

Hillsborough County Public Schools

# Benito Middle School



## 2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

---

## Table of Contents

---

|   |           |
|---|-----------|
| <b>School Demographics</b>                | <b>3</b>  |
| <b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>     | <b>4</b>  |
| <b>School Information</b>                 | <b>7</b>  |
| <b>Needs Assessment</b>                   | <b>13</b> |
| <b>Planning for Improvement</b>           | <b>22</b> |
| <b>Positive Culture &amp; Environment</b> | <b>28</b> |
| <b>Budget to Support Goals</b>            | <b>29</b> |

# Benito Middle School

10101 CROSS CREEK BLVD, Tampa, FL 33647

[ no web address on file ]

## Demographics

Principal: Brent Williams

Start Date for this Principal: 8/11/2008

|  |  |
|--|--|
| <b>2019-20 Status</b><br>(per MSID File)   | Active   |
| <b>School Type and Grades Served</b><br>(per MSID File)  | Middle School<br>6-8   |
| <b>Primary Service Type</b><br>(per MSID File)   | K-12 General Education   |
| <b>2020-21 Title I School</b>  | No   |
| <b>2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b><br>(as reported on Survey 3)  | 50%  |
| <b>2020-21 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b><br>(subgroups with 10 or more students)<br>(subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Students With Disabilities<br>English Language Learners<br>Asian Students<br>Black/African American Students<br>Hispanic Students<br>Multiracial Students<br>White Students<br>Economically Disadvantaged Students |
| <b>School Grades History</b>   | 2018-19: A (67%)<br>2017-18: A (70%)<br>2016-17: A (70%)   |
| <b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>  |  |
| <b>SI Region</b>   | Central  |
| <b>Regional Executive Director</b>   | <a href="#">Lucinda Thompson</a>   |
| <b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>   | N/A  |
| <b>Year</b>  |  |
| <b>Support Tier</b>  |  |
| <b>ESSA Status</b>   |  |

\* 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 Hillsborough 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](http://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

---

|                                       |           |
|---------------------------------------|-----------|
| <b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b> | <b>4</b>  |
| <b>School Information</b>             | <b>7</b>  |
| <b>Needs Assessment</b>               | <b>13</b> |
| <b>Planning for Improvement</b>       | <b>22</b> |
| <b>Title I Requirements</b>           | <b>0</b>  |
| <b>Budget to Support Goals</b>        | <b>29</b> |

## Benito Middle School

10101 CROSS CREEK BLVD, Tampa, FL 33647

[ no web address on file ]

### School Demographics

| School Type and Grades Served<br>(per MSID File) | 2020-21 Title I School | 2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate<br>(as reported on Survey 3) |
|--|------------------------|--|
| Middle School<br>6-8                             | No                     | 44%  |
| Primary Service Type<br>(per MSID File)          | Charter School         | 2018-19 Minority Rate<br>(Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)               |
| K-12 General Education                           | No                     | 70%  |

### School Grades History

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

### School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Hillsborough 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 provide an education that enables each student to excel as a successful, responsible citizen.

**Provide the school's vision statement.**

Preparing Students for Life.

### 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  |
|---------------|---------------------|--|
| Sanders, John | Principal           | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Collaborate and problem solve to ensure the implementation of high quality instructional practices using RTI/MTSS process at the core Tier 1 and intervention/enrichment (tiers 2/3) levels.</li> <li>2. Support Implementation of high quality instructional practices at the core (tier 1) and intervention/enrichment (tiers2/3) levels.</li> <li>3. Review ongoing progress monitoring data at the core to ensure fidelity of instruction and attainment of SIP goal(s) in curricular, behavioral, and attendance domains. In addition, he uses data to differentiate and prioritize instructional supports and interventions and supports teachers in using data to differentiate instruction.</li> <li>4. Communicates a clear, compelling vision of high academic achievement for Benito Middle School.</li> <li>5. Conducts high-quality classroom observations, identifies effective teaching practices, and understands pedagogy that result in improved student learning. After teacher observations, he uses this data to disaggregate school data to plan and target professional development and support teachers.</li> <li>6. Builds the capacity of staff to effectively develop, adapt, and implement rigorous curriculum aligned to the Florida standards to effectively address all students' learning needs.</li> <li>7. Strategically places teachers in grade levels and content areas based on their skills, strengths, and qualifications.</li> <li>8. Collects, analyzes, and uses multiple forms of data to make decisions.</li> </ol>   |
| Stark, Fatima | Assistant Principal | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Collaborate and problem solve to ensure the implementation of high quality instructional practices using RTI/MTSS process at the core Tier 1 and intervention/enrichment (tiers 2/3) levels.</li> <li>2. Support Implementation of high quality instructional practices at the core (tier 1) and intervention/enrichment (tiers2/3) levels.</li> <li>3. Review ongoing progress monitoring data at the core to ensure fidelity of instruction and attainment of SIP goal(s) in curricular, behavioral, and attendance domains. In addition, she uses data to differentiate and prioritize instructional supports and interventions and supports teachers in using data to differentiate instruction.</li> <li>4. Communicates a clear, compelling vision of high academic achievement for Benito Middle School.</li> <li>5. Conducts high-quality classroom observations, identifies effective teaching practices, and understands pedagogy that result in improved student learning. After teacher observations, she uses this data to disaggregate school data to plan and target professional development and support teachers.</li> <li>6. Builds the capacity of staff to effectively develop, adapt, and implement rigorous curriculum aligned to the Florida standards to effectively address all students' learning needs.</li> <li>7. Strategically places teachers in grade levels and content areas based on their skills, strengths, and qualifications.</li> <li>8. Collects, analyzes, and uses multiple forms of data to make decisions.</li> <li>9. Ensures teachers will plan for rigorous, standards aligned lessons through authentic, rigorous learning experiences. Lessons will include multiple types of instructional strategies to support student needs and improve their areas for</li> </ol> |



