

Hernando County School District

Powell 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	11
Planning for Improvement	18
Positive Culture & Environment	22
Budget to Support Goals	0

Powell Middle School

4100 BARCLAY AVE, Brooksville, FL 34609

<https://www.hernandoschools.org/pms>

Demographics

Principal: Alex Rasttater

Start Date for this Principal: 8/27/2021

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	No
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	84%
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: A (62%) 2017-18: B (60%) 2016-17: B (56%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
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 Hernando 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	11
Planning for Improvement	18
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Powell Middle School

4100 BARCLAY AVE, Brooksville, FL 34609

<https://www.hernandoschools.org/pms>

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	No	85%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	43%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Hernando 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.

To share the responsibility of preparing our students to become productive citizens through a caring environment with a commitment to excellence.

Provide the school's vision statement.

To do our best, to be the best, while dedicating ourselves to provide the best.

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
Dye, Tom	Principal	The administrative team facilitates Professional Learning Communities (PLC) and School Based Leadership Team (SBLT) meetings that involve shared decision making regarding instructional practices, Multi-Tiered System of Supports (MTSS), safety, and daily operational procedures. Evaluative administrator for Social Studies, Physical Education (PE), School Counselors, and Elective departments.
Rastatter, Alex	Assistant Principal	The administrative team facilitates Professional Learning Communities (PLC) and School Based Leadership Team (SBLT) meetings that involve shared decision making regarding instructional practices, Multi-Tiered System of Supports (MTSS), safety, and daily operational procedures. Evaluative administrator for Mathematics and Exceptional Student Education (ESE) departments.
Smith, Josh	Assistant Principal	The administrative team facilitates Professional Learning Communities (PLC) and School Based Leadership Team (SBLT) meetings that involve shared decision making regarding instructional practices, Multi-Tiered System of Supports (MTSS), safety, and daily operational procedures. Evaluative administrator for Science, English Language Arts (ELA), and Reading departments.
Rufa, Laura	Teacher, K-12	The Assessment Teacher provides and analyzes student and school data to help make informed instructional decisions. She coordinates progress monitoring and state testing, and manages all platforms for testing.
Beall, George	Teacher, K-12	English Language Arts (ELA) Department Chair
Fry, Deonne	Teacher, K-12	Reading Department Chair
Fischer, Renee	Teacher, K-12	Social Studies Department Chair
Carlson, Ed	Teacher, K-12	Science Department Chair
Haskins, Marcy	Teacher, ESE	Exceptional Student Education (ESE) Department Chair
Blackwell, Ron	Teacher, K-12	Physical Education (PE) Department Chair
Young, Serena	Teacher, K-12	Arts Department Chair
Kufner, Cindy	School Counselor	Guidance Department Chair
Franz, Sean	Teacher, K-12	Dean of Students/MTSS Coordinator

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Chinchilla, Stacey	Teacher, K-12	Mathematics Department Chair
Duncan, Paul	Teacher, K-12	7th Grade Team Leader
Burns, Gary	Teacher, K-12	8th Grade Team Leader
Lariviere, Nicole	Teacher, K-12	6th Grade Team Leader
Pointer, Leslie	Teacher, K-12	Intensive Math Department Chair

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Friday 8/27/2021, Alex Rasttater

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.*

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.*

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

Total number of students enrolled at the school

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													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	
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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

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

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 6/3/2021

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	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	

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	
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	

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	
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				57%	56%	54%	52%	57%	53%
ELA Learning Gains				58%	53%	54%	50%	55%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				51%	47%	47%	45%	49%	47%
Math Achievement				61%	61%	58%	60%	65%	58%
Math Learning Gains				62%	55%	57%	66%	62%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				70%	51%	51%	65%	61%	51%
Science Achievement				57%	56%	51%	57%	59%	52%
Social Studies Achievement				83%	72%	72%	78%	75%	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	52%	52%	0%	54%	-2%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2021					
	2019	55%	53%	2%	52%	3%
Cohort Comparison		-52%				
08	2021					
	2019	58%	53%	5%	56%	2%
Cohort Comparison		-55%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2021					
	2019	55%	53%	2%	55%	0%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2021					
	2019	55%	62%	-7%	54%	1%
Cohort Comparison		-55%				
08	2021					
	2019	57%	50%	7%	46%	11%
Cohort Comparison		-55%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2021					
	2019	57%	54%	3%	48%	9%
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	81%	75%	6%	71%	10%
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	80%	59%	21%	61%	19%
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	94%	55%	39%	57%	37%

