance for sub-populations (SWD, ELL, and Black/African-American Sub-Populations)

Person Responsible Angie Spencer (spencera@highlands.k12.fl.us)

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.

Although our overall suspensions decreased, SafeSchoolsforAlex.org ranks SMS in the High category based on number of incidents per 100 students. Obviously, we would like to see a continued decrease in the number of incidents. We have been allocated an additional dean position and will continue to implement our school-wide behavior plan "Show Your Blue."

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.

SMS builds positive relationships with families by giving all stakeholder groups (staff, parents, students, and the community) a voice in the school based decision making process. During morning and lunch announcements the mission and vision are communicated to students and staff. At SMS we believe in parental involvement and open communication. We have several measures in place to reinforce the open communication policy: SMS webpage, access to Remind (via text message), SMS FaceBook page, a marquis in front of the school, and Blackboard Connect. Teachers also utilize the Remind text messaging system to provide parents and students class-specific information and announcements. To increase family involvement, several family events are held throughout the school year. Each of these venues keep parents informed about their child's education. Specifically, at SMS teachers make contact via phone, pinnacle notes, and hand written notes in planners to inform parents of progress or potential concerns. Parent Conference days in 2020-2021 school year are designated for Wednesday mornings. Parents also have access to Skyward, an electronic grade-book. From Skyward, parents can see accurate grade information from a computer or smart phone with internet access.

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

SAC/PTO: Included on decision-making i.e. dress code, instrumental in teacher appreciation, ambassadors to our community and other parents

Faculty/Staff: Open communication with parents and families, promoting school events and initiatives such as Show Your Blue behavior system.

Administration: Open door policy with faculty and staff, frequent communication with parents.

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: Instructional Practice: Math	\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Science	\$0.00
4	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Social Studies	\$0.00

5	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Student Attendance	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00