| Name            | Position Title      | Job Duties and Responsibilities   |
|-----------------|---------------------|---|
| Jackson, Sherri | Instructional Coach | <p>growth.</p> <p>10. Holds teachers accountable to work collaboratively in their PLC to ensure all lessons are standards based and that the power standards have been identified.</p>  |
|                 |                     | <p>1. Collaborate with administrators when analyzing a variety of data in order to support the instructional development of all teachers.</p> <p>2. Collaborate and problem solve to ensure the implementation of high quality instructional practices using RTI/MTSS process at the core Tier 1 and intervention/enrichment (tiers 2/3) levels.</p> <p>3. Support Implementation of high quality instructional practices at the core (tier 1) and intervention/enrichment (tiers2/3) levels.</p> <p>4. Review ongoing progress monitoring data at the core to ensure fidelity of instruction and attainment of SIP goal(s) in curricular, behavioral, and attendance domains. In addition, she uses data to differentiate and prioritize instructional supports and interventions and supports teachers in using data to differentiate instruction.</p> <p>5. Communicates a clear, compelling vision of high academic achievement for Benito Middle School.</p> <p>6. Analyze data with teachers and model lessons in classrooms in coaching cycles.</p> <p>7. Provide direction and coordination for how curriculum is taught consistent with district initiatives and recognized best instructional practices.</p> <p>8. Assist teachers with understanding Benito's mission and vision.</p> <p>9. Develop staff members' knowledge, skills, attitudes, and behaviors through a variety of professional development targeted topics and designs using data in the SIP, FAIR, and other common assessments for all content areas.</p> <p>10. Support teachers and administrators in using data to improve instruction on all levels.</p> <p>11. Informally observe (non-evaluative) lessons and provide feedback for teachers' professional growth and students' success.</p> <p>12. Support teachers by helping with the strategic "how" of teaching and share multiple instructional strategies/processes with teachers during planning times.</p> <p>13. Assist teachers with planning and pacing of lessons, the development of differentiated lessons, and the selection of best practices to meet the needs of their students.</p> <p>14. Contribute to the development systems and structures to improve teacher practice within schools.</p> |
| Olson, Dulcinea |                     | <p>1. Designs and implements appropriate instruction of content area(s)/course(s) assigned in accordance with state standards, district curriculum, and students' needs.</p> <p>2. Creates a positive educational climate for students to learn in an atmosphere of respect and rapport.</p> <p>3. Creates and delivers relevant and rigorous lessons that maximize student engagement and achievement.</p>   |

| Name | Position Title | Job Duties and Responsibilities  |
|------|----------------|--|
|      |                | <p>4. Utilizes a variety of teaching practices and methodologies that reflect diverse educational, cultural, and linguistic backgrounds in order to meet the individual needs of students.</p> <p>5. Observes and evaluates student performance and mastery of standards, monitors student assessment data, and maintains student grades and attendance.</p> <p>6. Manages student behavior in the classroom by utilizing effective classroom management strategies and invoking appropriate disciplinary procedures.</p> <p>7. Communicates with parents and school/district personnel regarding student progress and encourages parental involvement.</p> <p>8. Takes all responsible precautions to provide for the health and safety of students and to protect equipment, materials, and facilities.</p> <p>9. Appropriately maintains and secures confidential records, inquiries, and data.</p> <p>10. Maintains appropriate certifications and professional development hours as required.</p> <p>11. Performs any other duties as assigned.</p> |

### Demographic Information

#### Principal start date

Monday 8/11/2008, Brent Williams

**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.*

22

**Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school**

58

**Total number of students enrolled at the school**

1,006

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

10

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

5

#### 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 | 311 | 318 | 380 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 1009 |       |
| Attendance below 90 percent                              | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 29  | 37  | 56  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 122  |       |
| One or more suspensions                                  | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13  | 37  | 41  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 91   |       |
| Course failure in ELA                                    | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1   | 6   | 9   | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 16   |       |
| Course failure in Math                                   | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1   | 8   | 15  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 24   |       |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment             | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 36  | 39  | 39  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 114  |       |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment            | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 36  | 56  | 60  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 152  |       |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 37  | 37  | 37  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 111  |       |