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

Grade 6				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
Grade 7				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
Civics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			

Grade 8				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students			
	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	14	41	35	22	42	43	24	30			
ELL	24	55	55	31	38	33	27	76			
ASN	89	94		94	71						
BLK	42	41	29	37	37	59	40	82	56		
HSP	44	53	52	48	45	44	49	74	73		
MUL	52	43		57	34		58	77	73		
WHT	50	50	41	58	48	49	51	77	68		
FRL	45	51	43	48	45	51	51	74	66		
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	42	40	31	54	53	31	53			
ELL	38	60	56	48	72	79	29	67	54		

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	78	78		81	78		64	91	75		
BLK	51	64	48	52	56	53	29	81			
HSP	56	57	53	55	61	72	50	78	46		
MUL	62	58	60	65	76	93	67	80			
WHT	56	57	50	62	61	67	63	86	60		
FRL	53	58	52	53	61	71	50	79	52		
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	15	33	32	28	65	67	27	58			
ELL	22	47	43	41	62	52		70			
ASN	64	57		72	70						
BLK	38	47	38	44	54	48	28	54	70		
HSP	48	50	47	53	66	67	44	75	54		
MUL	57	52	33	54	61	42	61	63	63		
WHT	54	49	46	64	67	70	65	81	66		
FRL	45	47	43	52	62	63	48	73	54		

ESSA Data Review

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

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	54
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	56
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	543
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	98%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	31
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	44
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	87
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	47
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	54
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	56
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	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	53
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?

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, demonstrate 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?

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

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

What strategies will need to be implemented in order to accelerate 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.

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

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Student Engagement

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Based on the results of our Student Engagement Survey, 47% of our students felt that class was not interesting, 47% said class was not challenging them, and 25% of students felt that they did not participate in class activities on a regular basis.

Measurable Outcome: Powell will see a 10% increase in the positive percentages from the questions about class interests, challenging coursework, and class activity and discussion participation.

Monitoring: Classroom walkthrough data - We would like to see at least 80% of our classroom walkthroughs Effective or Highly Effective in Domain 3C of the Danielson model.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Tom Dye (dye_t@hcsb.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy: Professional Development

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Student engagement ties to increased attendance, decrease in disciplines, and decreases in the number of students receiving a D or F in a class.

Action Steps to Implement

Teachers will receive Professional Development regarding the Danielson Model 3C and Inter-Rater Reliability Training on the August early release day.

Person Responsible Tom Dye (dye_t@hcsb.k12.fl.us)

Remove individual student desks in many classrooms and provide tables for students to collaborate in small groups.

Person Responsible Alex Rastatter (rastatter_a@hcsb.k12.fl.us)

Teacher modeling of engagement strategies identified during administrative walkthroughs will take place during early release Professional Development.

Person Responsible Josh Smith (smith_j5@hcsb.k12.fl.us)

Administration will pull the heat map quarterly to review domain 3C and will discuss at monthly data chats with teachers.

Person Responsible Alex Rastatter (rastatter_a@hcsb.k12.fl.us)

Book Study - Teach Like a Pirate by Dave Burgess

Person Responsible Josh Smith (smith_j5@hcsb.k12.fl.us)

#2. Leadership specifically relating to Walkthroughs**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Based on the increase in disciplines during the second semester, administration felt that by being in the classrooms more frequently, student disciplines will decrease.

Measurable Outcome:

We would like to see an increase by 10% in the total number of classroom walkthroughs.

