Seminole County Public Schools

Tuskawilla 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	19
Budget to Support Goals	0
- valian in antibant mania	•

Tuskawilla Middle School

1801 TUSKAWILLA RD, Oviedo, FL 32765

http://www.scps.k12.fl.us/schools/schoolinfopage.cfm?schoolnumber=0541

Start Date for this Principal: 5/6/2017

Active

Southeast

LaShawn Russ-Porterfield

N/A

Demographics

Principal: Randy Shuler

2019-20 Status

(per MSID File)

SI Region

Regional Executive Director

Turnaround Option/Cycle

Year

Support Tier

ESSA Status

2020-21 Title I School	No
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	57%
2020-21 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (59%) 2017-18: B (55%) 2016-17: B (60%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Info	rmation*

* 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 Seminole 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	0

Tuskawilla Middle School

1801 TUSKAWILLA RD, Oviedo, FL 32765

http://www.scps.k12.fl.us/schools/schoolinfopage.cfm?schoolnumber=0541

School Demographics

School Type and Gr (per MSID I		2020-21 Title I Schoo	I Disadvan	Economically taged (FRL) Rate ted on Survey 3)
Middle Sch 6-8	nool	No		55%
Primary Servio (per MSID I		Charter School	(Reporte	Minority Rate ed as Non-white Survey 2)
K-12 General E	ducation	No		55%
School Grades Histo	ory			
Year	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18
Grade		В	В	В

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Seminole 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 Tuskawilla Middle School is to cultivate an environment, built on relationships, where students strive to explore career opportunities, create new possibilities, and innovate the world around them for a better tomorrow.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The vision of Tuskawilla Middle School is for all students to be engaged in their learning through individualized and innovative educational experiences to prepare them for success in the ever-changing world.

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
Shuler, Randy	Principal	Financial, Operational, Decision Making, Vision, Data Monitoring
Garrett, Ryan	Assistant Principal	ELA, Reading, ESOL, POE, Performing Arts, Master Schedule, Communications
Mims, Yaschika	Assistant Principal	ESE, Social Studies, Guidance, Discipline, MTSS, Emergency Management, School Safety
Scott, Chris	Other	Facilities, Technology, Custodial
Longley, Jazmyne	Other	Discipline, Transportation, PBS, Bullying, Fundraisers, Field Trips
Woods, Cynthia	Assistant Principal	Math, Science, PD, Cluster, Textbooks, Pre-Plan, Awards Night, Student Recognition, SAC, School Improvement Plan

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Saturday 5/6/2017, Randy Shuler

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

5

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

17

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

59

Total number of students enrolled at the school

1,101

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

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

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

2021-22

The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:

Indicator	Grade Level													
indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	366	397	337	0	0	0	0	1100
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	5	15	2	0	0	0	0	22
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	21	25	9	0	0	0	0	55
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	25	26	21	0	0	0	0	72
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	53	64	50	0	0	0	0	167
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	88	81	39	0	0	0	0	208
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														
indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	TOLAT	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	29	35	11	0	0	0	0	75	

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level														
indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	53	58	29	0	0	0	0	140	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 9/2/2021

2020-21 - As Reported

The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:

Indicator	Grade Level													
indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	444	400	341	0	0	0	0	1185
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	33	42	24	0	0	0	0	99
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	30	43	13	0	0	0	0	86
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	62	52	35	0	0	0	0	149
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	69	64	35	0	0	0	0	168

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

Indicator						C	Grad	e Le	vel					Total
inuicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	28	31	13	0	0	0	0	72

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator						(Grad	e Le	vel					Total
indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	71	65	18	0	0	0	0	154
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

2020-21 - Updated

The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:

Indicator	Grade Level													
indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	444	400	341	0	0	0	0	1185
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	33	42	24	0	0	0	0	99
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	30	43	13	0	0	0	0	86
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	62	52	35	0	0	0	0	149
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	69	64	35	0	0	0	0	168

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

Indicator		Grade Level										Total		
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	TOtal
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	28	31	13	0	0	0	0	72

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level										Total			
Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	71	65	18	0	0	0	0	154
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 Grade Component	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement				56%	61%	54%	53%	60%	53%
ELA Learning Gains				55%	57%	54%	51%	56%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				44%	45%	47%	40%	43%	47%
Math Achievement				63%	66%	58%	63%	66%	58%
Math Learning Gains				60%	64%	57%	61%	64%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				46%	52%	51%	43%	48%	51%
Science Achievement				53%	59%	51%	59%	62%	52%
Social Studies Achievement				80%	75%	72%	64%	74%	72%

Grade Level Data Review - State Assessments

NOTE: This data is raw data and includes ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.