**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 | 1 | 5 | 10 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0     | 16 |

**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 | 6 | 5 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 11 |       |
| 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 8/25/2021

**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 | 320 | 350 | 340 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 1010 |       |
| Attendance below 90 percent               | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 31  | 32  | 39  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 102  |       |
| One or more suspensions                   | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 15  | 14  | 17  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 46   |       |
| Course failure in ELA                     | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6   | 30  | 15  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 51   |       |
| Course failure in Math                    | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7   | 30  | 15  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 52   |       |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment  | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 109 | 105 | 122 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 336  |       |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 72  | 70  | 45  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 187  |       |

**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 | 9 | 25 | 16 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 50 |       |

**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 | 60 | 40 | 38 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 138   |
| Students retained two or more times | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 41 | 26 | 32 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 99    |

**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 | 320 | 350 | 340 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 1010 |       |
| Attendance below 90 percent               | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 31  | 32  | 39  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 102  |       |
| One or more suspensions                   | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 15  | 14  | 17  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 46   |       |
| Course failure in ELA                     | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6   | 30  | 15  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 51   |       |
| Course failure in Math                    | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7   | 30  | 15  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 52   |       |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment  | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 109 | 105 | 122 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 336  |       |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 72  | 70  | 45  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 187  |       |

**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 | 9 | 25 | 16 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 50 |       |

**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 | 60 | 40 | 38 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 138 |       |
| Students retained two or more times | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 41 | 26 | 32 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 99  |       |

## 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             |        |          |       | 65%    | 51%      | 54%   | 66%    | 52%      | 53%   |
| ELA Learning Gains          |        |          |       | 60%    | 52%      | 54%   | 64%    | 53%      | 54%   |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile  |        |          |       | 51%    | 47%      | 47%   | 57%    | 48%      | 47%   |
| Math Achievement            |        |          |       | 70%    | 55%      | 58%   | 70%    | 56%      | 58%   |
| Math Learning Gains         |        |          |       | 67%    | 57%      | 57%   | 74%    | 59%      | 57%   |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile |        |          |       | 50%    | 52%      | 51%   | 61%    | 52%      | 51%   |
| Science Achievement         |        |          |       | 63%    | 47%      | 51%   | 59%    | 47%      | 52%   |
| Social Studies Achievement  |        |          |       | 88%    | 67%      | 72%   | 86%    | 66%      | 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%    | 53%      | 8%                         | 54%   | 7%                      |
| Cohort Comparison |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| 07                | 2021 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 60%    | 54%      | 6%                         | 52%   | 8%                      |
| Cohort Comparison |      | -61%   |          |                            |       |                         |
| 08                | 2021 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 64%    | 53%      | 11%                        | 56%   | 8%                      |
| Cohort Comparison |      | -60%   |          |                            |       |                         |

| MATH              |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade             | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 06                | 2021 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 52%    | 49%      | 3%                         | 55%   | -3%                     |
| Cohort Comparison |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| 07                | 2021 |        |          |                            |       |                         |

| MATH              |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade             | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
|                   | 2019 | 71%    | 62%      | 9%                         | 54%   | 17%                     |
| Cohort Comparison |      | -52%   |          |                            |       |                         |
| 08                | 2021 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 38%    | 31%      | 7%                         | 46%   | -8%                     |
| Cohort Comparison |      | -71%   |          |                            |       |                         |

| SCIENCE           |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade             | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 08                | 2021 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 57%    | 47%      | 10%                        | 48%   | 9%                      |
| Cohort Comparison |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |

| BIOLOGY EOC  |        |          |                       |       |                    |
|--------------|--------|----------|-----------------------|-------|--------------------|
| Year         | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2021         |        |          |                       |       |                    |
| 2019         | 0%     | 66%      | -66%                  | 67%   | -67%               |
| CIVICS EOC   |        |          |                       |       |                    |
| Year         | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2021         |        |          |                       |       |                    |
| 2019         | 84%    | 67%      | 17%                   | 71%   | 13%                |
| 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         | 95%    | 63%      | 32%                   | 61%   | 34%                |
| GEOMETRY EOC |        |          |                       |       |                    |
| Year         | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2021         |        |          |                       |       |                    |
| 2019         | 100%   | 57%      | 43%                   | 57%   | 43%                |

### Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

6th Grade:

1. Achieve 3000
2. 6th Grade Math Progress Monitoring Baseline

7th Grade:

1. Achieve 3000
2. 7th Grade Math Progress Monitoring Baseline
3. Civics Progress Monitoring Baseline

8th Grade:

