

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 |

Hillsborough - 3561 - Progress Village Middle Magnet - 2021-22 SIP

Progress Village Middle Magnet

8113 ZINNIA DR, Tampa, FL 33619

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Peter Megara

Start Date for this Principal: 1/3/2019

| 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) | 89% |
| 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: A (62%) 2017-18: A (63%) 2016-17: B (60%) |
| 2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Inf | ormation* |
| 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. F | or more information, <u>click here</u> . |
| | |

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 <u>www.floridacims.org.</u>

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 |

Hillsborough - 3561 - Progress Village Middle Magnet - 2021-22 SIP

Progress Village Middle Magnet

8113 ZINNIA DR, Tampa, FL 33619

[no web address on file]

School Demographics

| School Type and Gr (per MSID F | | 2020-21 Title I School | Disadvan | Economically taged (FRL) Rate ted on Survey 3) |
|--------------------------------------|----------|------------------------|---------------------|------------------------------------------------------|
| Middle Sch 6-8 | ool | No | | 57% |
| Primary Servic (per MSID F | | Charter School | (Reporte | Minority Rate ed as Non-white Survey 2) |
| K-12 General Ec | ducation | No | | 71% |
| School Grades Histo | ry | | | |
| Year Grade | 2020-21 | 2019-20 A | 2018-19 A | 2017-18 A |
| School Board Approv | val | | | |

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 is "Setting the Stage for Progress with the Spotlight on You!"

Provide the school's vision statement.

Our Vision is to unite students, families, and communities by promoting high academic standards through an arts-integrated learning environment. The focus centers on building interpersonal relationships and achieving excellence in all areas of the curriculum.

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 |
|-----------------------|------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Megara, Peter | Principal | Principal: Share school's goals with faculty |
| Blake, Bridgette | Assistant Principal | Assistant Principal of Curriculum Assistant Principals: Work with team to analyze test data Team: collect instructional data via walkthroughs; use data to improve instruction; provide PD |
| Hildebrand, Nicole | Assistant Principal | Assistant Principal for transportation, facilities, athletics and Covid point of contact Assistant Principals: Work with team to analyze test data Team: collect instructional data via walkthroughs; use data to improve instruction; provide PD |

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Thursday 1/3/2019, Peter Megara

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.*

6

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.

7

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school 46

Total number of students enrolled at the school

813

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

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

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

2021-22

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

| la dia stan | | | | | | | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------------------------------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|-------------|-----|-----|---|----|----|----|-------|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| Indicator | κ | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total | | | | | | |
| Number of students enrolled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 256 | 253 | 304 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 813 | | | | | | |
| 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 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | | | | | | |
| 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 | 45 | 32 | 44 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 121 | | | | | | |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 64 | 50 | 63 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 177 | | | | | | |
| 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 | | | | | | Gr | ade | e Le | vel | | | | | Total |
|--------------------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|----|-----|------|-----|---|----|----|----|-------|
| indicator | κ | 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 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |

The number of students identified as retainees:

| Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-------------|---|-----|-------|---------|-----------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--|
| κ | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total | |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | |
| | 0 | 0 0 | 0 0 0 | 0 0 0 0 | 0 0 0 0 0 | K 1 2 3 4 5 0 0 0 0 0 0 | K 1 2 3 4 5 6 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 | K 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 0 | K 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 0 0 | K 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 0 0 0 | K 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 0 0 0 0 0 2 0 0 0 0 | K 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 0 0 0 0 0 2 0 0 0 0 0 | K 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 0 0 0 0 0 2 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 1 2 0 0 0 0 0 | |

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 8/30/2021

2020-21 - As Reported

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

| le d'acteur | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-------------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|-----|-----|-----|---|----|----|----|-------|
| Indicator | κ | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total |
| Number of students enrolled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 166 | 128 | 154 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 448 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 36 | 46 | 62 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 144 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 |
| 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 | 35 | 20 | 48 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 103 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 59 | 42 | 73 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 174 |

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

| Indicator | | | | | | Gr | ade | e Le | evel | l | | | | Total |
|--------------------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|----|-----|------|------|---|----|----|----|-------|
| indicator | κ | 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 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 |

The number of students identified as retainees:

| Indicator | | | | | | Gr | ade | e Le | ve | I | | | | Total |
|-------------------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|----|-----|------|----|---|----|----|----|-------|
| Indicator | κ | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total |
| 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 | |

