Memorial Middle School

2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Memorial Middle School

4702 N CENTRAL AVE, Tampa, FL 33603

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: April Gillyard

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2017

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 (46%) 2017-18: C (44%) 2016-17: D (40%)
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

Memorial Middle School

4702 N CENTRAL AVE, Tampa, FL 33603

[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	91%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	91%

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.

The faculty and staff of Memorial Middle School will collaboratively use every available resource to foster an environment of high expectations which supports the physiological, social, emotional, and academic needs of every student.

Provide the school's vision statement.

We support the District's vision of Preparing Students for Life, and are working to ensure that our students leave our school equipped with the tools they need to graduate on time.

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
Williams, Brent	Principal	Brent Williams - Oversee all components of the SIP
Robinson, Tehia	Assistant Principal	Tehia Robinson - oversee all SAC meetings and coordinates with the SAC Chairperson
Mertens, Jane	Instructional Coach	Jane Mertens - Facilitator with everything dealing with reading - responsible for all schoolwide reading initiatives.
Weaver, William	Instructional Coach	Williams Weaver - Facilitator with everything dealing with writing - responsible for all schoolwide writing initiatives.

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Saturday 7/1/2017, April Gillyard

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.*
3

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*
12

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

36

Total number of students enrolled at the school

659

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

1

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

1

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	211	219	0	0	0	0	659
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	84	102	90	0	0	0	0	276
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	50	78	74	0	0	0	0	202
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	24	21	0	0	0	0	50
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	27	12	0	0	0	0	56
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	59	82	59	0	0	0	0	200
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	59	87	81	0	0	0	0	227
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	26	25	0	0	0	0	67

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	21	20	20	0	0	0	0	61

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

Monday 6/28/2021

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	190	227	230	0	0	0	0	647
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	54	88	67	0	0	0	0	209
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5	0	0	0	0	10
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	55	70	0	0	0	0	125
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25	24	0	0	0	0	49
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	57	91	54	0	0	0	0	202
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	59	93	71	0	0	0	0	223

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	4	1	0	0	0	0	5

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	6
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	190	227	230	0	0	0	0	647
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	54	88	67	0	0	0	0	209
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5	0	0	0	0	10
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	55	70	0	0	0	0	125
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25	24	0	0	0	0	49
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	57	91	54	0	0	0	0	202
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	59	93	71	0	0	0	0	223

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	4	1	0	0	0	0	5

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	6
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				34%	51%	54%	31%	52%	53%
ELA Learning Gains				48%	52%	54%	51%	53%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				45%	47%	47%	54%	48%	47%
Math Achievement				39%	55%	58%	32%	56%	58%
Math Learning Gains				58%	57%	57%	49%	59%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				61%	52%	51%	55%	52%	51%
Science Achievement				24%	47%	51%	20%	47%	52%
Social Studies Achievement				42%	67%	72%	39%	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	36%	53%	-17%	54%	-18%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2021					
	2019	26%	54%	-28%	52%	-26%
Cohort Comparison		-36%				
08	2021					
	2019	32%	53%	-21%	56%	-24%
Cohort Comparison		-26%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2021					
	2019	28%	49%	-21%	55%	-27%
Cohort Comparison						

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
07	2021					
	2019	38%	62%	-24%	54%	-16%
Cohort Comparison		-28%				
08	2021					
	2019	33%	31%	2%	46%	-13%
Cohort Comparison		-38%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2021					
	2019	22%	47%	-25%	48%	-26%
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	36%	67%	-31%	71%	-35%
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	85%	63%	22%	61%	24%
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.

6th grade: Baseline assessment, mid year assessment, common assessments, Achieve 3000, Newsela, Pre and post measures
7th grade: Baseline assessment, mid year assessment, common assessments, Achieve 3000, Newsela, Pre and post measures, USA Test Prep- Civics
8th grade: Baseline assessment, mid year assessment, common assessments, Achieve 3000, Newsela, Pre and post measures

Grade 6				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	28	13.2	
	Economically Disadvantaged	28	13.11	
	Students With Disabilities	14.41	14.41	
	English Language Learners	29	44	
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	27	47	
	Economically Disadvantaged	27	47	
	Students With Disabilities	3.45	23.79	
	English Language Learners	0	20	