1. Achieve 3000
2. 8th Grade Math Progress Monitoring Baseline
3. Science SSS Progress Monitoring Baseline

| Grade 6               |                            |       |        |        |
|-----------------------|----------------------------|-------|--------|--------|
| English Language Arts | Number/% Proficiency       | Fall  | Winter | Spring |
|                       | All Students               | 30.7% | 39.8%  | 49.6%  |
|                       | Economically Disadvantaged | 18%   | 20.8%  | 28%    |
|                       | Students With Disabilities | 43%   | 47.3%  | 54%    |
|                       | English Language Learners  | 0%    | 0%     | 5.6%   |
| Mathematics           | Number/% Proficiency       | Fall  | Winter | Spring |
|                       | All Students               | 67.7% | 40%    | NA     |
|                       | Economically Disadvantaged | 55.9% | 31.5%  | NA     |
|                       | Students With Disabilities | 72.4% | 44.3%  | NA     |
|                       | English Language Learners  | 40%   | 22.6%  | NA     |

| Grade 7               |                            |       |        |        |
|-----------------------|----------------------------|-------|--------|--------|
| English Language Arts | Number/% Proficiency       | Fall  | Winter | Spring |
|                       | All Students               | 30.4% | 44.8%  | 49.8%  |
|                       | Economically Disadvantaged | 18.3% | 27.6%  | 32.8%  |
|                       | Students With Disabilities | 40.8% | 50.5%  | 56%    |
|                       | English Language Learners  | 4.4%  | 8.7%   | 8.7%   |
| Mathematics           | Number/% Proficiency       | Fall  | Winter | Spring |
|                       | All Students               | 66.5% | 55.3%  | NA     |
|                       | Economically Disadvantaged | 48.5% | 38.3%  | NA     |
|                       | Students With Disabilities | 73.7% | 68.3%  | NA     |
|                       | English Language Learners  | 30.7% | 43.6%  | NA     |
| Civics                | Number/% Proficiency       | Fall  | Winter | Spring |
|                       | All Students               | 69.3% | 65.6%  | NA     |
|                       | Economically Disadvantaged | 52.3% | 52.2%  | NA     |
|                       | Students With Disabilities | 69.3% | 73.8%  | NA     |
|                       | English Language Learners  | 40.7% | 29.3%  | NA     |



| Grade 8               |                            |       |        |        |
|-----------------------|----------------------------|-------|--------|--------|
| English Language Arts | Number/% Proficiency       | Fall  | Winter | Spring |
|                       | All Students               | 37%   | 44.1%  | 49.8%  |
|                       | Economically Disadvantaged | 25%   | 27.7%  | 29.2%  |
|                       | Students With Disabilities | 44.6% | 46.3%  | 48.1%  |
|                       | English Language Learners  | 0%    | 0%     | 0%     |
| Mathematics           | Number/% Proficiency       | Fall  | Winter | Spring |
|                       | All Students               | 66.9% | 71.5%  | NA     |
|                       | Economically Disadvantaged | 60.8% | 67.9%  | NA     |
|                       | Students With Disabilities | 77.2% | 71.3%  | NA     |
|                       | English Language Learners  | 60.8% | 48.7%  | NA     |
| Science               | Number/% Proficiency       | Fall  | Winter | Spring |
|                       | All Students               | 60.2% | 58.4%  | NA     |
|                       | Economically Disadvantaged | 47.6% | 47.5%  | NA     |
|                       | Students With Disabilities | 73.0% | 60.1%  | NA     |
|                       | English Language Learners  | 23%   | 24.1%  | NA     |

## 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                                       | 24       | 39     | 34          | 23        | 42      | 40           | 22       | 43      | 64        |                   |                     |
| ELL                                       | 47       | 56     | 42          | 43        | 52      | 51           | 34       | 54      | 73        |                   |                     |
| ASN                                       | 91       | 78     |             | 89        | 73      |              | 84       | 93      | 94        |                   |                     |
| BLK                                       | 51       | 51     | 43          | 41        | 46      | 41           | 33       | 67      | 84        |                   |                     |
| HSP                                       | 57       | 57     | 47          | 47        | 54      | 55           | 49       | 72      | 75        |                   |                     |
| MUL                                       | 68       | 67     | 27          | 58        | 57      | 41           | 53       | 83      | 91        |                   |                     |
| WHT                                       | 66       | 63     | 53          | 70        | 59      | 44           | 54       | 84      | 83        |                   |                     |
| FRL                                       | 49       | 54     | 46          | 41        | 48      | 42           | 39       | 65      | 73        |                   |                     |
| 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                                       | 18       | 44     | 44          | 27        | 48      | 43           | 25       | 58      |           |                   |                     |
| ELL                                       | 25       | 53     | 54          | 40        | 60      | 58           | 17       | 63      |           |                   |                     |

