Farnell Middle School

2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Farnell Middle School

13912 NINE EAGLES DR, Tampa, FL 33626

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Kelinda Lockett

Start Date for this Principal: 1/24/2022

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Middle School 6-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2020-21 Title I School	No
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	29%
2020-21 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities English Language Learners Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (75%) 2017-18: A (77%) 2016-17: A (80%)
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

Farnell Middle School

13912 NINE EAGLES DR, Tampa, FL 33626

[no web address on file]

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	**2020-21 Title I School**	**2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
Middle School 6-8	No	25%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	48%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Hillsborough County School Board.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a school improvement plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F (see page 4). For schools receiving a grade of A, B, or C, the district may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at https://www.floridaCIMS.org.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

To provide an education and the supports which enable each student to excel as a successful and responsible citizen.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Preparing students for life.

School Leadership Team

Membership
Identify the name, email address, position title, and job duties/responsibilities for each member of the school leadership team.**:**

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Lockett, Kelinda	Principal	Principal
Alvarado, Allan	Teacher, K-12	SAC Chair
Accardi, Diane	Teacher, K-12	Subject Area Leader - Science
Hartman, Jonah	Teacher, K-12	Subject Area Leader - Math
Hartman, Holly	Teacher, K-12	Subject Area Leader - Social Studies
Hockley, Stephanie	Teacher, K-12	Media Specialist
Reitnauer, Amy	Teacher, K-12	Subject Area Leader - ELA

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Monday 1/24/2022, Kelinda Lockett

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.*
7

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.*
21

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

62

Total number of students enrolled at the school

1,180

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

3

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

3

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	370	388	407	0	0	0	0	1165
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	47	51	59	0	0	0	0	157
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	8	27	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	17	20	21	0	0	0	0	58
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	25	16	16	0	0	0	0	57
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	4	1	10	0	0	0	0	15

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

Friday 1/7/2022

2020-21 - As Reported

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

Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	374	389	415	0	0	0	0	1178
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	27	26	36	0	0	0	0	89
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	16	0	0	0	0	34
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	27	37	24	0	0	0	0	88
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	26	45	22	0	0	0	0	93

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

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

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	3	0	0	0	0	8
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	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	374	389	415	0	0	0	0	1178
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	27	26	36	0	0	0	0	89
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	16	0	0	0	0	34
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	27	37	24	0	0	0	0	88
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	26	45	22	0	0	0	0	93

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

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

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	3	0	0	0	0	8
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				79%	51%	54%	78%	52%	53%
ELA Learning Gains				68%	52%	54%	69%	53%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				61%	47%	47%	57%	48%	47%
Math Achievement				81%	55%	58%	84%	56%	58%
Math Learning Gains				72%	57%	57%	80%	59%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				62%	52%	51%	68%	52%	51%
Science Achievement				74%	47%	51%	79%	47%	52%
Social Studies Achievement				87%	67%	72%	86%	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	78%	53%	25%	54%	24%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2021					
	2019	78%	54%	24%	52%	26%
Cohort Comparison		-78%				
08	2021					
	2019	78%	53%	25%	56%	22%
Cohort Comparison		-78%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2021					
	2019	71%	49%	22%	55%	16%
Cohort Comparison						

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
07	2021					
	2019	83%	62%	21%	54%	29%
Cohort Comparison		-71%				
08	2021					
	2019	43%	31%	12%	46%	-3%
Cohort Comparison		-83%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2021					
	2019	74%	47%	27%	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	86%	67%	19%	71%	15%
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019					
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	96%	63%	33%	61%	35%
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	100%	57%	43%	57%	43%

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

Farnell will utilize the District Baseline and Midyear assessments to monitor student progress for math, science and civics.
Achieve 3000 for ELA

Grade 6				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	34.92	42.78	45.67
	Economically Disadvantaged	17.21	23.09	25.11
	Students With Disabilities	43.38	50.6	55.42
	English Language Learners	3.45	3.33	6.67
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	67.7	66.87	N/A
	Economically Disadvantaged	43.5	47.82	N/A
	Students With Disabilities	72.4	74.16	N/A
	English Language Learners	40	47.25	N/A

Grade 7				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	30.8	43.31	46.73
	Economically Disadvantaged	21.26	29.79	28.72
	Students With Disabilities	40.51	52.44	52.43
	English Language Learners	4	7.14	3.57
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	47	52.47	N/A
	Economically Disadvantaged	40.2	41.02	N/A
	Students With Disabilities	36.3	43.33	N/A
	English Language Learners	25.1	38.26	N/A
Civics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	48.7	73.75	N/A
	Economically Disadvantaged	40.7	50.64	N/A
	Students With Disabilities	55.8	78.69	N/A
	English Language Learners	32.8	52.08	N/A

Grade 8				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	37.59	55.06	56.65
	Economically Disadvantaged	20.55	34.95	36.75
	Students With Disabilities	51.04	64.29	63.27
	English Language Learners	3.7	7.14	7.14
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	51.05	71.27	N/A
	Economically Disadvantaged	33.9	60.18	N/A
	Students With Disabilities	60.8	79.89	N/A
	English Language Learners	52.8	84.11	N/A
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students	63.6	66.27	N/A
	Economically Disadvantaged	53.5	60.11	N/A
	Students With Disabilities	78.6	70.65	N/A
	English Language Learners	29.85	41.05	N/A

