

Hillsborough County Public Schools

Mclane Middle School



2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

| | |
|---|-----------|
| School Demographics | 3 |
| Purpose and Outline of the SIP | 4 |
| School Information | 7 |
| Needs Assessment | 11 |
| Planning for Improvement | 19 |
| Positive Culture & Environment | 23 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 24 |

Mclane Middle School

306 N KNIGHTS AVE, Brandon, FL 33510

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Keisha Thompson

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 Asian Students Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students* White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students |
| School Grades History | 2018-19: C (41%) 2017-18: C (43%) 2016-17: D (34%) |
| 2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information* | |
| SI Region | Central |
| Regional Executive Director | Lucinda Thompson |
| Turnaround Option/Cycle | N/A |
| Year | N/A |
| Support Tier | N/A |
| 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 | 11 |
| Planning for Improvement | 19 |
| Title I Requirements | 0 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 24 |

Mclane Middle School

306 N KNIGHTS AVE, Brandon, FL 33510

[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 | 84% |
| Primary Service Type (per MSID File) | Charter School | 2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2) |
| K-12 General Education | No | 86% |

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.

All stakeholders will foster a collaborative culture to build a community of accountable critical thinkers to be successful members of society.

Provide the school's vision statement.

To build relationships through trust and mutual respect, with all stakeholders, in order to foster academic and emotional success for all students.

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 |
|-------------------|---------------------|--|
| Smith, Erin | Psychologist | <p>Provides comprehensive psychological services for students experiencing learning and behavioral problems and for students exhibiting high-level abilities and talents.</p> <p>Provides comprehensive psychological services which include formal and informal assessment, counseling and assist behavior management,</p> |
| Colston, Tonya | Assistant Principal | <p>In charge of 6thth grade discipline and 8th grade discipline M-Z. Oversees the Science and ESE departments and science and social studies teacher observations and evaluations.</p> <p>Responsible for bringing feedback and input from respective teachers to the leadership team.</p> <p>Creates school wide systems and procedures</p> <p>Provides feedback to teachers concerning best teaching practices. With the team, collaboratively uses data from state and district assessments and reports to help plan and implement professional development for school improvement.</p> |
| Mattison, Timothy | Assistant Principal | <p>In charge of 7th grade discipline and 8th Grade discipline A-L.</p> <p>Oversees Literacy and Social Studies departments.</p> <p>Responsible for bringing feedback and input from respective teachers to the leadership team.</p> <p>Creates the Master Schedule and testing schedule</p> <p>Provides feedback to teachers concerning best teaching practices. With the team, collaboratively uses data from state and district assessments and reports to help plan and implement professional development for school improvement.</p> |
| Glenn, Brandon | Principal | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Instructional Leader for curriculum, instruction and assessments - provide strategic direction in the school, Safety and Supervision, assess teaching and learning, monitor scholar achievement - lead parent involvement efforts -hire and retain staff, develop budgets, evaluate staff and -manage facilities for learning |
| Kemp, Donna | Math Coach | <p>Assist all Math teachers helping them to strengthen instructional practices that will yield higher student outcomes; leads and facilitates content focused PLCs and professional learning opportunities; work with struggling students to improve standards proficiency.</p> |

| Name | Position Title | Job Duties and Responsibilities |
|-------------------|----------------|--|
| Ravenel, Kristina | SAC Member | - Helps to create SIP plan by involving all stake holders, using data to help drive decision making and collaborating with our business partners and volunteers in the communities that Mclane serves. |

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Thursday 7/29/2021, Keisha Thompson

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.*

1

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.*

10

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

37

Total number of students enrolled at the school

816

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

17

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

19

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 | 282 | 255 | 270 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 807 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 145 | 106 | 129 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 380 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 15 | 15 | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 48 |
| 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 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 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 | 13 | 12 | 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 41 |

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 | |

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 8/19/2021

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 | 276 | 212 | 257 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 745 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 129 | 100 | 83 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 312 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 18 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 32 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 26 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 90 | 69 | 88 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 247 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 98 | 73 | 99 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 270 |