| 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                                       | 91       | 74     |             | 93        | 84      |              | 88       | 94      | 96        |                   |                     |
| BLK                                       | 50       | 47     | 46          | 55        | 56      | 39           | 45       | 80      | 86        |                   |                     |
| HSP                                       | 55       | 58     | 51          | 60        | 61      | 51           | 50       | 83      | 85        |                   |                     |
| MUL                                       | 66       | 57     | 30          | 67        | 68      | 58           | 78       | 100     | 88        |                   |                     |
| WHT                                       | 76       | 67     | 61          | 81        | 76      | 64           | 77       | 94      | 91        |                   |                     |
| FRL                                       | 48       | 50     | 48          | 52        | 57      | 49           | 43       | 82      | 78        |                   |                     |
| 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                                       | 14       | 42     | 43          | 21        | 50      | 50           | 11       | 56      |           |                   |                     |
| ELL                                       | 31       | 52     | 51          | 42        | 59      | 52           | 38       | 71      | 80        |                   |                     |
| ASN                                       | 82       | 77     | 71          | 89        | 91      | 80           | 55       | 100     | 97        |                   |                     |
| BLK                                       | 54       | 57     | 50          | 56        | 65      | 54           | 52       | 82      | 91        |                   |                     |
| HSP                                       | 53       | 59     | 56          | 58        | 66      | 54           | 44       | 82      | 80        |                   |                     |
| MUL                                       | 77       | 63     |             | 73        | 79      | 70           | 75       | 95      | 100       |                   |                     |
| WHT                                       | 78       | 68     | 61          | 82        | 81      | 75           | 75       | 87      | 93        |                   |                     |
| FRL                                       | 53       | 58     | 55          | 56        | 67      | 57           | 48       | 79      | 83        |                   |                     |

### 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  | 60  |
| 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 | 52  |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index                                       | 601 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index  | 10  |
| Percent Tested  | 93% |
| Subgroup Data   |     |
| Students With Disabilities  |     |
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities                                      | 38  |
| 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                                      | 50  |
| 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   | 86  |
| 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                                | 51  |
| 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  | 57  |
| 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   | 61  |
| 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   | 64  |
| 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                                | 51 |
| 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?

FSA Math & Reading (2021 vs. 2019)

##### READING

6th - 2021: 57% (district 51%) 243 tested 2019: 62% 294 tested

7th - 2021: 63% (district 47%) 314 tested 2019: 61% 257 tested

8th - 2021: 63% (district 50%) 283 tested 2019: 66% 290 tested

Trends: 6th down 5%, 7th up 3%, 8th down 3%, all grade levels excelling beyond district avg. by at least 6 points

Focus : Integration of Knowledge & Ideas (6th & 8th) and Key Ideas & Details (7th)

##### MATH

6th - 2021: 55% (district 42%) 245 tested 2019: 57% 297 tested

7th - 2021: 51% (district 29%) 293 tested 2019: 68% 237 tested

8th - 2021: 27% (district 42%) 148 tested 2019: 40% 98 tested

Trends: 6th down 2%, 7th down 17%, 8th down 13%

Focus: Statistics, Probability, & Numbers (8th), Functions (7th), Ratio Proportions (6th)

##### ALGEBRA 1 (2021 vs. 2019)

2021: 98% 146 tested

2019: 97% 186 tested

Trends: up 1%

Focus: Alg 1 Modeling

##### GEOMETRY (2021 vs. 2019)

2021: 100% 28 tested

2019: 100% 27 tested

Trends: 100% pass rate maintained

Focus: Properties with Equations

##### SCIENCE SSS (2021 vs. 2019)

8th SSS: 2021: 51% 277 tested 2019: 60% 288 tested

Trends: down 9%

Focus: Nature of Science

##### CIVICS EOC (2021 vs. 2019)

2021: 76% 291 tested

2019: 84% 341 tested

Trends: down 8%

**ACCESS FOR ELL (2021 vs. 2019)**

2021: 79% Developing Stage or higher, 71 tested

2019: 73% Developing Stage or higher, 51 tested

Trends: up 6%

Focus Area: Reading Proficiency

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

7th (down 17%) &amp; 8th grade (down 13%) Math FSA

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

Due to COVID-19 and the subsequent closure of schools that lead to remote learning and voluminous rounds of quarantines, teachers faced difficulty not only collecting data. Ensuring all students were able to receive equal amounts of quality instruction was made complicated and difficult during the 2020-2021 academic year. Between technical issues, excessive remote absences, and repeated quarantines, some students experienced large gaps in instruction which especially influenced their acquisition and mastery of course content as well as their performance on state tests.

To target the improvement area moving forward, teachers and instructional support staff will be continuously tracking data through formative, summative, and progress monitoring assessment. Additionally, teachers, admin, and instructional support staff will meet in their respective PLCs regularly to analyze data and create/share strategies and resources to triage areas in need of acceleration. Students will be looped in to their previous year's and current data through data chats every quarter. Level 1 students will be and are placed in specific intensive classes in both reading and math in order to provide tier 2 and 3 intervention.