			ELA			
Grade	Year	School	District	School- District Comparison	State	School- State Comparison
06	2021					
	2019	55%	60%	-5%	54%	1%
Cohort Con	nparison					
07	2021					
	2019	50%	58%	-8%	52%	-2%
Cohort Con	nparison	-55%				
80	2021					
	2019	54%	61%	-7%	56%	-2%
Cohort Con	nparison	-50%				

			MATH			
Grade	Year	School	District	School- District Comparison	State	School- State Comparison
06	2021					
	2019	59%	65%	-6%	55%	4%
Cohort Co	mparison					
07	2021					
	2019	63%	61%	2%	54%	9%
Cohort Co	mparison	-59%				
08	2021					
	2019	30%	32%	-2%	46%	-16%
Cohort Co	mparison	-63%				

			SCIEN	CE		
Grade	Year	School	District	School- District Comparison	State	School- State Comparison
08	2021					
	2019	51%	57%	-6%	48%	3%
Cohort Com	nparison					

		BIOLO	GY EOC		
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	0%	71%	-71%	67%	-67%
		CIVIC	S EOC		
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	77%	74%	3%	71%	6%

		HISTO	ORY EOC		
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019					
		ALGE	BRA EOC		
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	84%	61%	23%	61%	23%
		GEOM	TRY EOC		
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	100%	64%	36%	57%	43%

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

Common District Created Benchmark Assessments were utilized to progress monitor:

- ELA Grades 6-8
- Mathematics Grades 6-8 including high school Algebra and Geometry
- Science Grade 8
- Civics Grade 7

		Grade 6		
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	214/71%	163/52%	223/68%
English Language Arts	Economically Disadvantaged	114/62%	85/45%	120/61%
	Students With Disabilities	12/31%	5/12%	10/25%
	English Language Learners	10/34%	7/23%	10/37%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	153/49%	136/42%	152/48%
Mathematics	Economically Disadvantaged	71/39%	63/33%	67/36%
	Students With Disabilities	11/28%	7/16%	5/13%
	English Language Learners	7/25%	5/17%	6/20%

		Grade 7		
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	202/71%	227/77%	289/85%
English Language Arts	Economically Disadvantaged	88/62%	100/67%	137/76%
	Students With Disabilities	18/36%	21/40%	28/50%
	English Language Learners	8/38%	13/59%	18/72%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	175/63%	165/57%	187/57%
Mathematics	Economically Disadvantaged	75/52%	68/47%	77/46%
	Students With Disabilities	12/25%	8/16%	11/22%
	English Language Learners	5/26%	4/21%	11/46%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	235/84%	194/68%	224/68%
Civics	Economically Disadvantaged	109/76%	84/57%	97/57%
	Students With Disabilities	26/51%	14/29%	19/36%
	English Language Learners	9/47%	7/35%	10/42%

		Grade 8		
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	240/81%	192/64%	261/76%
English Language Arts	Economically Disadvantaged	116/76%	80/54%	120/67%
	Students With Disabilities	15/43%	7/18%	16/38%
	English Language Learners	9/50%	4/20%	8/42%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	195/68%	231/75%	249/73%
Mathematics	Economically Disadvantaged	83/58%	102/65%	117/66%
	Students With Disabilities	8/28%	15/38%	17/45%
	English Language Learners	6/35%	10/50%	9/41%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	215/72%	212/69%	229/66%
Science	Economically Disadvantaged	91/61%	89/58%	99/55%
	Students With Disabilities	10/32%	9/24%	13/33%
	English Language Learners	7/39%	8/42%	9/43%

Subgroup Data Review

		2021	SCHOO	DL GRAD	E COMF	ONENT	S BY SI	JBGRO	UPS		
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	27	23	19	30	25	12	27			
ELL	46	54	49	41	42	41	42	55	63		
ASN	68	59		85	69		63		76		
BLK	32	37	26	39	41	33	20	39	56		
HSP	51	49	37	53	47	31	43	64	67		
MUL	74	59		74	57		58	60	75		
WHT	63	55	35	68	57	37	61	72	79		
FRL	46	44	36	49	43	30	42	56	65		
		2019	SCHO	OL GRAD	E COMF	ONENT	S BY SI	JBGRO	UPS		
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	19	38	34	28	47	37	21	59	50		
ELL	26	52	47	43	54	45	25	62			

		2019	SCHO	OL GRAD	E COMF	PONENT	S BY SI	JBGRO	UPS		
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	68	63		79	71		43	86	69		
BLK	51	47	23	47	54	33	44	85	71		
HSP	46	49	39	50	53	39	40	77	68		
MUL	62	46		64	67						
WHT	61	59	55	72	64	59	66	79	79		
FRL	46	50	41	52	55	43	42	72	67		
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	18	37	33	28	44	33	21	36	10		
ELL	29	47	39	38	56	53	35	48			
ASN	69	57	55	83	73		73	62	64		
BLK	43	43	28	43	53	38	34	40	33		
HSP	44	46	39	53	53	41	54	53	57		
MUL	69	67	50	70	54	20	76		72		
WHT	59	53	40	71	67	46	63	74	58		
FRL	46	47	38	53	54	40	52	56	44		

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	54
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	543
Total Components for the Federal Index	
Percent Tested	92%

Subgroup Data

Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	22
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	

English Language Learners					
Federal Index - English Language Learners	49				
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?					
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%					
Native American Students					
Federal Index - Native American Students	N/A				
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?					
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%					
Asian Students					
Federal Index - Asian Students	70				
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	36				
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	50				
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?					
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%					
Multiracial Students	·				
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	65				
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	59				
Federal Index - White Students White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	59 NO				

Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	47
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Analysis

Data Analysis

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

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

The performance of students with disabilities across all grade levels and content areas is a concerning trend.

