

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

| 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 | 50% |
| Primary Service Type (per MSID File) | Charter School | 2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2) |
| K-12 General Education | No | 69% |

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 | | |
| 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 | 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 | | |

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 | | |

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 | | | | |
|-----------------------|----------------------------|---------|---------|---------|
| English Language Arts | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | 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% |
| Mathematics | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | 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% |
| Civics | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | 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 | | | | |
|-----------------------|----------------------------|---------|---------|---------|
| English Language Arts | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | 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% |
| Mathematics | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | 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% |
| Science | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | 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.