

Seminole County Public Schools

Sanford 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	19
Positive Culture & Environment	20
Budget to Support Goals	0

Sanford Middle School

1700 S FRENCH AVE, Sanford, FL 32771

<http://www.scps.k12.fl.us/schools/schoolinfopage.cfm?schoolnumber=0151>

Demographics

Principal: Byron Durias

Start Date for this Principal: 5/6/2017

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)	50%
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 (63%) 2017-18: B (60%) 2016-17: A (65%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	LaShawn Russ-Porterfield
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 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	11
Planning for Improvement	19
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Sanford Middle School

1700 S FRENCH AVE, Sanford, FL 32771

<http://www.scps.k12.fl.us/schools/schoolinfopage.cfm?schoolnumber=0151>

School Demographics

<p>School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Middle School 6-8</p>	<p>2020-21 Title I School</p> <p>No</p>	<p>2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p>50%</p>
<p>Primary Service Type (per MSID File)</p> <p>K-12 General Education</p>	<p>Charter School</p> <p>No</p>	<p>2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p>69%</p>

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 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.

There is an increasing need in Florida and throughout the country, to ensure students have the future ready skills to compete in a globally competitive economy and meet the needs of the workplace. The future of the economy is in STEM related careers. The U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics indicates that employment in STEM occupations are projected to grow more than 9 million between 2012 and 2022. The mission of Sanford Middle School Math, Science, & Technology Magnet is to develop a more widely and diversely populated pipeline of students, with future ready skills, interested in STEM careers in an innovative, safe, and supportive learning environment. Where every student can think critically, and connect and apply STEM principles in order to solve real-world problems, through rigorous and relevant learning experiences across all discipline.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The school where every student is a STEM student and every teacher is a STEM teacher.

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
Durias, Byron	Principal	Support the Superintendent's vision for teaching and learning. Ensure that all students learn and that all students are safe.
Grace, Alisa	Assistant Principal	Support the Principal's vision for the school.
Coursin, Jen	Other	Support the Principal's vision for the school.
Diltz, Ronald	Dean	Support the Principal's vision for the school.
Moye, Kiafa	Dean	Support the Principal's vision for the school.
Farrell, Rachel	Instructional Coach	Support the Principal's vision for the school.
Crumpton, Lori	Instructional Coach	Support the Principal's vision for the school.
Schwartz, Megan	Instructional Coach	Support the Principal's vision for the school.
Cush, Michael	Assistant Principal	Support the Principal's vision for the school.
Munoz, Berna	Assistant Principal	Support the Principal's vision for the school.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Saturday 5/6/2017, Byron Durias

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.*

14

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

85

Total number of students enrolled at the school

1,314

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

15

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

7

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	468	434	399	0	0	0	0	1301
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	11	18	9	0	0	0	0	38
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	31	20	8	0	0	0	0	59
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	78	66	49	0	0	0	0	193
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	107	73	43	0	0	0	0	223
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	31	24	9	0	0	0	0	64

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	81	68	34	0	0	0	0	183
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 9/1/2021

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	519	475	447	0	0	0	0	1441
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	12	11	12	0	0	0	0	35
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	9	5	0	0	0	0	25
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	69	50	65	0	0	0	0	184
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	91	54	50	0	0	0	0	195

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	22	8	7	0	0	0	0	37

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	77	58	46	0	0	0	0	181
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	519	475	447	0	0	0	0	1441
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	12	11	12	0	0	0	0	35
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	9	5	0	0	0	0	25
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	69	50	65	0	0	0	0	184
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	91	54	50	0	0	0	0	195

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	22	8	7	0	0	0	0	37

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	77	58	46	0	0	0	0	181
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				63%	61%	54%	62%	60%	53%
ELA Learning Gains				57%	57%	54%	54%	56%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				40%	45%	47%	33%	43%	47%
Math Achievement				68%	66%	58%	67%	66%	58%
Math Learning Gains				63%	64%	57%	60%	64%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				49%	52%	51%	42%	48%	51%
Science Achievement				64%	59%	51%	72%	62%	52%
Social Studies Achievement				75%	75%	72%	71%	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	61%	60%	1%	54%	7%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2021					
	2019	59%	58%	1%	52%	7%
Cohort Comparison		-61%				
08	2021					
	2019	65%	61%	4%	56%	9%
Cohort Comparison		-59%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2021					
	2019	71%	65%	6%	55%	16%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2021					

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2019	58%	61%	-3%	54%	4%
Cohort Comparison		-71%				
08	2021					
	2019	26%	32%	-6%	46%	-20%
Cohort Comparison		-58%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2021					
	2019	62%	57%	5%	48%	14%
Cohort Comparison						

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	0%	71%	-71%	67%	-67%

CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	75%	74%	1%	71%	4%

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	83%	61%	22%	61%	22%

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	99%	64%	35%	57%	42%

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
English Language Arts	All Students	270/76%	229/63%	295/74%
	Economically Disadvantaged	80/57%	67/44%	95/54%
	Students With Disabilities	14/41%	13/35%	12/27%
	English Language Learners	10/40%	7/28%	9/41%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	282/76%	262/67%	275/68%
	Economically Disadvantaged	109/61%	105/55%	116/56%
	Students With Disabilities	24/57%	21/51%	25/52%
	English Language Learners	9/53%	5/25%	10/43%