Monitoring:

Heat Map from Frontline

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Tom Dye (dye_t@hcsb.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Monthly data chats and quarterly heat-map reviews will be used for discussion during the data chats with administration on the 3rd Wednesday of each month. We will also review discipline data and Domain 3C progress.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

After reviewing the Employee Engagement Survey with the leadership team and providing the leadership team opportunity to collaborate with their departments, it was brought to our attention that teachers desired more specific feedback based on their classroom walkthroughs.

Action Steps to Implement

Calendar was developed to include monthly data chats and quarterly heat map reviews with administration

Person Responsible

Tom Dye (dye_t@hcsb.k12.fl.us)

The walkthrough plan and data chat calendar will be reviewed during pre-school.

Person Responsible

Alex Rastatter (rastatter_a@hcsb.k12.fl.us)

Present information to the leadership team regarding feedback from the last leadership meeting of 20-21 school year in regards to changes for utilizing walkthrough data.

Person Responsible

Josh Smith (smith_j5@hcsb.k12.fl.us)

Administration will meet weekly to discuss what is being seen in classroom walkthroughs in order to drive the purpose of the upcoming week.

Person Responsible

Tom Dye (dye_t@hcsb.k12.fl.us)

#3. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Discipline

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	According to Rtl-B we have seen an increase in disciplines by 25% from the 2018-2019 school year.
Measurable Outcome:	Powell will see a 10% decrease in disciplines from 2020-2021 school year.
Monitoring:	Review discipline data at the monthly SBLT, Leadership, and PBIS meetings
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Tom Dye (dye_t@hcsb.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Working with teachers to build relationships with students to help decrease disciplines in the classroom
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Teacher-student relationships has a .52 effect size
Action Steps to Implement	
Review the discipline tracking form and intervention tracking document during pre-school with teachers	
Person Responsible	Josh Smith (smith_j5@hcsb.k12.fl.us)
Compassion in Action Training	
Person Responsible	Tom Dye (dye_t@hcsb.k12.fl.us)
Expectation meetings with students by grade level at the start of the year and again at the start of second semester.	
Person Responsible	Josh Smith (smith_j5@hcsb.k12.fl.us)
Brian Mendler Training	
Person Responsible	Alex Rastatter (rastatter_a@hcsb.k12.fl.us)

#4. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	The Federal Percent of Points Index for Powell's Students with Disabilities (SWD) is 36%
---	--

Measurable Outcome:	Powell will see at least a 4% increase in the Federal Percent of Points in the category of SWD.
----------------------------	---

Monitoring:	Data chats - Teachers will be monitoring student data in reference to General Education Students and Students with Disabilities (progress monitoring data, formative data, D/F reports, etc.)
--------------------	---

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Alex Rastatter (rastatter_a@hcsb.k12.fl.us)
---	---

Evidence-based Strategy:	Common planning by department
---------------------------------	-------------------------------

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Common planning by department allows the ESE teachers to be involved in the planning and disaggregation of the data from progress monitoring and common formatives.
---	---

Action Steps to Implement

Monthly data chats with administration

Person Responsible	Alex Rastatter (rastatter_a@hcsb.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.

Powell will see a 10% decrease in disciplines from 2020-2021 school year. We will be working with teachers to build relationships with students to help decrease disciplines in the classroom

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.

Powell Middle School runs a successful PBIS program recognized by the state of Florida for several consecutive years as a model school. For the 2020-2021 school year, we were awarded the PBIS Resilience Award. The committee meets monthly to plan special campus-wide events and develop ways of recognizing students and staff for their efforts. We have been sponsoring Panther Pride Fridays to build and enhance pride within our school. Monthly recognition with trophies/awards have been part of our faculty meetings to improve faculty and staff morale.

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

We have a robust PBIS committee with administration and teachers from all grade levels and curriculum areas. There are also students from each grade level. The committee has partnered with a local Wendy's for coupons to give away as part of the Panther Pride Spirit Days. The committee is also working to partner with additional businesses to help promote positive behavior in the classroom.