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

7th (up 3%) grade ELA FSA and ACCESS for ELL (up 6%) proficiency

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

Contributing factors to these improvements were increased PLCs between coordinating ESOL and mainstream ELA teachers in addition to increased/rolling analysis of reading data from weekly Achieve 3000 practice/activities.

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

In the 2021-2022 academic year, Benito will increase the presence and implementation of student-led rigorous content with lessons possessing built-in remediation and continuous rolling assessment on the teacher end. Standards-based classroom objectives will be posted daily with specific and measurable goals for students to preview and engage in from the beginning to the end of class. Instructional staff will visibly provide support needed to accelerate content and each portion of daily lessons will engage in backwards design to accomplish the objective in cooperation with the Instructional Leadership Team.

Specific Strategies to be Used:

- Accountable Talk
- Chunking
- Frayer model

- Think-Aloud frame
- QHT

**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.**

The professional development opportunities offered on Benito's campus will be specifically related to operational mastery of the Instructional Planning Tool, data analysis tools on EdConnect, and the Educator Virtual Library resources available to teachers through the Hillsborough County School District. These professional development opportunities will be offered in coordination with the literacy coach, the media specialist, and the math SAL. Additionally, teachers will be provided with trainings on how to view and interpret the baseline data in SchoolCity identifying students' level of understanding of the standards (either mastery, proficiency, or approach/almost proficient). Lastly, teachers will access digital resources on Hillsborough County's instructional frameworks provided through their department's Canvas landing pages during individual planning and PLC time.

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

To ensure sustainability of improvement, the Literacy Coach will be pushing in to the classrooms of all academic subjects to support teachers and students in the major areas of comprehension and task analysis. Additionally, Benito will continue to host ELP during all quarters and FSA bootcamps, & Algebra bootcamps in the Spring 2022 semester to triage test preparation during the 2022 testing season.

### Part III: Planning for Improvement

#### Areas of Focus:

**#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Student Engagement**

|   |   |
|---|---|
| <b>Area of Focus</b>                              | This focus area of Student Engagement specifically relating to student ownership of learning was identified as a critical need based on the ELA and Math FSA 2021 data results.   |
| <b>Description and Rationale:</b>                 | Learning Gains points for bottom quartile students in ELA decreased from 51% in 2018-2019 to 46% in 2021-2022.<br>Learning Gains points for the bottom quartile students in Math decreased from 50% in 2018-2019 to 46% in 2021-2022.   |
| <b>Measurable Outcome:</b>                        | The percentage of Benito students making Learning Gains points for ELA will increase from 61% in 2020-2021 to >65% in 2021-2022.<br>The percentage of bottom quartile Benito students making Learning Gains points for ELA will increase from 46% in 2020-2021 to >55% in 2021-2022.<br>The percentage of Benito students making Learning Gains points for Math will increase from 57% in 2020-2021 to >65% in 2021-2022.<br>The percentage of bottom quartile Benito students making Learning Gains points for Math will increase from 46% in 2020-2021 to >55% in 2021-2022.<br>The achievement percentage of Benito students in Science will increase from 52% in 2020-2021 to >65% in 2021-2022.<br>The achievement percentage of Benito students in Social Studies will increase from 78% in 2020-2021 to >80% in 2021-2022. |
| <b>Monitoring:</b>                                | Focus area will be monitored through fully operational PLCs, IST meetings, and effective observation, walkthroughs, and feedback conferences.   |
| <b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome:</b> | John Sanders (john.sanders@hcps.net)  |
| <b>Evidence-based Strategy:</b>                   | Implementation and presence of think-pair-share, independent and collaborative small group learning, accountable talk debate and discussion, and AVID strategies such as Socratic Seminar.  |
| <b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:</b>     | In tradition, Bloom's Taxonomy cites creation and contribution as the highest level of learning. Decades later with consideration of the non-linear path learning takes, experts have created frameworks that outline the benefit of student-led learning. In Fisher et al.'s book "Engagement By Design" the authors outline the benefits of classrooms with strong rapport that pivot themselves on discussion. Their evidence suggests that student-led and discussion-based learning maximizes time in class and creates the most meaningful student connection to content.   |

**Action Steps to Implement**

1. PLCs will center around developing and sharing student engagement strategies. Each meeting centering student engagement activities will answer the following critical questions:
  1. What do we want all students to know and be able to do?
  2. How will we know when students have learned the concept?
  3. How will we respond when students do not learn?
  4. How will we extend the learning for students who are already proficient?
2. Teachers will regularly implement student-centered activities such as small group rotations, cooperative group and partner work, and accountable talk and debate.
3. Admin will observe teachers both formally in their observation cycles and informally through walkthroughs and informal observations to give specific feedback focusing on methods to increase and incentivize student ownership of learning during classroom lessons.

