

Hillsborough County Public Schools

Madison 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	21
Budget to Support Goals	21

Madison Middle School

4444 W BAY VISTA AVE, Tampa, FL 33611

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: David Parker

Start Date for this Principal: 7/13/2021

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	Yes
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
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: C (51%) 2017-18: C (52%) 2016-17: C (50%)
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	21

Madison Middle School

4444 W BAY VISTA AVE, Tampa, FL 33611

[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	Yes	75%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	72%

School Grades History

Year	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18
Grade		C	C	C

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.

Madison Middle School will prepare students for life by ensuring an inclusive and safe learning environment, and connecting classroom experiences to the real-world with opportunities in Science, Technology, Engineering, Arts, and Math education.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Madison Middle School is committed to enhancing the academic and personal development of students by promoting a community of support, opportunities, and high expectations for all students and stakeholders.

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
Parker, David	Principal	Responsible for the overall operations of the school including but not limited to the School Improvement Plan.
Rogers, Trevor	Behavior Specialist	Responsible for monitoring outcomes and implementing strategies for students with two or more indicators on the Early Warning System. In addition, serves as a SAC member and Parent Family Engagement Coordinator.
Kamal, Lena	SAC Member	SAC Chair, Team Leader, and member of the School Improvement Team.
Snook, Trista	Reading Coach	Responsible for school-wide professional development, facilitating coaching cycles, overseeing the Reading department, and providing small-group interventions to students.
Paradiso, Nicole	Assistant Principal	Responsible for school-wide behavior systems, safety, discipline, athletics, and facilities.
Cordovi, Antonio	Assistant Principal	Responsible for curriculum and instruction, extended learning programs, assessments, and discipline.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Tuesday 7/13/2021, David Parker

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.*

5

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

29

Total number of students enrolled at the school

633

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

9

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

9

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	147	174	226	0	0	0	0	547
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	26	36	48	0	0	0	0	110
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	35	46	46	0	0	0	0	127
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

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

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

Monday 8/30/2021

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	211	221	211	0	0	0	0	643
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	29	15	0	0	0	0	62
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	1	0	0	0	0	6
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	45	55	47	0	0	0	0	147
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	58	60	48	0	0	0	0	166

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	2	0	0	0	0	0	3

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

2020-21 - Updated

The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:

Indicator	Grade Level														Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12		
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	211	221	211	0	0	0	0	643	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	29	15	0	0	0	0	62	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	1	0	0	0	0	6	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	45	55	47	0	0	0	0	147	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	58	60	48	0	0	0	0	166	

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	2	0	0	0	0	0	3

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data Review

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school, or combination schools).

School Grade Component	2021			2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement				46%	51%	54%	42%	52%	53%
ELA Learning Gains				51%	52%	54%	50%	53%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				37%	47%	47%	47%	48%	47%
Math Achievement				51%	55%	58%	46%	56%	58%
Math Learning Gains				56%	57%	57%	57%	59%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				41%	52%	51%	51%	52%	51%
Science Achievement				37%	47%	51%	37%	47%	52%
Social Studies Achievement				58%	67%	72%	56%	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	47%	53%	-6%	54%	-7%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2021					
	2019	45%	54%	-9%	52%	-7%
Cohort Comparison		-47%				
08	2021					
	2019	37%	53%	-16%	56%	-19%
Cohort Comparison		-45%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2021					
	2019	50%	49%	1%	55%	-5%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2021					
	2019	52%	62%	-10%	54%	-2%
Cohort Comparison		-50%				
08	2021					
	2019	26%	31%	-5%	46%	-20%
Cohort Comparison		-52%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2021					
	2019	35%	47%	-12%	48%	-13%
Cohort Comparison						

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019					
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	52%	67%	-15%	71%	-19%

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	89%	63%	26%	61%	28%
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	0%	57%	-57%	57%	-57%

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

For ELA, we used Achieve 3000 for progress monitoring and the percentages are based on number of students proficient based on Achieve 3000 assessments. For Math, Science, and Civics, we used the median scores on Hillsborough County Public School's Baseline and Mid-Year assessments rather than % of students proficient for progress monitoring.

