

Hillsborough County Public Schools

Sergeant Paul R Smith Middle School



2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	18
Positive Culture & Environment	21
Budget to Support Goals	22

Sergeant Paul R Smith Middle School

14303 CITRUS POINTE DR, Tampa, FL 33625

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Robert Kleesattel

Start Date for this Principal: 7/28/2021

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: B (58%) 2017-18: B (59%) 2016-17: B (57%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	

* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, [click here](#).

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F. This plan is also a requirement for Targeted Support and Improvement (TS&I) and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CS&I) schools pursuant to 1008.33 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

To be designated as TS&I, a school must have one or more ESSA subgroup(s) with a Federal Index below 41%. This plan shall be approved by the district. There are three ways a school can be designated as CS&I:

1. have a school grade of D or F
2. have a graduation rate of 67% or lower
3. have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

For these schools, the SIP shall be approved by the district as well as the Bureau of School Improvement.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F, or a graduation rate 67% or less. Districts may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing for schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at www.floridacims.org.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	18
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	22

Sergeant Paul R Smith Middle School

14303 CITRUS POINTE DR, Tampa, FL 33625

[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	68%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	81%

School Grades History

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

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.

Our Mission

At Sgt. Smith, we will cultivate a learning environment that promotes scholarship, integrity, communication, and excellence.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Our Vision

Our journey at Sgt. Smith will propel us to be academically driven, self-confident, responsible citizens who will make positive contributions to the community.

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
Kleesattel, Rob	Principal	Administrator of school; directs assistant principals in duties
Smith, Ashley	Assistant Principal	Creates master schedule; leads multiple teams in advancing curriculum.
Dahmash, Elsebeth	Reading Coach	Engages with teachers in coaching cycles.
Anderson, Amy	Other	Leads student school advisory committee; works with high-risk caseload; PBIS team leader
Jones, Michelle	Math Coach	Part-time math coach; works with math department to ensure best practices
PadillaGaray, Elizabeth	Assistant Principal	Oversees discipline and building maintenance.
Crosskey, Sheriss	Other	Oversees ESE department, ensuring IEPs and 504s are in place and followed.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Wednesday 7/28/2021, Robert Kleesattel

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.*

11

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

34

Total number of students enrolled at the school

674

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

5

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

5

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	192	199	282	0	0	0	0	673
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	1	4	0	0	0	0	11
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	15	45	45	0	0	0	0	105
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	21	46	51	0	0	0	0	118
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	2	2	0	0	0	0	8

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

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

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

Wednesday 8/25/2021

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	287	235	258	0	0	0	0	780
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	21	23	0	0	0	0	54
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	24	37	47	0	0	0	0	108
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	6	0	0	0	0	12
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	4	0	0	0	0	11
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	63	56	67	0	0	0	0	186
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	70	46	5	0	0	0	0	121

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	11	23	31	0	0	0	0	65

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	2	1	0	0	0	0	3
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	287	235	258	0	0	0	0	780	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	21	23	0	0	0	0	54	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	24	37	47	0	0	0	0	108	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	6	0	0	0	0	12	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	4	0	0	0	0	11	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	63	56	67	0	0	0	0	186	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	70	46	5	0	0	0	0	121	

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	11	23	31	0	0	0	0	65	

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	2	1	0	0	0	0	3	
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				56%	51%	54%	52%	52%	53%
ELA Learning Gains				56%	52%	54%	55%	53%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				47%	47%	47%	47%	48%	47%
Math Achievement				59%	55%	58%	61%	56%	58%
Math Learning Gains				53%	57%	57%	66%	59%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				45%	52%	51%	60%	52%	51%
Science Achievement				55%	47%	51%	43%	47%	52%
Social Studies Achievement				76%	67%	72%	78%	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	56%	53%	3%	54%	2%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2021					
	2019	50%	54%	-4%	52%	-2%
Cohort Comparison		-56%				
08	2021					
	2019	57%	53%	4%	56%	1%
Cohort Comparison		-50%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2021					
	2019	53%	49%	4%	55%	-2%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2021					
	2019	56%	62%	-6%	54%	2%
Cohort Comparison		-53%				
08	2021					
	2019	34%	31%	3%	46%	-12%
Cohort Comparison		-56%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2021					
	2019	51%	47%	4%	48%	3%
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	74%	67%	7%	71%	3%

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	83%	63%	20%	61%	22%
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.