2020-21 - Updated

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

| Indiantar | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-------------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|-----|-----|-----|---|----|----|----|-------|
| Indicator | κ | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total |
| Number of students enrolled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 166 | 128 | 154 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 448 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 36 | 46 | 62 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 144 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 |
| 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 | 35 | 20 | 48 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 103 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 59 | 42 | 73 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 174 |

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

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

The number of students identified as retainees:

| le dia séc s | | | | | | Gr | ade | e Le | vel | | | | | Total |
|-------------------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|----|-----|------|-----|---|----|----|----|-------|
| Indicator | κ | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total |
| 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 | |

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 Grade Component | School | District | State | School | District | State | School | District | State |
| ELA Achievement | | | | 60% | 51% | 54% | 60% | 52% | 53% |
| ELA Learning Gains | | | | 57% | 52% | 54% | 53% | 53% | 54% |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | 51% | 47% | 47% | 42% | 48% | 47% |
| Math Achievement | | | | 61% | 55% | 58% | 68% | 56% | 58% |
| Math Learning Gains | | | | 58% | 57% | 57% | 68% | 59% | 57% |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | 45% | 52% | 51% | 58% | 52% | 51% |
| Science Achievement | | | | 55% | 47% | 51% | 56% | 47% | 52% |
| Social Studies Achievement | | | | 87% | 67% | 72% | 77% | 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 | 59% | 53% | 6% | 54% | 5% |
| Cohort Co | mparison | | | | | |
| 07 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 60% | 54% | 6% | 52% | 8% |
| Cohort Co | mparison | -59% | | | | |
| 08 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 62% | 53% | 9% | 56% | 6% |
| Cohort Co | mparison | -60% | | | • | |

| | | | MATH | 4 | | |
|------------|---------|--------|----------|-----------------------------------|-------|--------------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School- District Comparison | State | School- State Comparison |
| 06 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 46% | 49% | -3% | 55% | -9% |
| Cohort Com | parison | | | | | |

| | | | MATH | 1 | | |
|-------------|----------|--------|----------|-----------------------------------|-------|--------------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School- District Comparison | State | School- State Comparison |
| 07 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 70% | 62% | 8% | 54% | 16% |
| Cohort Corr | nparison | -46% | | | | |
| 08 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 28% | 31% | -3% | 46% | -18% |
| Cohort Corr | nparison | -70% | | | | |

| | | | SCIEN | CE | | |
|------------|---------|--------|----------|-----------------------------------|-------|--------------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School- District Comparison | State | School- State Comparison |
| 08 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 55% | 47% | 8% | 48% | 7% |
| Cohort Com | parison | | | • | | |

| | | BIOLO | GY EOC | | |
|------|--------|----------|-----------------------------|---------|--------------------------|
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2021 | | | | | |
| 2019 | | | | | |
| | | CIVIC | S EOC | | |
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2021 | | | | | |
| 2019 | 87% | 67% | 20% | 71% | 16% |
| | | HISTO | RY EOC | | |
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2021 | | | | | |
| 2019 | | | | | |
| I | | ALGEB | RA EOC | • | |
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2021 | | | | | |
| 2019 | 88% | 63% | 25% | 61% | 27% |
| | | GEOME | TRY 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.

PV staff will utilize the district assessments for the following data for Math and Science: baseline, midyear district Assessments.

For ELA data, we will utilize the Achieve3000 data from 3 checkpoints and anyone who "meets" the criteria is considered proficient.

| | | Grade 6 | | |
|--------------------------|-------------------------------|---------|--------|--------|
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 21.6 | 18.4 | 19.9 |
| English Language Arts | Economically Disadvantaged | 8.5 | 8.5 | 10 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 18.7 | 3.1 | 18.7 |
| | English Language Learners | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 55.9 | 51.27 | NA |
| Mathematics | Economically Disadvantaged | 49.6 | 47.88 | NA |
| | Students With Disabilities | 67.70 | 57.99 | NA |
| | English Language Learners | 23.7 | 83.7 | NA |

| | | Grade 7 | | |
|--------------------------|-------------------------------|---------|--------|--------|
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 20.9 | 19.5 | 22.8 |
| English Language Arts | Economically Disadvantaged | 13 | 19.6 | 22.2 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 13.7 | 13.7 | 20.6 |
| | English Language Learners | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 57.5 | 59.35 | NA |
| Mathematics | Economically Disadvantaged | 41.50 | 54.65 | NA |
| | Students With Disabilities | 62.90 | 72.81 | NA |
| | English Language Learners | 30.6 | 59 | NA |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 24 | 52 | 54 |
| Civics | Economically Disadvantaged | 23 | 49 | 49 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 16 | 51 | 56 |
| 1 | English Language Learners | 65 | 43 | 51 |