Grade 7				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	8.64	12.77	
	Economically Disadvantaged	7.63	12.32	
	Students With Disabilities	33	31	
	English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	0	45.75	
	Economically Disadvantaged	0	45.61	
	Students With Disabilities	0	42.22	
	English Language Learners	0	45.37	
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Civics	All Students	32	43	
	Economically Disadvantaged	32	42.56	
	Students With Disabilities	0	38.33	
	English Language Learners	0	59.17	

Grade 8				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	15.43	20.10	
	Economically Disadvantaged	13.87	18.04	
	Students With Disabilities	45	41	
	English Language Learners			
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	0	52.18	
	Economically Disadvantaged	0	52.23	
	Students With Disabilities	0	22.64	
	English Language Learners	0	73.33	
Science	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	45	47.84	
	Economically Disadvantaged	44.76	47.81	
	Students With Disabilities	23.88	31.67	
	English Language Learners	64.18	58.33	

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	2	22	32	8	25	27	7	16			
ELL	24	41	46	31	47	50	15	35	75		
ASN	62	58		79	69						
BLK	17	20	20	15	31	30	9	29	55		
HSP	31	40	38	33	47	50	25	38	82		
MUL	50			30							
WHT	47	40	46	43	50	36	40	54			
FRL	31	36	33	31	44	43	22	38	75		
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	10	32	31	10	39	54	3	17			
ELL	21	48	52	31	61	68	11	30	54		

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
2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
ASN	67	77		75	77						
BLK	25	37	30	29	48	61	18	33	45		
HSP	34	49	49	39	61	64	24	43	64		
WHT	42	57	33	46	53	40	27	52			
FRL	33	47	44	38	58	62	23	41	66		

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
2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
SWD	6	42	49	9	35	33	8	10			
ELL	15	45	49	19	46	53	12	22	67		
ASN	47	60		67	73						
BLK	21	53	68	24	42	60	5	32			
HSP	31	51	56	31	49	53	24	38	68		
MUL	23			46	36						
WHT	49	51		37	54	64	27	47			
FRL	31	50	52	31	49	55	21	38	69		

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	42
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	63
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	417
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	97%
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	43

English Language Learners	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	67
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	45
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	40
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	45
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	42
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Analysis

Data Analysis
Answer the following analysis questions using the progress monitoring data and state assessment data, if applicable.

What trends emerge across grade levels, subgroups and core content areas?

Students are not able to master on grade level standards. The two ESSA subgroups of SWD and Black students are not yet at the 41% proficiency level and struggle to make connections to the level of rigor needed to master the standards. There was a decline in ELA and Math proficiency, as well as in Science and Civics.

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

The greatest need for improvement is ELA and Math proficiency.

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

There were significant absences for teachers and students during the 2020-21 school year. The lack of planning for teachers out due to Covid-19. Lack of PD for teachers in lesson planning and teacher clarity.
There needs to be considerable time for teachers to plan with their content area coach; common planning time for teachers to lesson plan for learning loss. Establish learning pods where teachers are getting weekly PD on learning acceleration; teacher led small group instruction; scaffolding and differentiation; and progress monitoring.

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

The acceleration points for Alg 1 maintained their points.

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

The math department did progress monitoring assessments throughout the entire school year and used common assessments to plan for instruction.

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

Teachers will plan individually with a content coach to map out lesson where acceleration can take place. They will receive PD on scaffolding, differentiation, and small group instruction on a weekly basis. Teachers will plan in their content PLC to help facilitate where acceleration can occur in their curriculum.

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.

Learning Pods - where content teachers share strategies and ideas to accelerate learning and address the learning loss
PLC- teams will meet to discuss progress monitoring assessments, common assessments, and interim assessments to plan for re-teach and acceleration.
ILT- this team will drive the instruction for grade level content areas on scaffolding and how to differentiate

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

-Continue with hiring academic coaches to ensure teachers are planning lessons to accelerate learning.
-Using aides and paras to help facilitate small group instruction and pull-outs
-On going professional development based on the instructional priority

