

Hillsborough County Public Schools

Mann 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	20
Budget to Support Goals	20

Mann Middle School

409 E JERSEY AVE, Brandon, FL 33510

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Brad Brooks

Start Date for this Principal: 7/29/2021

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* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students* White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: C (47%) 2017-18: C (49%) 2016-17: C (52%)
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

Mann Middle School

409 E JERSEY AVE, Brandon, FL 33510

[no web address on file]

School Demographics

<p>School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Middle School 6-8</p>	<p>2020-21 Title I School</p> <p>Yes</p>	<p>2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p>76%</p>
<p>Primary Service Type (per MSID File)</p> <p>K-12 General Education</p>	<p>Charter School</p> <p>No</p>	<p>2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p>67%</p>

School Grades History

	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18
Year				
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.

At Horace Mann Middle School, our mission is to empower the student with the essential tools to become a responsible and contributing member of the community.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Preparing Student's 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
Jones, Dante	Principal	Progress Monitoring, walkthroughs,
Scaglione, Nina	Instructional Coach	Data Driven PLCs, coaching for standards based lesson planning
Dewsbury, Nicolette	Instructional Media	SAC Chair, supplying diverse materials to meet student needs.
Schlosser, Sarah	Teacher, K-12	Facilitating PDs, analyzing data related to math performance and SAC member.
Perez, FrancesL	Assistant Principal	AP of Facilities, runs problem solving leadership team, and will keep track of discipline data/early warning signs
Pfeffer, Jason	Assistant Principal	AP of Curriculum, manages ILT, and SALs, analyzes data on performance and acceleration
Yates, Kathleen	Science Coach	Coaches Science Teachers on best practices for acceleration,

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Thursday 7/29/2021, Brad Brooks

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.*

44

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.*

6

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

55

Total number of students enrolled at the school

712

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

6

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

6

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	229	218	251	0	0	0	0	698
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	62	77	99	0	0	0	0	238
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	41	49	0	0	0	0	91
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	41	56	87	0	0	0	0	184
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	82	80	86	0	0	0	0	248
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	41	42	52	0	0	0	0	135

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	23	24	0	0	0	0	47

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	4	6	8	0	0	0	0	18
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	105	85	0	0	0	0	0	190

Date this data was collected or last updated

Friday 8/13/2021

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	259	198	290	0	0	0	0	747
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	91	82	115	0	0	0	0	288
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	7	10	0	0	0	0	30
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	53	64	0	0	0	0	118
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	53	64	0	0	0	0	118
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	72	51	72	0	0	0	0	195
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	90	57	79	0	0	0	0	226

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	7	5	7	0	0	0	0	19

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	2	0	0	0	0	2
Students retained two or more times	0	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	259	198	290	0	0	0	0	747
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	91	82	115	0	0	0	0	288
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	7	10	0	0	0	0	30
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	53	64	0	0	0	0	118
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	53	64	0	0	0	0	118
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	72	51	72	0	0	0	0	195
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	90	57	79	0	0	0	0	226

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	7	5	7	0	0	0	0	19

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	2	0	0	0	0	2
Students retained two or more times	0	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				43%	51%	54%	43%	52%	53%
ELA Learning Gains				46%	52%	54%	47%	53%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				41%	47%	47%	39%	48%	47%
Math Achievement				42%	55%	58%	49%	56%	58%
Math Learning Gains				46%	57%	57%	52%	59%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				44%	52%	51%	32%	52%	51%
Science Achievement				28%	47%	51%	38%	47%	52%
Social Studies Achievement				60%	67%	72%	64%	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	45%	53%	-8%	54%	-9%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2021					
	2019	41%	54%	-13%	52%	-11%
Cohort Comparison		-45%				
08	2021					
	2019	39%	53%	-14%	56%	-17%
Cohort Comparison		-41%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2021					
	2019	33%	49%	-16%	55%	-22%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2021					
	2019	48%	62%	-14%	54%	-6%
Cohort Comparison		-33%				
08	2021					
	2019	11%	31%	-20%	46%	-35%
Cohort Comparison		-48%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2021					
	2019	26%	47%	-21%	48%	-22%
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	57%	67%	-10%	71%	-14%

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	74%	63%	11%	61%	13%
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.