English Language Arts: Achieve3000

Math: Baseline & Mid-Year

Civics: Baseline & Mid-Year

Science: Baseline & Mid-Year

Grade 6				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	19%	26%	26%
	Economically Disadvantaged	16%	21%	20%
	Students With Disabilities	22%	26%	28%
	English Language Learners	6%	5%	5%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	49.60	58.65	
	Economically Disadvantaged	43.50	52.11	
	Students With Disabilities	36.50	58.65	
	English Language Learners	33.15	37.13	

Grade 7				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	20%	28%	31%
	Economically Disadvantaged	16%	22%	25%
	Students With Disabilities	25%	36%	37%
	English Language Learners	0%	0%	5%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	41.5	53.98	
	Economically Disadvantaged	36.3	53.98	
	Students With Disabilities	19.70	35.08	
	English Language Learners	36.30	52.47	
Civics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	48.70	50.64	
	Economically Disadvantaged	48.70	44.15	
	Students With Disabilities	69.30	47.37	
	English Language Learners	18.80	24.12	

Grade 8				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	32%	40%	38%
	Economically Disadvantaged	27%	33%	32%
	Students With Disabilities	36%	44%	44%
	English Language Learners	0%	0%	0%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	66.90	55.92	
	Economically Disadvantaged	66.90	51.21	
	Students With Disabilities	89.05	51.21	
	English Language Learners	74.70	63.86	
Science	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	63.60	39.12	
	Economically Disadvantaged	60.20	42.98	
	Students With Disabilities	71.55	43.33	
	English Language Learners	36.80	15.77	

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	12	31	33	10	23	25	16	20			
ELL	35	46	36	39	44	40	26	41	79		
ASN	79	72		87	70		82	90	87		
BLK	31	37	38	29	37	26	38	57			
HSP	42	45	35	42	41	36	40	50	67		
MUL	65	50		63	47						
WHT	54	47	24	58	45	19	59	79	84		
FRL	40	43	34	40	39	32	39	52	66		
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	18	32	25	25	38	34	21	52			
ELL	26	49	54	40	55	45	20	68	64		

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	92	65		97	68		92	100	100		
BLK	33	42	33	42	30	20	29	83			
HSP	50	54	48	52	50	45	49	68	65		
MUL	65	56		74	53		50	85	100		
WHT	68	64	48	71	64	58	71	84	73		
FRL	50	54	46	53	50	43	48	69	65		
2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	16	40	34	19	45	45	14	13			
ELL	31	54	52	46	62	58	20	59	50		
ASN	87	67		95	72		67	100	100		
BLK	25	48	50	40	60	60	26	56			
HSP	47	53	48	55	67	63	36	77	65		
MUL	59	50		60	69	60	55	73			
WHT	63	62	41	73	63	52	60	82	85		
FRL	46	52	47	54	63	58	37	72	68		

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	47
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	43
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	468
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	96%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	21
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 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	81
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	37
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	44
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	56
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	52
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	43
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?

Sgt. Smith's lowest performance is in gains for the bottom quartile in both ELA and Math, which includes high numbers of Black/African American students and Students with Disabilities.

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

Bottom quartile performance in ELA and Math. In Math, Learning Gains of the lowest 25% dropped from 45 in 2019 to 30 in 2021. In ELA, Learning Gains of the lowest 25% dropped from 47 in 2019 to 34 in 2021.

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

Contributing factors include motivation, lacking of foundational skills and basic needs not being met due to economic challenges. New actions that need to be taken for this to improve include implementing PBIS with fidelity and working with instructional staff to address how to effectively address learning deficits with data driven small groups, scaffolding and ongoing assessment; these steps will support those requiring foundational skill support and motivate them to reach grade-level success.

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

Acceleration points only dipped by 1 point from 2019 to 2021.

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

Strategic scheduling of math courses.

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

Implementation of the Instructional Frameworks across content areas in order to facilitate data-driven teacher-led small group instruction and target learning deficits.

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.

Coaching cycles with instructional coaches, Bite-sized professional development during faculty and PLC meetings, Rolling inservices targeted to implementing the frameworks with specific content

areas, Lunch and Learns. The site-based Instructional Leadership Team will conduct regular walk-throughs of departments and provide feedback and eventual coaching cycles to teachers.

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

Site-based Instructional Leadership Team will grow and refine their coaching skills this year in order to be more effective in coming years. Instructional coaches will continue to attend district professional development to bring back to the leadership team in order to build those skills.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Small Group Instruction

