

Hillsborough County Public Schools

Coleman Middle School



2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	18
Positive Culture & Environment	19
Budget to Support Goals	20

Coleman Middle School

1724 S MANHATTAN AVE, Tampa, FL 33629

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Anthony Jones

Start Date for this Principal: 7/2/2021

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Middle School 6-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2020-21 Title I School	No
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	17%
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 (76%) 2017-18: A (75%) 2016-17: A (77%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	

* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, [click here](#).

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the 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.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	18
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	20

Coleman Middle School

1724 S MANHATTAN AVE, Tampa, FL 33629

[no web address on file]

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	18%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	28%

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 and the supports which enable each student to excel as a successful and 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
Pritchard, Odalys	Principal	School Leader, Campus Safety, Instructional Leader, Supervision, Community Liaison, Staff Management and Development
Seits, Theresa	Assistant Principal	Student Discipline, Curriculum, Supervision, Community Liaison, Staff Management and Development
Chisholm, Robert	Assistant Principal	Student Discipline, Curriculum, Supervision, Community Liaison, Staff Management and Development

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Friday 7/2/2021, Anthony Jones

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

5

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

12

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

59

Total number of students enrolled at the school

1,034

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

8

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

8

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	316	350	368	0	0	0	0	1034	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	5	13	0	0	0	0	32	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	21	0	0	0	0	24	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	0	0	0	0	6	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	3	0	0	0	0	6	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	18	15	0	0	0	0	47	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	24	19	20	0	0	0	0	63	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	4	

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

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

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	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	3	
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

Saturday 10/2/2021

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	331	349	339	0	0	0	0	1019	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	16	14	0	0	0	0	36	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	8	0	0	0	0	16	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	19	0	0	0	0	28	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	14	19	0	0	0	0	49	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	22	21	16	0	0	0	0	59	

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

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

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	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	2
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	331	349	339	0	0	0	0	1019	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	16	14	0	0	0	0	36	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	8	0	0	0	0	16	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	19	0	0	0	0	28	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	14	19	0	0	0	0	49	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	22	21	16	0	0	0	0	59	

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

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

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	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	2
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				82%	51%	54%	82%	52%	53%
ELA Learning Gains				66%	52%	54%	66%	53%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				56%	47%	47%	57%	48%	47%
Math Achievement				87%	55%	58%	86%	56%	58%
Math Learning Gains				74%	57%	57%	75%	59%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				67%	52%	51%	65%	52%	51%
Science Achievement				71%	47%	51%	71%	47%	52%
Social Studies Achievement				91%	67%	72%	87%	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	81%	53%	28%	54%	27%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2021					
	2019	82%	54%	28%	52%	30%
Cohort Comparison		-81%				
08	2021					
	2019	81%	53%	28%	56%	25%
Cohort Comparison		-82%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2021					
	2019	82%	49%	33%	55%	27%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2021					

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2019	89%	62%	27%	54%	35%
Cohort Comparison		-82%				
08	2021					
	2019	55%	31%	24%	46%	9%
Cohort Comparison		-89%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2021					
	2019	71%	47%	24%	48%	23%
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	91%	67%	24%	71%	20%
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	96%	63%	33%	61%	35%
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.

2021 FSA Results as disaggregated by HCPS accountability metrics.

Grade 6				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students			82
	Economically Disadvantaged			70
	Students With Disabilities			33
	English Language Learners			50
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students			83
	Economically Disadvantaged			72
	Students With Disabilities			39
	English Language Learners			25

Grade 7				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students			82
	Economically Disadvantaged			69
	Students With Disabilities			42
	English Language Learners			33
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students			41
	Economically Disadvantaged			67
	Students With Disabilities			44
	English Language Learners			33
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Civics	All Students			92
	Economically Disadvantaged			82
	Students With Disabilities			81
	English Language Learners			33

Grade 8				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students			78
	Economically Disadvantaged			66
	Students With Disabilities			38
	English Language Learners			50
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students			82
	Economically Disadvantaged			81
	Students With Disabilities			50
	English Language Learners			100
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students			71
	Economically Disadvantaged			63
	Students With Disabilities			19
	English Language Learners			25

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	39	39	42	46	53	47	19	82			
ELL	64	72	63	64	67	64	44	75	82		
ASN	86	63		94	81		64		100		
BLK	50	55	54	56	62	71		67			
HSP	68	63	53	78	76	68	63	89	87		
MUL	80	68	50	85	73	60	77	90	93		
WHT	83	61	55	87	78	65	76	94	91		
FRL	68	56	51	73	66	55	63	83	74		
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	44	42	33	48	49	56	41	54	69		
ELL	43	62	58	54	56	42					

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	88	58		97	82		67	73	100		
BLK	64	58		75	74	80	30				
HSP	70	60	56	76	66	59	64	86	82		
MUL	80	63	67	84	76		85	84	100		
WHT	85	68	57	89	75	66	74	93	88		
FRL	72	62	55	74	62	55	55	81	85		
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	41	48	40	46	50	47	29	50	56		
ELL	52	53	53	70	63	43		69			
ASN	90	70		90	78			100	100		
BLK	62	63	62	50	50	55					
HSP	62	56	48	77	73	63	42	71	78		
MUL	76	67		89	77	80	72	92	100		
WHT	86	68	59	89	77	67	77	91	90		
FRL	69	57	57	71	62	56	51	71	84		

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	78
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	100
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	778
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	96%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	46
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	

English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	70
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	81
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	59
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	72
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	75
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	77
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	65
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?