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	22	40	38	23	44	50	30	32	60		
ELL	51	64	51	59	55	49	33	63	91		
ASN	89	79	59	90	61		86	93	95		
BLK	62	53	15	47	43	33	50	67	53		
HSP	59	57	39	57	53	50	48	65	78		
MUL	86	75	85	73	63		90	80	67		
WHT	78	63	47	78	63	56	75	82	90		
FRL	60	56	41	53	51	48	57	64	80		
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	36	50	50	40	51	48	15	57	67		
ELL	54	71	67	64	73	56	66	74	85		

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	91	80	75	94	84		88	94	95		
BLK	67	62	73	71	70	56	55	91	95		
HSP	64	62	58	68	64	54	71	76	87		
MUL	79	59	54	85	64	70	53	77	88		
WHT	83	69	61	84	74	68	77	90	89		
FRL	66	60	53	70	64	55	56	75	85		
2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS										
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	36	50	49	51	59	54	39	56	64		
ELL	53	66	60	69	78	70	43	78	81		
ASN	87	84	57	96	88	73	89	95	96		
BLK	75	67	48	70	69	57	62	91	100		
HSP	67	69	56	75	75	66	70	78	90		
MUL	80	72		78	74	70	79	100	86		
WHT	82	67	59	87	81	72	83	87	94		
FRL	66	66	56	73	76	67	71	75	90		

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	68
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	75
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	678
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	91%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	38
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	59
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	82
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	47
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	58
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	77
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	

White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	71
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	59
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 in the bottom quartile and SWD are performing the lowest in ELA and Math - which translate to their performance in other areas as well.

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

ELA and Math bottom quartile and SWD

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

Strengthening core instruction to include differentiated learning groups and targeted instruction based on standards aligned assessments.

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

All reporting categories decreased.

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

n/a

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

Classroom teachers will plan during PLCs for differentiated student needs and implement small learning groups.

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.

PLC protocols and structures, small learning group structures, student data chats

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

Regular PLCs schedule where teachers collaborate weekly during common planning time. Restructure ILT to review student data and student work.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Focus on differentiated instruction for our students with disabilities.
Measurable Outcome:	For the 2021-2022 school year, 50% of our students with disabilities will make learning gains in order to be above the Federal Index level.
Monitoring:	This area of focus will be monitored by ELA Subject Area Leader, Reading teachers, ELA teachers and ESE case managers.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Amy Reitnauer (amy.reitnauer@hcps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Differentiated Instruction, small group, formal and informal assessments.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Collaboration with our ESE team, data analysis through the ELA PLC's, ESSA Data Review of our SWD's (Federal Index below 38%)

Action Steps to Implement

Differentiated Instruction

Person Responsible	Amy Reitnauer (amy.reitnauer@hcps.net)

Small groups

Person Responsible	Amy Reitnauer (amy.reitnauer@hcps.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Focus on differentiated instruction for our students with disabilities.
Measurable Outcome:	For the 2021-2022 school year, our students with disabilities subgroup will increase their Math Achievement score from 23% to 50%.
Monitoring:	PMA data will be discussed and addressed through PLCs and Department meetings.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Jonah Hartman (jonah.hartman@hcps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Appropriate placement of students in math class, differentiated instruction, ELP.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	During the 2020-2021 school year, the data showed that our students with disabilities fell below the Federal Index of 41% to 38%. In previous years, data analysis has proven these methods to be successful when appropriately placing students in math classes.

Action Steps to Implement	
Appropriate placement of students in math classes.	
Person Responsible	Jonah Hartman (jonah.hartman@hcps.net)
Differentiated Instruction	
Person Responsible	Jonah Hartman (jonah.hartman@hcps.net)
ELP	
Person Responsible	Jonah Hartman (jonah.hartman@hcps.net)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Collaborative Planning	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	In order to address the needs of varied levels of learners, teachers will need to review real time data during collaborative planning sessions and plan differentiated lessons to include increased rigor and academic ownership.
Measurable Outcome:	Increase in the number of proficient students; increase in the number of students making learning gains.
Monitoring:	Collaborative planning sessions will include monthly data chats with teachers and students to review and plan around PMAs. Student performance on PMAs should improve based on this targeted planning.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Kelinda Lockett (kelinda.lockett@hcps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Differentiated instruction, small group instruction based on performance on assessments
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Instruction for class a whole does not address the varied needs of students in classes with achievement level ranges from 1 to 5.

Action Steps to Implement

Solidify collaborative planning calendar.

Person Responsible	Kelinda Lockett (kelinda.lockett@hcps.net)

Staff PD on Collaborative Planning protocols

Person Responsible	Kelinda Lockett (kelinda.lockett@hcps.net)

Implement collaborative planning sessions to include regular data chats with teachers and students.

Person Responsible	Kelinda Lockett (kelinda.lockett@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.

ISS and OSS rates have decreased, however, student drug incidences remain the leading discipline challenges. Student education, awareness, and advocacy will be the main focus to address these behavior concerns. Farnell has 2.0 incidents per 100 students. Violent Incidents were 1.42 (Middle) and Drug/Public Order Incidents were 0.55 (Low) per 100 students.

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.

Farnell Middle School will pursue building a positive school culture and environment through group such as PTSA and SAC. PTSA and SAC are some of the most important groups to Farnell. They meet monthly to offer support to students, teachers and other staff. Along with that, Farnell also holds curriculum nights to offer and explain programs and opportunities to the school. In addition, parents stay informed through Parent Link announcements and Canvas.

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

Administration - highlighting and recognizing teachers and students who exemplify the behaviors and habits we want to see in our school.
Teachers - incentivizing student Attendance, Behavior, and Course Performance in Tier 1 plans in the classroom and quarterly as a grade level.
Students - leadership clubs to lead by example

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: Instructional Practice: Collaborative Planning	$0.00
		Total:	$0.00