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	49% of current students (as of 8/26/2021) scored below proficiency in FSA ELA in 2021. 48% of current students scored below proficiency in FSA Math in 2021. Based on this data, as well as attendance indicators (as a result of COVID) and the learning deficits faced, it is imperative that instructional frameworks are implemented to address all learner's needs. This will include data-driven small group instruction, formative, ongoing assessment and precise scaffolding and extension.
Measurable Outcome:	ELA Achievement Points will be at or above 59; Math Achievement Points will be at or above 62. ELA Learning Gains of the Lowest 25% will be at or above 53; Math Learning Gains of the Lowest 25% will be at or above 56.
Monitoring:	The site-based Instructional Leadership Team will conduct regular walk-throughs of classrooms and meet every two weeks to identify trends and support needs.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Ashley Smith (ashleyc.smith@hcps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Implementation of the instructional frameworks, with a key focus on implementing data-driven, teacher-led small group work to address learning deficits.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Targeted small group instruction meets the needs of all learners, while addressing our ESSA subgroups that require intervention: Black/African American students and Students with Disabilities. With proper implementation and ongoing support from instructional coaches, teachers will be best equipped to meet the needs of our learners. John Hattie's research on effect sizes was used to determine best practices. According to his research, Response to Intervention has an effect size of 1,29 and Scaffolding 0,82 (anything over the "hinge point" of 0,4 is considered to have a positive impact on student learning).

Action Steps to Implement

Utilize Literacy Coach to support teachers with planning, modeling, analyzing data and implementing the data-driven small groups.

Person Responsible Ashley Smith (ashleyc.smith@hcps.net)

Mathematics coach will coach, model, and plan with math teachers.

Person Responsible Ashley Smith (ashleyc.smith@hcps.net)

Each department (Science, Social Studies, ELA, Math) will request data spreadsheets from all teachers in order to effectively group students based on need.

Person Responsible Elsebeth Dahmash (elsebeth.dahmash@hcps.net)

Literacy coach will design and present professional development that focuses on utilizing the instructional frameworks, how to effectively scaffold/extend instruction and what options may be used for formative/ongoing assessment.

Person Responsible Elsebeth Dahmash (elsebeth.dahmash@hcps.net)

Mathematics Coach will provide professional development that focuses on planning and implementing data-driven small group work utilizing the instructional frameworks.

Person Responsible Michelle Jones (michelleg.jones@dhc.k12.fl.us)

#2. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Based on the number of insubordinate and disruptive behavior incidents, as well as attendance rates (all taken from the previous year's KPI data), we will implement PBIS to create a positive, safe, inclusive school environment.

Measurable Outcome: Sgt. Smith will reduce the number of disobedient/insubordinate, disruptive and fighting incidents by 10%. Last year, total number of such incidents was 132; in the 2021-22 school year, the goal is to have a minimum of 13 fewer incidents.

Monitoring: Behavior data will be shared monthly at PBIS meetings and monthly at faculty meetings. Incidents are tracked through Behavior Tracker.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Ashley Smith (ashleyc.smith@hcps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Implementation of PBIS plan.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: PBIS is a research-based framework for implementing schoolwide systems of behavioral support, in a tiered continuum based on student responsiveness to intervention, to help prevent and reduce undesired behavior and improve social and academic outcomes for all students in a school. (from www.pbis.org)

Action Steps to Implement

Refresh faculty on PBIS expectations and implementation during Pre-Planning week.

Person Responsible Amy Anderson (amy.anderson@hcps.net)

Students trained in the first week of school on the expectations, rules and procedures related to PBIS.

Person Responsible Elizabeth PadillaGaray (elizabeth.padillagaray@hcps.net)

PBIS team meets monthly to plan special PBIS events and review data.

Person Responsible Amy Anderson (amy.anderson@hcps.net)

Student store held bi-monthly so students can spend their earned "fins" on incentives.

Person Responsible Amy Anderson (amy.anderson@hcps.net)

Review, discuss and plan at quarterly faculty meetings.

Person Responsible Amy Anderson (amy.anderson@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.

Per SafeSchoolsforAlex website, Sgt. Smith ranks very high in violent and property incidents, relative to other middle schools. School culture is of primary focus for Sgt. Smith and is reflected in our second area of focus. We will monitor this through our Problem Solving Leadership Team meetings, where we will implement measures to address issues like absenteeism, discipline/behavior incidents and other key performance indicators as the need arises.

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.

Throughout the school year, multiple opportunities are available to students outside of academics. Some of those opportunities include:

PBIS - Spirit week, theme days, Friendship Week (Spring)

Hispanic Heritage night

Student Advisory Council

NJHS

Clubs during and after school

Competitions

Literacy Week

Sports

Additionally, our school's School Advisory Council (SAC) will be a group of stakeholders (teachers, administrators, business partners, community members and students) who reflect our school's demographics. The group will be composed of mostly non-instructional members (students, community members, business partners) will continue to monitor the SIP and support/promote positive school culture initiatives.

Sgt. Smith also operates with grade-level teams and team leaders. In these teams, students who need additional support will be identified and the team will discuss interventions.

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

SAC, Literacy Week - Bess Dahmash, Literacy Coach & SAC chair
PBIS Incentives & Initiatives - Amy Anderson, Success Coach & FACE liaison
RTI - Team leaders, Sheriss Crosskey - ESE Specialist

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
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00