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Small Group Instruction	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	After conducting the 5-Why protocol with the academic leadership team after looking over the data. The main area of focus was that teachers lack the skill to scaffold grade level work appropriately.
Measurable Outcome:	Overall, student achievement point total will increase from 354 to 490. We will go from a "D" to a "B". The instructional coaches will provide meaningful coaching and lesson planning to establish strong instruction in the classroom which will lead to improved student outcomes.
Monitoring:	Planning logs from the academic coaches Classroom walkthroughs from the administrators and coaches PD attendance sheets
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Brent Williams (brent.williams@hcps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	According to Doug Fisher's work the effect size for scaffolding (.82), feedback (.70), and small group instruction(.47) yields at least one year's growth in student achievement. We will focus on these evidence based strategies when working with teachers to improve their practice.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	We have been doing Visible Learning work for the last 2 school years focusing on Teacher Clarity and Assessment Capable Learners. We will continue moving forward with this process. We have been focusing on learning intentions and success criteria with the teachers and have seen improvement in EET performance for domains 1 and 3. Teachers are more aware of what the students are learning and how do they know they have learned the standard. We have established a testing calendar and are using the research-based driven by data book to align all interim assessments by content area. This allows teachers to disaggregate their own data and plan for future instruction. This year there will be a focus on accelerating learning through teacher led small group instruction, scaffolding and differentiation.

Action Steps to Implement

Using visible learning practices, I have a detailed plan that utilizes my coaches and resource personnel. All 42 teachers are paired with an instructional coach. They meet weekly or bi-weekly depending on their tiered proficiency levels. Coaches work with their teacher on three components of our instructional priorities: lesson planning; opportunity myth; and driven by data. These are all research-based practices that have been proven to increase achievement. Coaches keep a monthly log of meetings held with teachers; meet with admin twice a month to discuss teacher next steps or concerns; facilitate PDs based on teacher trends; and perform all other duties like pulling data, working with students. Responsible for ELP during lunch with preidentified students. In addition, each coach will be responsible for working with students who fall in the ESSA subgroup SWD & Black students. They will be on their caseload to monitor their attendance, behavior, and grades. The students will be split evenly between all of the coaches. They will meet with the students monthly to discuss academic progress.

Person Responsible	Brent Williams (brent.williams@hcps.net)

The reading coach and math resource will focus on small group instruction, pull-outs, push-in support. The coach will make a schedule to meet with each of their teachers weekly. They will conduct classroom observations, coaching cycles, small group pull-outs, or side-by-side coaching every two weeks.

| **Person Responsible** | Jane Mertens (jane.mertens@hcps.net) |

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the SafeSchoolsforAlex.org, compare the discipline data of the school to discipline data across the state and provide primary or secondary areas of concern that the school will monitor during the upcoming school year. Include how the school culture and environment will be monitored through the lens of behavior or discipline data.

Based on our school discipline data, we will work on creating an environment of respect and belonginess. The panorama survey from 2020-21 suggests that the school climate and culture needs improvement in the areas of respect and belonging. We have established a PBIS system where students will be rewarded on the basis of exhibiting positive behavior. There will be monthly incentive activities along with weekly "caught you doing good" prizes. Attendance will also be addressed because many of our students do not attend school regularly. This year we will have mentoring programs for the girls and boys to try to connect them with a mentor. There will be a student government, where students will have a voice on school wide activities and events. We will use our behavior tracker to monitor the behavior of disrespect and disobedience and monitor our KPI data for attendance. The PSLT will meet twice a month to discuss tier 2 & 3 students and make adjustments as needed throughout the year. We will survey the students twice a year to monitor the progress on how they are feeling about school and the connection they have with attendance.

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 hold monthly parent meetings at the end of our SAC meeting. These meetings will consist of parent engagement and involvement strategies along with how to help their child at home. These meetings will be focused on how parents can help their child navigate through school. We have a food pantry and clothes closet on campus for our families to access as needed throughout the school year. We will give the parents an initial survey at the beginning of the year to determine their needs and how we can help fulfill their needs at home and school. We will have four conference nights so the families can engage with our teachers in order to have a clear picture of how their child is doing in school.

Our goal is to partner with our parents so they feel like they have a voice in the decisions made at the school

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

Social Worker- meets with families in need; sponsors clothes closet and food pantry; works with homeless families; provides counseling services to families
Psychologist- works with students on SEL needs; leads the MTSS/RTI process
Guidance Counselors- makes sure students are properly scheduled; restorative practices with students; facilitates peer mediations; works with teachers on tier 2 & 3 behavior strategies
Administration- meets with families to discuss behavior concerns; conducts PD on tier 1 behavior strategies with teachers; supports classroom management techniques; and conducts parent engagement events

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Small Group Instruction	$0.00
		Total:	$0.00