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

The achievement and learning gains of students with disabilities demonstrates the greatest need for improvement.

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

Factors contributing to the low performance of students with disabilities in ELA and Math proficiency and learning gains include disruption in instructional continuity due to the pandemic that further widened gaps in students' foundational skills. Actions to support improvement in these areas will include frequent formative progress monitoring with target support and acceleration in identified areas of need.

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

Grades 6 and 7 ELA and Grade 8 mathematics reflect the most improvement.

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

Deliberate monitoring of specific student groups contributed to this improvement. Actions included focus on the monitoring of the lowest 30% of students, acceleration of high level 1 and high level 2 and level 3 students along with standards-based tutoring.

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

Acceleration strategies will include strategic monitoring of lowest 30% of students, acceleration of high level 1 and high level 2 and level 3 students, more frequent common formative assessment to gather progress monitoring data and highly structured professional learning community discussions using this data to collaborate on strategies to accelerate student learning.

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.

Professional development will be focused on the development of highly effective professional learning communities and how school-based leaders can foster the growth and development of teacher collaboration for student success.

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

Additional services dedicated to student acceleration include social emotional learning support for students and families, data driven tutoring and acceleration support, expanded use of SCPS early warning tracking and MTSS based support, and additional progress monitoring opportunities in ELA and mathematics for all students in grades 6-8

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

Area of Focus
Description and

Increasing academic achievement of students with disabilities. ESSA Federal Percent of Points Index indicates this is a high priority need and focusing on the success of these students will reduce achievement gaps and prepare these students for future academic

Rationale: success.

Measurable Outcome:

Increase achievement and learning gains for students with disabilities.

Monitoring:

This area of focus will be monitored through classroom walk throughs, review of progress monitoring data and through data chats with professional learning communities.

responsible

Person

for Randy Shuler (randy_shuler@scps.k12.fl.us)

monitoring outcome:

Lessons aligned to Florida Standards at the appropriate level of complexity with ongoing

Evidencebased feedback loops between leadership and teachers, students and teachers and student with students and PLCs focused on data, instructional planning and student evidence of

Strategy: learning.

Rationale for Evidencebased Standards based lessons differentiated to meet the needs of these specific student groups and data driven deliberate action planning will improve achievement and learning gains for our students. This strategy is aligned to having high expectations for all learners

Strategy: and teachers.

Action Steps to Implement

Student owned progress monitoring
Low 30% Monitoring
High Level 1 and High Level 2 Monitoring
Low Level 3 Acceleration
Collaborative Data Driven PLCs
See SCPS School Improvement Plan for additional details

Person Responsible

Randy Shuler (randy_shuler@scps.k12.fl.us)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the <u>SafeSchoolsforAlex.org</u>, 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 administrator who oversees discipline, Mrs. Longley has and will examine the discipline referral data from the previous year to identify common trends to address for the school year. Mrs. Longley will also monitor on a quarterly basis to ensure that behaviors are being addressed immediately. Mrs. Longley will address any areas of concern (Inappropriate and Unsafe Acts) on a bi-weekly video segment for students to outline and review the SCPS student code of conduct. Mrs. Longley will address any new areas of concern as they arise and offer solutions and examples on how to effectively address the behavior.

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.

The school-based PBS team has created structures in place to reward positive behavior. Students can earn our school-based incentives such as falcon bills and positive behaviors for exhibiting behaviors that align with our S.O.A.R. (Safety first, On Time, Actively Engaged and Respectful and responsible) expectations. All teachers and staff can reward students at any time. Students can redeem their falcon bills for various prizes at the PBS store during lunches in the campus restaurant. Students who receive a positive referral are recognized by administrators and are given additional prizes as an award. The administrator who oversees PBS identifies and highlights ideal behaviors on the school news so that students continue to strive for excellence in their behavior choices.

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

Tuskawilla Middle School prides itself in having a strong collaborative parent and community partnership. SAC and PTSA members provide strong parent support to the school through volunteerism in the classroom, at special events and through the school store. The Tuskawilla Business Advisory Board engages the surrounding business and collegiate community with the school through program consultation, guest speaking, hosting field trips and monetary contributions. The Business Advisory Board participation in STEM Night, Career Expo, and Teach-In allow students to make real-world connections and prepare them