Grade 6				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	19%	22%	22%
	Economically Disadvantaged	12%	15%	17%
	Students With Disabilities	26%	28%	29%
	English Language Learners	0%	0%	0%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	44%	28%	
	Economically Disadvantaged	36%	30%	
	Students With Disabilities	44%	31%	
	English Language Learners	24%	14%	

Grade 7				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	23%	24%	26%
	Economically Disadvantaged	13%	17%	19%
	Students With Disabilities	40%	35%	36%
	English Language Learners	0%	0%	0%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	42%	36%	
	Economically Disadvantaged	36%	27%	
	Students With Disabilities	55%	55%	
	English Language Learners	13%	10%	
Civics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	19%	28%	
	Economically Disadvantaged	19%	28%	
	Students With Disabilities	28%	28%	
	English Language Learners	1%	1%	

Grade 8				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	23%	25%	29%
	Economically Disadvantaged	18%	19%	24%
	Students With Disabilities	22%	19%	26%
	English Language Learners	0%	0%	6%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	43%	50%	
	Economically Disadvantaged	43%	49%	
	Students With Disabilities	48%	46%	
	English Language Learners	43%	23%	
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students	45%	46%	
	Economically Disadvantaged	42%	43%	
	Students With Disabilities	45%	39%	
	English Language Learners	19%	31%	

Subgroup Data Review

2021 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
SWD	14	34	33	17	29	30	6	29			
ELL	27	36	26	26	32	31	17	21			
ASN	81	73		79	56						
BLK	22	31	23	15	25	26	10	45	40		
HSP	41	43	35	33	30	28	30	47	40		
MUL	58	50		63	48			60			
WHT	69	61	23	71	54	29	62	75	70		
FRL	41	43	30	35	32	26	28	51	46		
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	15	37	33	15	29	23	8	20			
ELL	18	38	38	24	43	36	17	31			

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	79	79		88	83						
BLK	27	41	36	32	46	46	18	44			
HSP	39	46	31	45	53	39	28	55	76		
MUL	60	56		64	48						
WHT	66	63	59	70	66	47	61	69	92		
FRL	38	46	37	42	49	42	28	53	72		
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	29	47	45	25	44	47	21	35			
ELL	18	51	66	19	52	63	27	30			
ASN	60	61		75	61						
BLK	28	35	26	28	47	43	14	41			
HSP	36	49	55	37	52	53	32	46	73		
MUL	63	63		67	75						
WHT	62	62	91	72	72	64	63	82	97		
FRL	36	47	45	38	54	51	27	49	73		

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	43
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	5
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	41
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	434
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	83%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	24
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	29
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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	72
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	26
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	37
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	56
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	57
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	37
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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?

On the 2021 FSA, a nominal decrease in 6th and 7th grade ELA and Math achievement. However, 8th grade ELA and Math achievement increased by double-digits.

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

Our SWD, Black, and ELL students demonstrate the greatest need for improvement since these groups performed below the 41% threshold in all reporting categories on the FSA and on district progress monitoring assessments.

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

Lack of cultural relevant teaching strategies, student engagement, knowledge of students (data analysis), and Professional Learning Communities (PLCs). Implementing culturally relevant/high-interest content, professional development for student engagement, small-group learning/tutoring, and robust PLCs will generate improvement.

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

ELA and Math Achievement

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

Focus on accelerated learning, strategically scheduling students with teachers, and rigorous coursework aligned to state standards.

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

Establishing robust PLCs, identifying students to place in accelerated courses, offering opportunities to support students struggling with grade-level standards such as tutoring and adaptive computer learning modules.

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.

Differentiated instruction with grade-level standards, enhancing student engagement, and assessing student learning during instruction.

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

Purchasing supplemental support positions and curriculum, attending district trainings for acceleration, attending trainings for PLCs.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Professional Learning Communities

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Based on SOAR interviews (qualitative data) and ESSA subgroup data on FSA, it was determined that Professional Learning Communities were ineffective at our site.
Measurable Outcome:	We expect to see a 3-7% increase on the FSA in all reporting categories for our TS&I subgroups on the 2022 FSA.
Monitoring:	Administrators will attend weekly PLCs and monitor the implementation of the Inquiry Cycle (plan, do, check, act).
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	David Parker (david.parker@hcps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Inquiry Cycle (Marzano & DuFour)
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Research-based strategy used to improve student achievement.

Action Steps to Implement

Present school-wide data on 2019 & 2021 FSA

Person Responsible David Parker (david.parker@hcps.net)

Model PLC facilitation, and provide inquiry cycle and protocol resources for PLCs

Person Responsible David Parker (david.parker@hcps.net)

Provide on going feedback using the PLC/Inquiry Cycle rubric to Subject Area Leaders and teachers.

Person Responsible David Parker (david.parker@hcps.net)

Conduct weekly walkthroughs and provide feedback to teachers regarding PLC implementation plans and instructional priorities.

Person Responsible David Parker (david.parker@hcps.net)

On-going professional development on effective PLCs

Person Responsible Trista Snook (trista.snook@hcps.net)

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Black, Students with Disabilities (SWD), and Limited English Proficiency (LEP) students performed the lowest on the 2021 Math FSA and was identified as TS&I groups based on 2019 FSA data.

Measurable Outcome: We expect to see a 3-7% increase in all reporting categories for SWD, Black, and LEP students on the 2022 FSA.

