

Hillsborough County Public Schools

Pierce Middle School



2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	18
Positive Culture & Environment	20
Budget to Support Goals	20

Pierce Middle School

5511 N HESPERIDES ST, Tampa, FL 33614

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Pablo Gallejo

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 (50%) 2017-18: C (52%) 2016-17: C (50%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	

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

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	18
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	20

Pierce Middle School

5511 N HESPERIDES ST, Tampa, FL 33614

[no web address on file]

School Demographics

<p>School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Middle School 6-8</p>	<p>2020-21 Title I School</p> <p>Yes</p>	<p>2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p>87%</p>
<p>Primary Service Type (per MSID File)</p> <p>K-12 General Education</p>	<p>Charter School</p> <p>No</p>	<p>2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p>93%</p>

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.

Pierce Middle School will provide an environment of Respect, Responsibility and Pride in academics and behavior.

Provide the school's vision statement.

"Pierce Middle School will become the hub of the community through Respect, Responsibility and Pride inspiring students to graduate from High School and pursue Higher Education".

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
Gallego Alvarez, Pablo	Principal	To be the instructional leader on campus, monitoring the proper functioning of the ILT teams, PLCs, and all other systems in place. Ultimately responsible for the safety and culture of the school.
Vignau, Yariel	Assistant Principal	Discipline, building/facilities management, covid liaison, athletics, and instructional leadership.
Ferguson, Hailee	Assistant Principal	Curriculum, scheduling, testing, discipline, instructional leadership

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Thursday 7/29/2021, Pablo Gallejo

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.*

2

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.*

14

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

37

Total number of students enrolled at the school

807

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

8

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

7

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	280	220	307	0	0	0	0	807
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	70	69	124	0	0	0	0	263
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	23	40	0	0	0	0	71
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	39	65	65	51	0	0	0	220
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	28	38	43	0	0	0	0	109
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	41	38	35	0	0	0	0	114
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	32	26	53	0	0	0	0	111
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	109	82	121	0	0	0	0	312

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	2	14	25	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	2	0	0	0	0	0	2
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	2

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 9/28/2021

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	261	261	303	0	0	0	0	825
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	43	82	82	0	0	0	0	207
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	34	38	0	0	0	0	74
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	23	9	0	0	0	0	37
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	19	11	0	0	0	0	45
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	41	38	35	0	0	0	0	114
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	32	26	53	0	0	0	0	111

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	37	58	0	0	0	0	95

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	63	27	59	0	0	0	0	149
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	2	0	0	0	0	7

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	261	261	303	0	0	0	0	825
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	43	82	82	0	0	0	0	207
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	34	38	0	0	0	0	74
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	23	9	0	0	0	0	37
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	19	11	0	0	0	0	45
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	41	38	35	0	0	0	0	114
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	32	26	53	0	0	0	0	111

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	37	58	0	0	0	0	95

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	63	27	59	0	0	0	0	149
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	2	0	0	0	0	7

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				39%	51%	54%	40%	52%	53%
ELA Learning Gains				46%	52%	54%	52%	53%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				43%	47%	47%	45%	48%	47%
Math Achievement				49%	55%	58%	47%	56%	58%
Math Learning Gains				56%	57%	57%	55%	59%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				48%	52%	51%	52%	52%	51%
Science Achievement				32%	47%	51%	33%	47%	52%
Social Studies Achievement				51%	67%	72%	52%	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	34%	53%	-19%	54%	-20%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2021					
	2019	35%	54%	-19%	52%	-17%
Cohort Comparison		-34%				
08	2021					
	2019	39%	53%	-14%	56%	-17%
Cohort Comparison		-35%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2021					
	2019	39%	49%	-10%	55%	-16%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2021					

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2019	53%	62%	-9%	54%	-1%
Cohort Comparison		-39%				
08	2021					
	2019	15%	31%	-16%	46%	-31%
Cohort Comparison		-53%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2021					
	2019	30%	47%	-17%	48%	-18%
Cohort Comparison						

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	0%	66%	-66%	67%	-67%

CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	48%	67%	-19%	71%	-23%

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	89%	63%	26%	61%	28%

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.