**Person  
Responsible** John Sanders (john.sanders@hcps.net)



**#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction**

|   |   |
|---|---|
| <b>Area of Focus</b>                              | This focus area Standards-aligned particularly relating to demonstration of learning through assessment was identified as a critical need based on the ELA and Math FSA 2021 data results.  |
| <b>Description and Rationale:</b>                 | Learning Gains points for bottom quartile students in ELA decreased from 51% in 2018-2019 to 46% in 2021-2022.<br>Learning Gains points for the bottom quartile students in Math decreased from 50% in 2018-2019 to 46% in 2021-2022.   |
| <b>Measurable Outcome:</b>                        | The percentage of Benito students making Learning Gains points for ELA will increase from 61% in 2020-2021 to >65% in 2021-2022.<br>The percentage of bottom quartile Benito students making Learning Gains points for ELA will increase from 46% in 2020-2021 to >55% in 2021-2022.<br>The percentage of Benito students making Learning Gains points for Math will increase from 57% in 2020-2021 to >65% in 2021-2022.<br>The percentage of bottom quartile Benito students making Learning Gains points for Math will increase from 46% in 2020-2021 to >55% in 2021-2022.<br>The achievement percentage of Benito students in Science will increase from 52% in 2020-2021 to >65% in 2021-2022.<br>The achievement percentage of Benito students in Social Studies will increase from 78% in 2020-2021 to >80% in 2021-2022. |
| <b>Monitoring:</b>                                | Focus area will be monitored through fully operational PLCs, progress monitoring per grade level and subject, FUSE and mainstream teacher collaboration/planning to monitor and serve Students with Disabilities, and effective observation, walkthroughs, and feedback conferences.  |
| <b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome:</b> | John Sanders (john.sanders@hcps.net)  |
| <b>Evidence-based Strategy:</b>                   | Employ the Four Principles of Excellent Instruction to align B.E.S.T. standards-based instruction with continuous assessment.   |
| <b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:</b>     | Evidence suggests that students are best able to assess their own learning when given clear expectations. Under the Four Principles of Excellent Instruction, the most successful form of learning is when teachers are able to equip students with the ability to articulate the quality and stage of their learning aka formatively assess themselves. Through the Four Principles of Excellent Instruction, students coupled with teachers are able to collect continuous data about their learning to assess the need for acceleration. Teachers can accomplish this by outlining each lesson's focus, coherence, and rigor through the B.E.S.T. Standards-based objective. Through this, students will have access to self-assessment and the highest yielding learning environment.   |

**Action Steps to Implement**

1. Teachers will design and post specific measurable and appropriately rigorous learning objectives that align with the content on a daily basis. They will refer to and reinforce them throughout the lesson day by day.
2. Teachers will provide clear step by step guides for procedural instructions regarding how to master the daily objective. The objective is clearly displayed and can be articulate by the students.
3. Teachers will engage in high order questioning and gradual release wherein students pose higher order questions.

4. Teachers will facilitate and students will engage in authentic, rich discussion that is student led.
5. Assessment will be visible and students will be able to identify and articulate their own mistakes.

**Person**  
**Responsible** John Sanders (john.sanders@hcps.net)

**#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Differentiation**

|   |   |
|---|---|
| <b>Area of Focus Description and Rationale:</b>   | <p>This focus area of Differentiation specifically, acceleration was identified as a critical need based on the ELA and Math FSA 2021 data results.</p> <p>Learning Gains points for bottom quartile students in ELA decreased from 51% in 2018-2019 to 46% in 2021-2022.</p> <p>Learning Gains points for the bottom quartile students in Math decreased from 50% in 2018-2019 to 46% in 2021-2022.</p>  |
| <b>Measurable Outcome:</b>                        | <p>The percentage of Benito students making Learning Gains points for ELA will increase from 61% in 2020-2021 to &gt;65% in 2021-2022.</p> <p>The percentage of bottom quartile Benito students making Learning Gains points for ELA will increase from 46% in 2020-2021 to &gt;55% in 2021-2022.</p> <p>The percentage of Benito students making Learning Gains points for Math will increase from 57% in 2020-2021 to &gt;65% in 2021-2022.</p> <p>The percentage of bottom quartile Benito students making Learning Gains points for Math will increase from 46% in 2020-2021 to &gt;55% in 2021-2022.</p> <p>The achievement percentage of Benito students in Science will increase from 52% in 2020-2021 to &gt;65% in 2021-2022.</p> <p>The achievement percentage of Benito students in Social Studies will increase from 78% in 2020-2021 to &gt;80% in 2021-2022.</p>  |
| <b>Monitoring:</b>                                | <p>Focus area will be monitored progress monitoring per grade level and subject, teacher formative assessment, ILT meetings, mainstream and ESE teacher collaboration and IEP planning to monitor growth of Students with Disabilities, and effective observation, walkthroughs, and feedback conferences.</p>  |
| <b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome:</b> | John Sanders (john.sanders@hcps.net)  |
| <b>Evidence-based Strategy:</b>                   | <p>Acceleration strategies such as chunking the text, think aloud, modified/pre-annotated texts and lessons, and brainstorm.</p>  |
| <b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:</b>     | <p>Based on the U.S. Department of Education's COVID-19 Handbook, acceleration provides the opportunity for the identification and elimination of unfinished learning. Acceleration provides the occasion for instructors to pause and identify the necessary reiteration of grade-level instruction without foregoing rigor. By dedicating time to spiraling back within lessons, major conceptual gaps are closed as they happen as opposed to addressed after they are created.</p> <p>Additionally, based on The New Teacher Project's (TNTP) research on acceleration, emerging data suggests that acceleration is favorable for student progress versus traditional remediation. Through acceleration, content is scaffolded so students have better access to level-appropriate tasks. As teachers identify unfinished learning through rolling data analysis there is immediate accommodation and differentiation that prevents the reverse effects of gaps in schooling due to the COVID-19 pandemic and other contributing factors such as poverty or ESE status.</p> |