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 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 |

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 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | |
| 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 | 276 | 212 | 257 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 745 | |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 129 | 100 | 83 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 312 | |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 22 | 47 | 60 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 129 | |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 18 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 32 | |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 26 | |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 90 | 69 | 88 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 247 | |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 98 | 73 | 99 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 270 | |

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 | 12 | 39 | 42 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 93 | |

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 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | |
| 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 | | | | 29% | 51% | 54% | 29% | 52% | 53% |
| ELA Learning Gains | | | | 43% | 52% | 54% | 39% | 53% | 54% |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | 43% | 47% | 47% | 43% | 48% | 47% |
| Math Achievement | | | | 29% | 55% | 58% | 32% | 56% | 58% |
| Math Learning Gains | | | | 40% | 57% | 57% | 49% | 59% | 57% |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | 45% | 52% | 51% | 53% | 52% | 51% |
| Science Achievement | | | | 26% | 47% | 51% | 31% | 47% | 52% |
| Social Studies Achievement | | | | 47% | 67% | 72% | 38% | 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 | 22% | 53% | -31% | 54% | -32% |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 07 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 28% | 54% | -26% | 52% | -24% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -22% | | | | |
| 08 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 27% | 53% | -26% | 56% | -29% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -28% | | | | |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 06 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 18% | 49% | -31% | 55% | -37% |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 07 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 34% | 62% | -28% | 54% | -20% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -18% | | | | |
| 08 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 18% | 31% | -13% | 46% | -28% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -34% | | | | |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 08 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 23% | 47% | -24% | 48% | -25% |
| 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 | 44% | 67% | -23% | 71% | -27% |
| 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 | 65% | 63% | 2% | 61% | 4% |
| GEOMETRY EOC | | | | | |
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2021 | | | | | |
| 2019 | | | | | |

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

State Assessments, District Assessment, Bench Mark Testing and Comment Assessments

| Grade 6 | | | | |
|-----------------------|----------------------------|-------|--------|--------|
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| English Language Arts | All Students | 6.25 | 5.88 | 5.56 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 6.25 | 5.88 | 5.56 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 25 | 40 | 20 |
| | English Language Learners | 33 | 33 | 33 |
| | | | | |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Mathematics | All Students | 29 | 31 | 25 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 27 | 29 | 28 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 39 | 33 | 35 |
| | English Language Learners | 20 | 52 | 0 |
| | | | | |
| Grade 7 | | | | |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| English Language Arts | All Students | 11.76 | 7.4 | 9.17 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 6.59 | 5.89 | 5.60 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | English Language Learners | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | | | | |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Mathematics | All Students | 14 | 13 | 13 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 19.70 | 26.10 | 20 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 0 | 26.10 | 0 |
| | English Language Learners | 19.70 | 26.10 | 0 |
| | | | | |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Civics | All Students | 32.80 | 34.26 | 28 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 32.80 | 30.90 | 28 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 25.20 | 22.39 | 20 |
| | English Language Learners | 25.20 | 34.26 | 20 |
| | | | | |

| Grade 8 | | | | |
|-----------------------|----------------------------|-------|--------|--------|
| English Language Arts | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 10.85 | 10.6 | 15.35 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| | English Language Learners | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| Mathematics | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 48.10 | 27.99 | 0 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 43.40 | 30.58 | 0 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 25.40 | 29.29 | 0 |
| | English Language Learners | 0 | 30.58 | 0 |
| Science | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 33.35 | 31.98 | 0 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 31 | 28.81 | 0 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 16.10 | 12.85 | 0 |
| | English Language Learners | 17.10 | 32.14 | 0 |