Each Grade level and subject level will use baseline, midyears, and semester exams to progress monitor students. Social studies used baseline and midyear assessments designed by the district to progress monitor Civics students. Math used baseline and then form 1 in January. Last years ELA progress monitoring was done using Achieve Data. Science used Form 1 and Form 2, and then the 8th grade FSSA.

Grade 6				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	16	17	19
	Economically Disadvantaged	13	14	16
	Students With Disabilities	13	14	14
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	36.5	52.94	
	Economically Disadvantaged	36.5	51.27	
	Students With Disabilities	21	40.28	
	English Language Learners	7.4	31.04	

Grade 7				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	17	20	23
	Economically Disadvantaged	12	14	18
	Students With Disabilities	26	30	34
	English Language Learners	8	11	10
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	30.7	56.77	
	Economically Disadvantaged	30.7	48.68	
	Students With Disabilities	27.9	61.03	
	English Language Learners	15.2	26.10	
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Civics	All Students	32.8	44.15	
	Economically Disadvantaged	32.8	40.8	
	Students With Disabilities	55.8	50.60	
	English Language Learners	8.4	27.55	
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring

Grade 8				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	20	25	30
	Economically Disadvantaged	16	20.4	25
	Students With Disabilities	23	26	28
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	47	41	
	Economically Disadvantaged	43.4	40.99	
	Students With Disabilities	43.4	25.4	
	English Language Learners	43.4	30.58	
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students	34.5	43.19	24
	Economically Disadvantaged	25.5	39.78	
	Students With Disabilities	27.5	35.38	
	English Language Learners	15.8	32.02	

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	13	27	24	16	25	30	9	18			
ELL	21	35	35	15	18	28	14	38			
BLK	21	35	38	20	25	29	17	40	75		
HSP	36	38	32	31	32	35	26	39	69		
MUL	40	45		39	35		33				
WHT	41	41	30	38	37	39	24	61	70		
FRL	31	37	33	28	32	33	21	42	71		
2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	19	34	35	23	44	44	4	40			
ELL	20	38	33	25	38	49	18	41			
ASN	73	67		67	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
BLK	29	37	34	24	38	41	20	36	53		
HSP	42	45	34	43	48	41	26	61	76		
MUL	35	45		42	37		20	65			
WHT	50	50	52	49	50	52	33	70	72		
FRL	38	43	41	37	44	42	25	57	67		
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	16	37	35	26	40	32	20	51			
ELL	22	36	35	36	49	37	21	42			
ASN	62	57		79	81		67		91		
BLK	29	41	45	31	40	26	18	51	72		
HSP	40	47	39	50	50	34	43	57	86		
MUL	35	31	20	36	41	17	54	73			
WHT	52	52	37	55	58	37	39	75	71		
FRL	39	44	37	43	47	31	34	60	77		

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	39
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	YES
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	6
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	42
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	390
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	93%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	20
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	27

English Language Learners	
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	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	33
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	39
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	38
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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	42
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?

We declined in all areas, across math, reading, science and civics. The only upward trend was Algebra I which increased by 5 points.

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

Science and Math demonstrate the greatest discrepancy from Mann's scores to the district. Those subjects have also experienced the most decline over multiple 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?

Science experienced personnel fluctuations for the last three years which impacted their basic knowledge of scientific content from 6th and 7th grade. We also experienced high absenteeism due to the effects of the pandemic. We started the 60% elearning and continued with at least 40% by the end of the year, this trend led to a lack of connection between students and standards. Students were unsuccessful in elearning.

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

Algebra I EOC scores increased by over 5 points. This is the only subject area where we experienced an increase.

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

We had stable staffing with teachers who experienced little to no absences and engaged in common planning and were standards aligned. Our Algebra I/Math SAL conducted Lunch and learns all year helping struggling students to accelerate. We had multiple weekend boot camps for acceleration and EOC prep.

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

ESE facilitation will be changed to incorporate small group pull outs across math content areas. A Part-time Science Coach was purchased to work with struggling Science teachers, and conduct pullout groups for student acceleration. Our Reading Instructional Coach will be working with all subject areas to include more reading strategies through core curriculum instruction.

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.

PD will be provided on the instructional frameworks for differentiation

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

A success coach is working with our bottom quartile students to ensure student growth and acceleration.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: We know that our students have been out of physical school for 5 months or longer in many cases, and there will be learning deficiencies as well as social emotional needs. We will use the baseline assessment to discover any standard and content deficiencies, that will enable us to plan for interventions, acceleration, and extension.