**Action Steps to Implement**

1. Teachers will look for instances of incorrect work/responses and assess students' ability to verbalize their own mistakes.
2. Teachers will embed multiple methods of assessment in daily lessons either formative or summative.
3. Based on embedded assessments, students will be able to know and articulate if they mastered the standard of the objective and whether or not spiraling back is necessary.

4. PLCs will collaborate to identify opportunities for acceleration in lessons.
5. Teachers will implement embedded assessment and or bell work/warmup questions that build necessary acceleration skills.

**Person Responsible** John Sanders (john.sanders@hcps.net)

6. SALs/ILT, PLCs, and the literacy coach will collaborate to draft methods of effective assessment.

**Person Responsible** Fatima Stark (fatima.stark@hcps.net)

### 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 discipline data in comparison with the state, Benito's discipline rate is greater than the state average of 4.2 incidents per 100 students with 5.1 incidents per 100 students. Based on the discipline breakdown, the primary area of concern is violent discipline incidents such as fighting, physical attack, threat, or intimidation. Although Benito ranks mid to low within the district, the instance of such incidents is high in state comparison. The secondary area of concern is drug/public order incidents relating specifically to tobacco/vaping. Inversely from the violent incident statistics, Benito is ranked mid to high within the district, but mid to low within the state.**

**With this data in mind, Benito will continue to establish positive behavioral habits for students by communicating clear classroom and school-wide expectations through posters, assemblies, and verbal reinforcement of rules/policies. Additionally, Benito will continue to approach all behavioral incidents with student well-being at the center, making sure that each discipline action and consequence benefits both the student and the school community. Teachers will continue to use behavior tracker to monitor minor discipline infractions and communicate with families and stakeholders in an attempt to intervene before the escalation of a referral. Additionally, teachers and staff will continue to develop positive relationships with students on an individual level to increase student buy-in and positive contribution to school culture and environment.**

### 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.**

Benito establishes a system for effective and positive communication with stakeholders via the school website, the Parent Teacher Student Association or PTSA, Parent Link, Myspot, and the monthly newsletter. These communication methods are in addition to the instructional staff's regular communication with students and stakeholders through Canvas.

Additionally, Benito holds events that foster school community engagement wherein students, families /guardians, and other stakeholders are encouraged to attend and or participate. Examples of the events are as follows:

Open House

Quarterly Conference Nights

PSTA sponsored events

Chorus, Band, and Orchestra concerts

AVID events: annual talent show and university field trips

Black History Month speakers

Grade-Level incentives: field trips and honor roll celebrations

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

The student, teacher, staff, family/guardian, and community member stakeholders at Benito create a positive culture and environment on a daily basis through various commonly held practices.

All adults on campus assist to uphold school-wide rules and expectations through restorative behavioral practices and consistent and fair enforcement of rules. They fit the school culture and team because they are carefully selected for their roles to make students feel safe and welcome in the school community with their dispositions. Additionally, all instructional staff engage students with explicit daily standards-based class objectives, incentivized learning environments, and student-led learning that fosters student ownership of learning.

Benito students promote a positive school culture and environment through participating in class activities and taking ownership over their learning by engaging in higher order thinking and development in all academic subjects. Additionally, they abide by school policies in order to protect themselves and their peers. Students help maintain positive relationships by engaging with their teachers and peers positively in class and outside of school through involvement in extra-curricular activities such as sports, honor societies, tutoring, etc.

Benito families and guardians contribute to a positive school culture by communicating with their student(s) and school staff, engaging with staff to resolve issues and answer questions, and regularly volunteering their time to promote school development through fundraising, volunteering, and attending engaging events and extra-curricular activities.

The New Tampa and Benito-surrounding community stakeholders invest in the positive school environment by engaging in business partnerships with the school and donating to the school campus to maintain and beautify the campus.

**Part V: Budget**

**The approved budget does not reflect any amendments submitted for this project.**

|        |        |   |        |
|--------|--------|---|--------|
| 1      | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Student Engagement            | \$0.00 |
| 2      | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Standards-aligned Instruction | \$0.00 |
| 3      | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Differentiation               | \$0.00 |
| Total: |        |   | \$0.00 |