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 | 5 | 16 | 9 | 7 | 31 | 31 | 4 | 19 | | | |
| ELL | 15 | 35 | 28 | 23 | 36 | 32 | 8 | 42 | | | |
| ASN | 25 | 55 | | 62 | 67 | | | | | | |
| BLK | 12 | 24 | 30 | 10 | 24 | 34 | 14 | 30 | 50 | | |
| HSP | 20 | 33 | 27 | 25 | 37 | 32 | 15 | 43 | 40 | | |
| MUL | 31 | 31 | | 25 | 31 | | | | | | |
| WHT | 46 | 44 | | 42 | 45 | | 41 | 65 | 85 | | |
| FRL | 18 | 30 | 30 | 18 | 29 | 33 | 17 | 36 | 47 | | |
| 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 | 11 | 47 | 50 | 11 | 38 | 46 | 5 | 20 | | | |
| ELL | 17 | 33 | 35 | 29 | 57 | 57 | 13 | 50 | | | |

| 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 | 50 | 67 | | 71 | 47 | | | | | | |
| BLK | 18 | 40 | 43 | 16 | 30 | 35 | 13 | 35 | 59 | | |
| HSP | 32 | 43 | 43 | 33 | 51 | 65 | 30 | 52 | 68 | | |
| MUL | 41 | 52 | | 42 | 31 | | 36 | | | | |
| WHT | 45 | 45 | 36 | 46 | 50 | 56 | 52 | 58 | 74 | | |
| FRL | 25 | 41 | 41 | 27 | 39 | 43 | 22 | 44 | 70 | | |
| 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 | 9 | 17 | 26 | 13 | 36 | 44 | 21 | 20 | | | |
| ELL | 11 | 41 | 48 | 22 | 51 | 48 | 11 | 33 | | | |
| ASN | | 50 | | | 70 | | | | | | |
| BLK | 19 | 35 | 41 | 21 | 42 | 58 | 20 | 28 | 63 | | |
| HSP | 32 | 40 | 48 | 32 | 50 | 43 | 29 | 45 | 83 | | |
| MUL | 47 | 38 | | 53 | 71 | | | 46 | | | |
| WHT | 46 | 48 | 43 | 53 | 62 | 57 | 62 | 50 | 72 | | |
| FRL | 28 | 39 | 45 | 30 | 49 | 55 | 30 | 36 | 74 | | |

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 | 33 |
| 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 | 46 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 334 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 10 |
| Percent Tested | 80% |
| Subgroup Data | |
| Students With Disabilities | |
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities | 15 |
| 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 | 52 |
| 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 | 25 |
| 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 | 31 |
| 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 | 30 |
| 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 | 53 |
| 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 | 30 |
| 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?

Our students with disabilities, Bottom Quartile and ELL students continue to demonstrate the lowest proficiency rates across grade levels, subgroups, and content levels.

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

Our SWD, bottom quartile and ELL data (all content areas) demonstrate the greatest need for improvement

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

The lack of specific professional development focused around writing, and math as well as culturally relevant teaching were lacking. Several teacher and leadership vacancies.

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

Civics data was showing gains in multiple assessments. Exam data for science was also above district, but our other school assessments showed inconsistency. Civics however, had strong planning and progress monitoring with teachers using standard based activities on a daily basis and looping content to keep previous content benchmarks current with students.

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

Teachers used interactive notebooks to guide student learning and help prepare for Civics EOC along with USA Prep materials. Civics tutoring was offered and personalized for students based on their needs.

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

Progress monitoring with immediate feedback and follow through need to be implemented with fidelity to accelerate the learning

Based on the contributing factors and strategies identified to accelerate learning, describe the professional development opportunities that will be provided at the school to support teachers and leaders.

Teachers will be trained on Literacy best practices and a literacy strategy of the month to implement.

Teachers will be provided professional development on the new BEST standards through site-based PD days and bi-weekly PLCs.

Teachers will be provided professional development on using data analysis to create, implement, monitor, and revise engaging and equitable lesson plans for all students.

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

We will collaborate with our teachers, families, and community members to provide monthly updates on school goals and action steps for achieving them.