Measurable Outcome: EWS will decrease by 10% in attendance and course failures.
3% gains in Science, ELA, and Math.

Monitoring: Science will use their progress monitoring assessments (2 a quarter)
ELA will use compare their baseline scores to the semester exams, and writing midyear.
Math will use their progress monitoring assessments.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Dante Jones (dante.jones@hcps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Common Assessments, and focus on the instructional frameworks
Vertical planning and cross curricular planning between Reading and Language Arts.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: School wide focus on multiple data points will improve student performance. According to Shirley Hord when "learning community members are accountable to one another to achieve the shared goals of the school and school system and work in transparent, authentic settings that support their improvement it strengthens their practice and increase student results."

Action Steps to Implement

- 1.) PLCS will use standards aligned data chats to close learning gaps
- 2.) Science Coach will be facilitating Science PLCS and pulling data from progress monitoring assessments, and pulling bottom quartile for acceleration
- 3.) Reading Instructional Coach will monitor students not in reading through common assessments and target for pull out groups for acceleration.

Person Responsible: Dante Jones (dante.jones@hcps.net)

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

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Close the achievement gap concerning under performing subgroups, including ELL, ESE, and African American.

Measurable Outcome: We will increase our subgroups Federal Index by 3% in order to progress to achieving the state goal of 41%

Monitoring: Disaggregate progress monitoring assessment data based on ESSA categories to go over in ILT and to guide formation of groups to focus on Frameworks C

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Dante Jones (dante.jones@hcps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Extended learning opportunities and breakout groups
Standards aligned teaching strategies
Initiating a RTI/MTSS Tier 2 and Tier 3 process and progress monitoring for efficacy

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Response to intervention has the highest effect sizes as we learned in our book study last year on Visible Learning. We currently have not been doing much RTI, creating an RTI program and using it with fidelity along with extended learning opportunities provides the most opportunity for growth. Our teachers also need to be educated in culturally responsive teaching in order to better meet our subgroups needs.

Action Steps to Implement

- 1) Targeted invitations to subgroup members for ELP and Subject Area bootcamps
- 2.) Classroom materials will be tailored to our subgroups for diversity and inclusion.
- 3.) Common assessments will be reviewed in ILT with attention to subgroups for learning gaps
- 4.) Professional development on Implied Bias
- 5.) Success Coach will target 125 bottom quartile students for pull out groups and acceleration planning.

Person Responsible: Dante Jones (dante.jones@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.

Mann is ranked 402 out of 553 for middle schools state wide. Our highest category is property incidents. If you track our data though, there has been a decline in OSS as we try to mitigate out of school time for our students in light of the large learning loss as a result of the pandemic itself. (Reword) Our primary AP has recently found another job so we will be hiring a new assistant principal. We will also be working with our Success Coach and ESE Specialist to create an RTI process to have better intervention with our students before they get to the referral part of the discipline hierarchy. This committee will monitor our discipline numbers and discuss ongoing trends and concerns in our monthly PSLT meeting for mitigation purposes.

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.

We will continue to use our SEL coordinator Jill Adair to help push and encourage teachers to build a positive relationship with students and parents through SEL and particularly the 7 mindsets. TELL survey results and PFE (No TELL or PFE - we used Panorama) survey results are used to plan engaging programs that help to meet parents and student needs. SAC Chair and Title One coordinator will collaborate with the AVID coordinator on engaging Family Nights including the Fall Family Night, AVID college night, Camp Raider (incoming 6th graders), and a Reading Family Night. These programs will help parents with strategies for student and parent success. Field trips are conducted through AVID, band, intensive reading and science that include college visits, and DISNEY educational programs. (one period). We have set up a food pantry in collaboration with ECHO as well as continuing community partnerships with the Tampa Bay Lightning, Caspers (Mcdonalds), First Tee, and CVS.

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

AP Frances Perez and Jill Adair are co-chairing the 7 mindsets committee
 Media Specialist Nicolette Dewsbury, SAC chair, Family Night committee
 Science Coach Ms. Yates
 Reading Coach/Title I Parent and Family Engagement Liaison Nina Scaglione

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Standards-aligned Instruction	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00