Baseline, mid-year and FSA testing were used to complete the sections below.

Grade 6				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	1.8	6.9	21.0
	Economically Disadvantaged	1.8	4.7	20.4
	Students With Disabilities	0	1.0	2.2
	English Language Learners	1.0	1.3	5.3
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	82/45%	92/36%	73/31%
	Economically Disadvantaged	64/78%	74/37%	71/97%
	Students With Disabilities	16/19%	31/33%	12/16%
	English Language Learners	40/49%	54/36%	9/12%

Grade 7				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	10.9	10.6	18.5
	Economically Disadvantaged	7.0	7.5	16.7
	Students With Disabilities	0.0	0.0	2.7
	English Language Learners	1.0	1.0	2.7
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	58/32%	121/35%	49/22%
	Economically Disadvantaged	42/72%	93/35%	46/94%
	Students With Disabilities	4/7%	36/34%	4/8%
	English Language Learners	32/55%	55/33%	11/22%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Civics	All Students	188	234	293
	Economically Disadvantaged	139/74%	169/72%	179/61%
	Students With Disabilities	31/17%	47/20%	57/19%
	English Language Learners	38/20%	44/19%	59/20%

Grade 8					
		Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students		11.9	8.8	21.8
	Economically Disadvantaged		6.5	5.7	19.2
	Students With Disabilities		1.0	1.0	2.9
	English Language Learners		2.3	1.1	10.9
		Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students		52/33%	187/42%	51/25%
	Economically Disadvantaged		42/81%	144/43%	48/94%
	Students With Disabilities		13/25%	44/36%	10/20%
	English Language Learners		34/65%	122/39%	14/27%
		Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students		209	255	307
	Economically Disadvantaged		157/75%	188/74%	282/92%
	Students With Disabilities		36/17%	52/20%	64/21%
	English Language Learners		42/20%	55/22%	61/20%
		Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring

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	25	32	33	32	39	36	27	29			
ELL	26	37	34	31	37	46	19	39	71		
ASN	67	53		73	47						
BLK	32	38	30	21	27	26	41	40			
HSP	33	37	32	37	41	44	29	42	65		
MUL	60	50		50	60						
WHT	34	34		41	48		45	53			
FRL	33	37	32	36	40	41	32	43	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	27	34	31	27	33	31	17	40			
ELL	19	46	44	31	53	50	10	36	84		

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	43	33		76	71						
BLK	43	44	53	43	51	53	25	39			
HSP	38	47	43	48	56	49	34	52	88		
MUL	56	67		63	73						
WHT	40	40	33	50	47	35	30	58	70		
FRL	39	46	44	49	55	48	32	52	87		

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	38	37	19	44	43	13	31			
ELL	19	45	48	31	54	55	14	38	82		
ASN	54	72		63	72		60				
BLK	23	39	22	32	53	54	12	40			
HSP	41	52	48	48	55	51	34	55	87		
WHT	43	49	50	52	54	50	42	50			
FRL	39	52	46	47	55	52	33	51	88		

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	40
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	YES
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	5
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	38
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	402
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	99%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	31
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	38

English Language Learners	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	60
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	32
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	40
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	55
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	43
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	40
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?

ELL students saw significant drops across core content areas due to lack of face-to-face instruction for a portion of the school year. These drops were greater in Math and Language Arts.

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

7th Grade math scores dropped 43 points, from a 54 to an 11 percent passing the FSA. Although a new curriculum and accelerated math was implemented, this is an area in where we have placed emphasis for this school year. 8th Grade Language Arts dropped 11 points, from a 40 to a 29 percent passing rate on the FSA. Adding emphasis to reading and writing this year will provide an improvement on this area.