Full fidelity Tier 2 and Common planning PLCs bi-weekly

Inquiry based culturally responsive tasks and strategies in all classes weekly.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

| | |
|---|---|
| Area of Focus Description and Rationale: | Teachers will continue to grow in planning to the depth of the standard and improve task alignment and progress monitoring student work. Student data will be the focal point of driving instruction. |
| Measurable Outcome: | ELA will increase learning gains by 20%. We will target all of our Tier 2 and Tier 3 students. Those students will be pulled for acceleration, writing boot campus and additional support in ELA. |
| Monitoring: | Monitoring will also occur through a combination of classroom observations, progress monitoring assessments (unit and cycle), data chats with admin and teachers, and engagement in collaborative planning and PLCs. |
| Person responsible for monitoring outcome: | [no one identified] |
| Evidence-based Strategy: | Data will be used during PLC's to ensure consistent review of student work and data. Weekly classroom visits to provide feedback to teachers. We are working on student scales and our classroom culture by ongoing PD on PBIS and CCEIS. |
| Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: | Teachers need time to reflect on their practice and collaborate with others on improvement. There needs to be celebration on successes to build on what they do right with small adjustments on improving their craft. |

Action Steps to Implement

As a whole our campus is working to increase fidelity and effectiveness of Tier 1 instructional practices by using walkthrough data to coach teachers and to assess professional development needs. Our Instructional Leadership Team (ILT) is helping to revamp our Professional Learning Communities (PLCs) by relying on data-based decision making and problem-solving processes. The Teacher Talent Developers (TDDs) are working with teacher teams to assist with lesson planning, student engagement and task alignment. This will be for our economically disadvantage group as well as our multiracial subgroups. We will continue to progress monitor and track

Person Responsible Timothy Mattison (timothy.mattison@hcps.net)

Bi-weekly PLC's to work through data driven instruction and culturally relevant classroom.
ILT feedback sessions with all teachers.
Model classrooms' substitutes will be secured on campus.

Person Responsible Brandon Glenn (brandon.glenn@hcps.net)

Walk through to provide feedback and support.

Person Responsible Brandon Glenn (brandon.glenn@hcps.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

| | |
|---|---|
| Area of Focus Description and Rationale: | Teachers struggled with implementing small group instruction. This was a focus to help differentiate the learning. Teachers of ESE students needed to improve classroom expectations so that all students were expected to be on grade level. |
| Measurable Outcome: | Math will increase there learning gains by 20%. We will target all of our Tier 2 and Tier 3 students. Those students will be pulled for acceleration, math boot camps and additional support in Math. |
| Monitoring: | Monitored through classroom observations, teacher/administrator conversations, teacher/district created progress monitoring assessments, and collaboration among the team in PLCs. |
| Person responsible for monitoring outcome: | Brandon Glenn (brandon.glenn@hcps.net) |
| Evidence-based Strategy: | The evidence-based strategy being implemented for this area of focus includes school wide incorporation of structured classroom and discussions during PLCs. |
| Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: | When teachers utilize data to organize students and plan differentiated instruction, student needs will be addressed and math proficiency will increase across subgroups. |
| Action Steps to Implement | |
| Provide coaching and support in data driven instruction weekly-reflection and classroom visits. | |
| Person Responsible | Donna Kemp (donna.kemp@hcps.net) |

#3. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to English Language Learners

| | |
|---|--|
| Area of Focus Description and Rationale: | As the ELL population continues to grow, training in instructional strategies will be provided to instruct our ELL students. Student performance is not accurate due to the gap in learning from the pandemic. |
| Measurable Outcome: | We expect a growth in proficiency from our ELL students in ELA, Math and Science of a minimum of 10% in each content area. |
| Monitoring: | Ongoing observation with actionable feedback. |
| Person responsible for monitoring outcome: | Brandon Glenn (brandon.glenn@hcps.net) |
| Evidence-based Strategy: | Teachers will deliver lessons that are differentiated to meet the needs of ELL students based on English Language Proficiency levels to ensure academic success. Bilingual Adie will provide support in ELA classes. |
| Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: | Our ELL students need ongoing support as they learn to read, write and speak in English with proficiency. |

Action Steps to Implement

ESOL, ELA and Reading teachers will collaborate during PLCs to co-plan lessons that will bridge together grade-level work and integrate language development within specific content.