| | | Grade 8 | | |
|--------------------------|-------------------------------|---------|--------|--------|
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 21.8 | 25.2 | 21.4 |
| English Language Arts | Economically Disadvantaged | 8.9 | 16.2 | 17.5 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 24 | 18.9 | 28.4 |
| | English Language Learners | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 70.40 | 56.28 | NA |
| Mathematics | Economically Disadvantaged | 47.00 | 40.99 | NA |
| | Students With Disabilities | 77.3 | 63.86 | NA |
| | English Language Learners | 53.3 | 54.08 | NA |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 27.5 | 39.7 | NA |
| Science | Economically Disadvantaged | 39.3 | 47.4 | NA |
| | Students With Disabilities | 66.7 | 46.8 | NA |
| | English Language Learners | 39.3 | 39.7 | NA |

Subgroup Data Review

| | | 2021 | SCHOO | OL GRAD | E COMF | ONENT | S BY SI | JBGRO | UPS | | |
|-----------|-------------|-----------|-------------------|--------------|------------|--------------------|-------------|------------|--------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|
| 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 | 20 | 32 | 34 | 28 | 43 | 39 | 32 | 61 | | | |
| ELL | 38 | 46 | 50 | 38 | 51 | 55 | 33 | 64 | | | |
| BLK | 42 | 42 | 30 | 40 | 40 | 39 | 31 | 77 | 63 | | |
| HSP | 54 | 52 | 44 | 51 | 54 | 48 | 50 | 83 | 72 | | |
| MUL | 59 | 66 | | 57 | 64 | | 50 | 85 | 64 | | |
| WHT | 72 | 61 | 55 | 70 | 59 | 47 | 60 | 91 | 68 | | |
| FRL | 48 | 48 | 39 | 43 | 44 | 40 | 37 | 76 | 56 | | |
| | | 2019 | SCHOO | OL GRAD | E COMF | PONENT | S BY SI | JBGRO | UPS | | |
| 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 | 20 | 39 | 39 | 24 | 39 | 31 | 19 | 48 | 82 | | |
| ELL | 39 | 65 | 61 | 40 | 56 | 50 | 23 | 80 | | | |
| ASN | 100 | 92 | | 100 | 83 | | | | | | |

| 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 |
| BLK | 47 | 51 | 44 | 48 | 51 | 42 | 41 | 84 | 82 | | |
| HSP | 63 | 59 | 58 | 64 | 63 | 44 | 54 | 86 | 84 | | |
| MUL | 67 | 59 | 58 | 65 | 56 | 50 | 56 | 86 | 79 | | |
| WHT | 70 | 59 | 56 | 72 | 61 | 51 | 71 | 91 | 91 | | |
| FRL | 51 | 54 | 48 | 51 | 53 | 44 | 46 | 81 | 80 | | |
| | | 2018 | SCHOO | OL GRAD | E COMF | PONENT | S BY SI | JBGRO | UPS | | |
| 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 | 20 | 37 | 35 | 21 | 43 | 39 | 17 | 41 | | | |
| ELL | 28 | 44 | 54 | 54 | 62 | 63 | | 47 | | | |
| ASN | 81 | 50 | | 100 | 81 | | | | | | |
| BLK | 43 | 46 | 38 | 55 | 65 | 57 | 33 | 67 | 89 | | |
| HSP | 60 | 54 | 48 | 70 | 65 | 60 | 54 | 81 | 87 | | |
| MUL | 72 | 49 | | 80 | 69 | | 64 | 80 | 100 | | |
| WHT | 74 | 62 | 50 | 77 | 74 | 61 | 79 | 82 | 85 | | |
| FRL | 49 | 48 | 42 | 59 | 65 | 57 | 46 | 68 | 87 | | |

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 | 54 | | | |
| 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 | | | | |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 489 | | | |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 9 | | | |
| Percent Tested | 83% | | | |
| Subgroup Data | | | | |
| Students With Disabilities | | | | |
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities | 36 | | | |
| 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 | 47 | | | |

Hillsborough - 3561 - Progress Village Middle Magnet - 2021-22 SIP

| 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 | |
| Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32% | |
| Black/African American Students | |
| Federal Index - Black/African American Students | 45 |
| 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 | 56 |
| 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 | 64 |
| 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 | 65 |
| 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 | 48 |
| 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?

For 2021 state testing, our average raw score for ELA and Mathematics for the African American subgroup was low among all grade levels.