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

Lack of face-to-face instruction, quarantines and isolations, and fewer resources throughout the year including teachers going on medical leaves and retirements we were not able to be as strategic in placing the instructional personnel in the correct courses based on their strengths. Some of the actions taken include hiring new personnel better suited for our areas of major need, increase of resources from the district including weekly coaching from DRTs, implementation of tutoring programs in different areas including ELLs.

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

Seventh grade math went up by eight points in 2019.

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

Small group tutoring, setting up Saturday Academic Academies, and push in/pull outs by our Math Coach.

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

Data chats, intentional groupings of students, small-group instruction, tutoring by teachers and math coach, and professional development offerings to improve data driven instruction with the focus on acceleration rather than remediation.

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.

Small-group instruction, acceleration vs. remediation, and data driven lesson planning.

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

Common planning between subject area teachers, supports from DRT and academic coaches that include coaching cycles, modeling of lessons and data chats.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	With new curriculum and lack of resources, last year we saw our greatest drop in seventh grade math.
Measurable Outcome:	We will be using baseline, midyear, and FSA data from last year to identify the best instructors for each course. Our goal is to have a 50% or greater passing grade in math FSA and 55% of the students making gains in math FSA.
Monitoring:	Baseline, midyear data, and common assessments throughout the year
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Pablo Gallego Alvarez (pablo.gallegoalvarez@hcps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Using the monitoring data information, teachers will tailor their instruction focusing on acceleration rather than remediation to obtain the desirable outcomes.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Acceleration is the most important strategy to improve and correct learning loss from the prior year.

Action Steps to Implement

Intentional planning and support through PLC's with a focus on data-based decision making.
 Weekly meetings with district resource teacher.
 Use of multiple programs to support learning such as IXL and Kait Pen technology
 To support students with disabilities, we provide, resource classes to meet their needs, as well as pull-out and small group instruction.

Person Responsible Hailee Ferguson (hailee.sullivanferguson@sdhc.k12.fl.us)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Social Studies

Area of Focus

Description and Rationale: From 2018-2019 to 2020-2021 the school experienced a 9 point drop in the Civics EOC.

Measurable Outcome: After dropping from 48-to 39 percent in the Civics EOC, the school's goal for the current school year is a 52% passing rate for the EOC.

Monitoring: Using the data collected through baseline testing and other formative assessments teachers will be targeting their instruction in order to accelerate the learning for all students. Walk-throughs from admin and instructional coaches to support instruction will be done on a regular basis.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Yariel Vignau (yariel.vignau@hcps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: The use of baseline and individual student data is used to plan lessons tailored to the individual needs of the students.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: When teachers know their students and where they are academically while adjusting the lessons to meet their needs, an increase in learning will take place.

Action Steps to Implement

Intentional planning and support through PLC's with a focus on data-based decision making.
 Use of IXL to support reading and instruction
 Support from the reading coach and ELL specialist to help provide support to all students.
 Scheduling of level one seventh graders for the third year into US History to provide a foundation of US government and improve knowledge when taking the Civics EOC in eighth grade.
 To support students with disabilities, we provide small group instruction that was demonstrated to all teachers at professional study day and a school-wide professional development.
 Support from the ESE specialist on-site and an ESE district resource teacher to support students with disabilities within the social studies department.

Person Responsible Yariel Vignau (yariel.vignau@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.

For 2019 the school reported 3.2 incidents per 100 students. This rate is less than the state wide rate of 4.2 incidents per 100 students. The school will continue to implement its behavior plan concentrating more on restorative practices and fixing the issues rather than just suspending 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.

Implementation of the school wide PBIS system allows the school to create a culture where students are being rewarded for doing the right thing. Administration regularly provides events for faculty and staff to celebrate different cultures. events and celebrations across campus. Outside community stakeholders regularly provide for the school with items such as a new teachers lounge and beautification projects across the campus.

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

The PBIS team is responsible for implementation of the school wide system of rewards called Archer Bucks. The Boys and Girls Club provides our students with a no cost morning, afternoon and summer program full of enrichment activities for our students. Sunshine committee plans events throughout the school year for our teachers.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Social Studies	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00