Grade 7				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	309/82%	319/83%	378/91%
	Economically Disadvantaged	131/73%	143/76%	179/85%
	Students With Disabilities	20/48%	22/51%	34/68%
	English Language Learners	9/50%	8/36%	17/71%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	282/76%	262/67%	275/68%
	Economically Disadvantaged	109/61%	105/55%	116/56%
	Students With Disabilities	24/57%	21/51%	25/52%
	English Language Learners	9/53%	5/25%	10/43%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Civics	All Students	324/86%	288/76%	308/75%
	Economically Disadvantaged	137/75%	116/63%	127/61%
	Students With Disabilities	25/58%	15/38%	18/38%
	English Language Learners	11/69%	7/35%	9/41%

Grade 8				
Number/% Proficiency		Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	298/85%	245/66%	299/76%
	Economically Disadvantaged	127/73%	93/49%	125/62%
	Students With Disabilities	17/44%	12/25%	11/23%
	English Language Learners	9/43%	5/25%	8/35%
	Number/% Proficiency		Fall	Winter
Mathematics	All Students	223/62%	238/65%	233/59%
	Economically Disadvantaged	85/47%	93/50%	93/46%
	Students With Disabilities	11/24%	11/23%	14/31%
	English Language Learners	8/44%	5/28%	11/46%
	Number/% Proficiency		Fall	Winter
Science	All Students	111/56%	103/51%	114/50%
	Economically Disadvantaged	55/41%	55/39%	61/38%
	Students With Disabilities	12/28%	14/32%	6/13%
	English Language Learners	6/32%	5/24%	5/23%

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	22	29	23	30	30	24	16	51	28		
ELL	37	47	40	45	40	43	20	69	48		
ASN	88	78	65	89	68	44	86	91	91		
BLK	40	40	24	36	27	15	27	51	55		
HSP	48	47	31	50	33	27	44	81	54		
MUL	64	56	33	59	35	30	42	83	44		
PAC	54	62		46	46						
WHT	71	57	32	73	47	37	67	76	72		
FRL	44	43	29	43	32	23	33	62	53		
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	19	30	24	28	50	45	27	25	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
ELL	29	49	43	35	61	58	17	65			
ASN	89	73	71	91	83	67	88	95	95		
BLK	39	46	39	44	48	37	36	54	75		
HSP	54	53	34	63	63	59	58	70	73		
MUL	71	45	29	69	61	55	53	87	80		
WHT	71	59	42	76	64	53	74	83	84		
FRL	46	48	37	52	52	44	48	60	76		
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	17	34	28	26	37	27	32	29	31		
ELL	19	30	28	39	49	46	31	17			
ASN	88	73	40	92	79	64	95	91	97		
BLK	37	43	30	41	45	34	42	52	62		
HSP	51	47	36	58	54	39	59	62	70		
MUL	68	54	31	69	65	41	76	67	75		
WHT	70	57	32	76	63	50	79	78	83		
FRL	44	44	30	50	50	37	51	56	66		

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	57
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	542
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	94%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	28
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	45
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	78
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	35
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	47
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	50
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	52
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	59
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	42
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?

Grade 7 ELA reflects 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 Rationale:	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 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.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Byron Durias (byron_durias@scps.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Lessons aligned to Florida Standards at the appropriate level of complexity with ongoing feedback loops between leadership and teachers, students and teachers and student with students and PLCs focused on data, instructional planning and student evidence of learning.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	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 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
- Tutoring
- See SCPS School Improvement Plan for additional details

Person Responsible Byron Durias (byron_durias@scps.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.

Based on the data from Safe Schools for Alex, Sanford Middle School has seen an increase in student suspensions since 2014. While suspension rates dropped from 2018 to 2019, our overall trend over the past 6 years in the data presented by Safe Schools for Alex has been an increase in out of school suspensions. The increased use of Restorative Practices as apart of our student behavior practices should positively impact our suspension rates as a school. With a focus on accountability, fair process, and providing students opportunities to right their own wrongs, Sanford Middle expects to see our suspensions rates to decline as we move away from standard punitive discipline to a more holistic process.

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.

Sanford Middle School believes that a positive school culture and environment is essential for student success. Sanford Middle School is a Restorative Practices school, focusing large amounts of time to the training and support of teachers to build high expectations for student progress. Developing school structures through restorative practices also helps build student and staff relationships, nurture self-awareness and expression, and help keep students connected to each other and the school. Through a variety of strategies that are implemented school wide, we help students find value in themselves and others and how to speak and listen to one another in an atmosphere of safety, decorum, and equality. In addition to Restorative Practices, Sanford Middle has a PBS team focused on identifying positive student behaviors across campus and acknowledging those behaviors that revolve around B.R.A.V.E. Believe in your potential. Respect your School and community. Always do what is right. Visualize your success. Engage and excel in learning. Our PBS team uses Positive Behavior Referrals to reinforce students exhibiting B.R.A.V.E characteristics through their actions on campus.

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

Administrative Team – Support PBS team and all staff in promoting Restorative Practices and B.R.A.V.E. characteristics school-wide. PBS Team – implement restorative circles to resolve conflicts on campus.

Implement school wide systems to support positive behavior reinforcement. All Teachers– Infuse restorative practices into daily instruction to build classroom and school wide positive culture. Utilize “Seminar” to promote Social Emotional Learning campus wide. Promote B.R.A.V.E. characteristics through school spirit and positive behavior initiatives. All Students – participate in weekly Seminar time focusing on culture building. Promote and exhibit B.R.A.V.E. characteristics across campus. Participate in and promote school clubs and organizations. Serve in leadership roles on campus such as SMS Ambassadors program and SMS Tech Team. Community Members, Parents, and Outside Partners – Support school initiatives such as B.R.A.V.E. and Restorative Practices. Attend on and off campus events. Communicate with Principal Durias through “Coffee with the Principal”, SAC, and other available venues.