Person Responsible Brandon Glenn (brandon.glenn@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.

With the pending changes to our master schedule in October of 2021, we will be strategically scheduling low performing students with our higher performing teachers. We also will monitor class size to provide the lowest teacher-to pupil ratio possible.

As a whole our campus is working to increase fidelity and effectiveness of Tier 1 instructional practices by using walkthrough data to coach teachers and to assess professional development needs. Our Instructional Leadership Team (ILT) is helping to revamp our Professional Learning Communities (PLCs) by relying on data-based decision making and problem solving processes. The Teacher Talent Developers (TTDs) are working with teacher teams to assist with lesson planning, student engagement, and task alignment. We received schoolwide licenses for IXL and use district assessment for ELA, which will be utilized as Tier 2 and 3 interventions with inherent progress monitoring tools embedded with each program. Student performance will be tracked on a weekly basis, which is a more frequent progress monitoring schedule than our school has implemented in the past. Using the data from IXL and district assessments teachers will pull small groups of students and use direct, explicit supplemental instruction to target the standards and skills that they are struggling with the most.

Our schoolwide Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports (PBIS) team is working with the district Comprehensive Coordinated Early Intervention Services (CCEIS) team to reduce the disproportionality of our student discipline data. We are reviewing our current practices to enhance classroom management and student engagement factors to reduce the number of behavioral incidences that result in Office Discipline Referrals (ODRs). The PBIS learn is also incorporating incentives for students and staff to boost school spirit, school engagement and staff morale.

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 are actively increasing engagement with our students, parents and communities partners. McLane created additional social media accounts, hosted virtual conferences, increased awareness of school-wide events by publishing their dates at least two weeks in advance, and published a quarterly ESOL newsletter to better communicate with our Spanish-speaking families. Other forms of communication include

PeachJar, Parent Links, and positive in-person interactions.

We've hosted focus groups with teachers and students, respectively, to gain insight into their experiences and expectations for our school. We implement school-wide positive behavioral supports (SWPBIS), but would like to increase our fidelity with the framework. Examples of supports include classroom behavior management systems and incentives, school-wide activities, positive referrals for outstanding character and behavior, and weekly character building/social emotional learning (SEL) lessons (i.e., Viking Strength Trainers).

Our school is also incorporating a restorative practices model, which emphasizes relationship and community building, fostering mutual respect and rectifying harm done to others through proactive/responsive circles, peer mediations, restorative conversations, and re-entry interviews for serious behavior infractions. This school year we are FULLY implementing our PBIS strategies that involve all stake holders. Students will be able to earn Viking Dollars! \$50 per teacher to start. Viking Dollars should be given for following classroom AND school-wide behavior expectations.

ALL staff are expected to consistently and fairly reward students for meeting positive behavior expectations

Students will turn in their dollars at the PBIS Store for tangible prizes (snacks, school supplies, etc.)

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

- Principal: Articulate the vision of establishing a safe and orderly school environment to all stakeholders
- Assistant principals: Push the vision to faculty, staff, and students through formal and informal conversations;
monitor the effective implementation of the vision across all faculty, staff, and students
- Faculty and staff: help the vision of a safe and orderly school environment in their classroom, offices, and
during hallway duty by understanding and buying into the school guidelines for success
- Students: Buying into the vision by understanding the school guidelines for success and modeling the guidelines for success in the classroom and around campus

Part V: Budget

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

| | | | |
|--------|--------|--|--------|
| 1 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA | \$0.00 |
| 2 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math | \$0.00 |
| 3 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: English Language Learners | \$0.00 |
| Total: | | | \$0.00 |