Monitoring: We will monitor this area of focus by examining these ESSA subgroups' performance on district, classroom, and state assessments.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: David Parker (david.parker@hcps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Implement effective PLCs (Marzano & DuFour), use adaptive mathematics programs (Hattie, effect size .59), expose students to more reading for Math word problems (Hattie, effect size .43), and provide small-group instruction/tutoring.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Research on PLCs by Marzano and DuFour for Professional Learning Communities and John Hattie's Visible Learning Research.

Action Steps to Implement

Analyze ESSA subgroup data and share with the faculty and staff.

Person Responsible David Parker (david.parker@hcps.net)

Conduct a data analysis and "how-to" access student data professional development session in the beginning of the school year.

Person Responsible Trista Snook (trista.snook@hcps.net)

Share best teaching practices during PLCs.

Person Responsible Trista Snook (trista.snook@hcps.net)

Compare ESSA TS&I subgroups performance on common assessments during PLCs and provide interventions (small-group learning/individualized learning using adaptive computer programs-monitor growth,, and Lunch and Learns).

Person Responsible David Parker (david.parker@hcps.net)

Strategically schedule students with certain teachers, and ensure SWD are in the Least Restrictive Environment. Also, construct a master schedule to permit additional time for common planning (content) in addition to the two scheduled PLCs a month.

Person Responsible Antonio Cordovi (antonio.cordovi@hcps.net)

Incorporate high-interest/culturally relevant content to teach grade-level standards for Black and LEP students.

Person Responsible [no one identified]

Incorporate high-interest/culturally relevant content to teach grade-level standards for Black and LEP students.

Person Responsible [no one identified]

#3. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Social Emotional Learning

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Based on last years Social and Emotional Learning Panorama survey, there is a need to support student perception on campus related to school safety, self-efficacy, emotional regulation, school climate, and sense of belonging.

Measurable Outcome: Our goal is to increase favorability in all of the aforementioned areas by 10% on the Spring 2022 SEL Panorama survey; and, reduce incidents reported by 3.0 per 100 students according to the FL School Safety dashboard.

Monitoring: Quarterly and Semester student surveys.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Nicole Paradiso (nicole.paradiso@hcps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Second Step SEL lessons once a week, quarterly pep rallies and academic recognition, establishing a Climate and Culture team.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: John Hattie's research on Visible Learning (mindfulness .28 effects size; self-efficacy .71 effect size; positive self-concept .41 effect size; concentration, persistence, engagement .54 effect size).

Action Steps to Implement

Establish a Culture and Climate team to develop Tier 1 structures and systems (SEL, PBIS, school-wide expectations)

Person Responsible Nicole Paradiso (nicole.paradiso@hcps.net)

Analyze student discipline data biweekly; analyze SEL Panorama data at the end of semester 1 & 2, administer periodic student perception surveys.

Person Responsible David Parker (david.parker@hcps.net)

Schedule weekly SEL lessons school-wide using a research-based Second Step curriculum.

Person Responsible Nicole Paradiso (nicole.paradiso@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.

Madison MS incidents per 100 student is 9.7 per 100 students. The middle school state-wide average is 4.2 per 100 students. As a result, Madison MS will construct a Culture and Climate team that will develop consistent Tier 1 structures and systems (PBIS, SEL, school-wide expectations), monitor school-wide discipline data, and engage in MTSS/RTI discussions to ensure supports are in place to support student learning and behaviors. We expect a 3.0 per incident decrease per 100 students by the end of the 2021-2022 school year.

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.

Madison will implement weekly SEL lessons, establish a Climate and Culture team to monitor discipline data, and implement PBIS on campus. The Climate and Culture team will plan school-wide quarterly incentives based on our Key Performance Indicators (Attendance, Behavior, and Course Performance) and provide Second Step training (SEL curriculum) to teach emotional intelligence.

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

Nicole Paradiso (AP)- administrator overseeing the Climate and Culture Team and providing data analysis
Erin Saunders (Social Worker)- Climate and Culture leader on campus; responsible for forming a team to address areas of focus (student perception, discipline patterns, PBIS, Tier 1 systems)

David Parker (principal)- responsible for the overall climate and culture of the school, hiring highly-qualified teachers, establishing a professional development plan, and implementing policy and procedures on campus.

PTSA- will conduct fundraisers throughout the school year to support student incentives. In addition, members of the PTSA will contact community stakeholders to partner with Madison MS for Great American Teach-In and donations.

Parents- will implement strategies for Social Emotional Learning shared in the school's biweekly newsletters.

Trevor Rogers (Student Success Coach & Parent Family Engagement Coordinator)- will hold two Parent Nights during the school year to inform parents and celebrate student success.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Professional Learning Communities	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups	\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Social Emotional Learning	\$0.00
Total:			\$14,950.50