ELA Lowest Quartile Gains is our lowest performing area (54%). This is consistent with prior year data (57%), continuing a 4 year trend.

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

ELA Learning Gains fell from 66% in 2019 to 61%. ELA Lowest 25% Learning Gains also fell from 57% in 2018 to 54% continuing a decline over the last four years.

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

Contributing factors were related to challenges to providing instruction for our struggling students within a remote learning (eLearning) environment. Attendance during eLearning was also a factor. Individualized and small group instruction in a face-to-face environment will help to provide the acceleration and support necessary to help students make learning gains.

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

We gained another achievement point in Social Studies Achievement continuing the upward trend from 87% in 2018 to 92% in 2021 (+5%). Algebra EOC scores increased from 96% to 100%.

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

New teachers were added in 2018 with extensive knowledge of teaching civics and increased knowledge of students through schoolwide data analysis and assessment item analysis.

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

Close analysis of learning gaps for targeted scaffolding during lessons. Focused PD based on teacher input, administrative observations and data indicators. PLCs using student work to identify, plan and tailor lessons to student learning needs.

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.

Weekly Professional Learning Mondays tailored specifically to school needs. Monthly subject area PLCs to analyze formative data, monitor student progress and collaborate around best practices for student achievement.

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

Increased proficiency in small group instruction and co-teaching support. Consistent scheduling and communication of expectations. Regular classroom visits with feedback to teachers.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Differentiation

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Differentiation, including small group instruction, can positively impact our learning gain and sub-group data.

Measurable Outcome: ELA BQ gains will increase from 54% to 60%.

Monitoring: Progress monitoring benchmarks

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Odalys Pritchard (odalys.pritchard@hcps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Small group learning
Teacher Clarity
Teacher knowledge of students

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Small group learning has an effect size of .47 in Hattie's visible learning research. It is also part of our new instruction frameworks in HCPS. Teacher Clarity has an effect size of .75. Teacher clarity refers to students being clear about what they are learning, why the learning is important and how they will be assessed on their learning. Teacher knowledge of students or "teacher estimates of achievement." This reflects the accuracy of an individual teacher's knowledge of students in his or her classes and how that knowledge determines the kind of classroom activities and material, as well as the difficulty of the tasks, are assigned.

Action Steps to Implement

Meet with ILT to discuss strategies, determine specific next steps, professional learning opportunities, and progress monitoring benchmarks.

Person Responsible: Odalys Pritchard (odalys.pritchard@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.

Discipline data remains low compared to the district and state. Attendance, tardies and suspensions will continue to be monitored by administration and support staff. Students showing multiple indicators and targeted interventions will be closely monitored and discussed during weekly MTSS meetings,

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.

Weekly "Coleman Cobra Connection" to staff by Principal with updates, motivational messages and Professional Learning.
Instructional Leadership Team to support teaching and learning at CMS
Development of Tier 1 system for student expectations and positive behavior based on COBRA acronym
Student incentives program and opportunities (honor roll, spirit days, etc)
Student clubs (Robotics, Girls who Code and more)
AVID included as elective to promote student voice and achieve academic potential
PTSA and multiple business partners/sponsors, monthly PTSA newsletter
SAC Committee

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

Principal - Weekly "Coleman Cobra Connection" to staff and regular parentlink communication to parents.
PTSA - provides input and support regarding students events, beautification and school FUN. (Positive Family/Home Dynamics effect size .52)
ILT - provides expertise and voice for instructional excellence (Collective Teacher Efficacy effect size 1.5)
SLT - provides common goal planning and problem solving (Collective Teacher Efficacy effect size 1.5)
MTSS - provides identification, interventions and progress monitoring for student need/concerns (RTI effect size 1.9)
Students Clubs and Organizations (Special Programs effect size .38)
Sunshine Committee- plans events for faculty and staff both inside and outside of school
Buddies Club (Gen Ed & SWD)

- Open House
- SAC/PTA
- Newsletter/Websites/Edsby/Marque
- Parent Link/Remind (phone text system)
- Conference Nights
- Volunteer Orientation/Recognition
- Committee Events
- Great American Teach In
- Ongoing Community Partnerships
- Volunteer Program

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Differentiation	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00