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

Using the 2020-2021 state assessments data, our African American males and females had the lowest average raw score: ELA grade 6 was 32, 7th grade was 33 and 8th grade was 32. For mathematics, our African American males and females had the lowers raw score: for 6th grade was 21, 7th grade was 22, and for 8th grade 19.

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

Due to E-learning and Covid-related schedule change as well as district mandated unit losses, students schedules were impacted and changes of teachers occurred, which ultimately impacts learning. Minimal schedules and in-person learning will contribute to student achievement and growth in learning. Standards-based lesson planning and teaching to the rigor of the standard will help improve student learning.

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

Our geometry students maintained a high level of achievement on the state EOC, with 95% of the students passing the 2021 test.

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

Instructors provided additional academic enrichment for both e-learning students and brick and mortar students.

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

Teachers are using pre-assessments and baselines to assess students' current knowledge and to develop "just in time" learning opportunities to support acceleration of learning. School-wide use of AVID strategies, chunking of information, using graphic organizers and grade-level texts will support this goal.

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.

PV will utilize our faculty meetings to share content strategies and SEL strategies to use in classrooms. Staff members are also participating in the Youth Mental Health First Aide training.

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

Our Social studies teachers are encouraged to attend the once a month "Super Saturday" sessions provided by the district supervisor. Mathematics teachers are enrolled in a self-paced Canvas course for PD from the math supervisor.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

| Area of Focus Description and Rationale: | Our area of focus is based on student data received from the district from the 2020-2021 school year, our school decided that all lessons must be grade-level appropriate, and standards based to accelerate student learning. | | | |
|--------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--|--|--|
| Measurable Outcome: | As a school our goal is to increase our total points earned in the Florida State Assessments to earn the school grade of an "A". An increase of 8% will need to be earned by May 2022. | | | |
| | Each department's PLC will review data from common assessments, baselines, mid-years to reflect and reteach standards and to plan collaboratively. School-wide walk-throughs and professional development opportunities will provide feedback on standards-aligned instruction and our areas to grow. | | | |
| Monitoring: | Steps for monitoring and supporting our SWD subgroups: Provide verbal and visual instructions for assignments: precise & clear verbal description Gain student's attention with visual cues when presenting key information or directions Minimize the number of written problems to demonstrate proficiency Provide cues to make students aware of important features/tasks Vary voice tones and maintain frequent eye contact | | | |
| Person responsible for monitoring outcome: | Peter Megara (peter.megara@hcps.net) | | | |
| Evidence- based Strategy: | Differentiation | | | |
| Rationale for Evidence- based Strategy: | Differentiation is informed by research or evaluation findings that suggest it is likely to improve student learning. | | | |
| Action Steps | to Implement | | | |
| 1.Walk-throughs 2.Plcs- reviewing the trends | | | | |

 Develop strategies or PD to address areas of growth
 Once implemented in the classrooms, the leadership team will need to revisit areas of growth to check for improvements.

Person

Peter Megara (peter.megara@hcps.net) Responsible

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Differentiation

| #2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Differentiation | | | | | |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--|--|--|--|
| Area of Focus Description and Rationale: | Progress Village will identify and address individualized student learning opportunities. | | | | |
| Measurable Outcome: | As a school our goal is to increase our total points earned in the Florida State Assessments to earn the school grade of an "A". An increase of 8% will need to be earned by May 2022. | | | | |
| Monitoring: | Teachers will progess monitor student learning throughout the marking period by using data chats, common assessments, Canvas gradebook and the Canvas class page as a learning tool. Teachers can use small groups to re-teach and accelerate student learning losses that occur throughout the year when a student is absent from class. Steps for monitoring and supporting our SWD subgroups: Provide verbal and visual instructions for assignments: precise & clear verbal description Gain student's attention with visual cues when presenting key information or directions Minimize the number of written problems to demonstrate proficiency Provide cues to make students aware of important features/tasks Vary voice tones and maintain frequent eye contact | | | | |
| Person responsible for monitoring outcome: | Peter Megara (peter.megara@hcps.net) | | | | |
| Evidence- based Strategy: | Teachers will receive subject-specific support during Professional Learning Community planning meetings. They will collaborate (when possible) while planning to reflect the expectations set forth in the HCPS K-12 Instructional Frameworks. Teachers will then discuss the outcomes of their assessments and next steps based on the data (Plan-Do-Check-Act). This opportunity to participate in on-going self-reflection from data reviews will enable teachers to plan for enrichment and/or remediation. Students will receive this differentiated support through small group rotations as outlined in the HCPSK-12 Instructional Frameworks. | | | | |
| Rationale for Evidence- based Strategy: | Data analysis, collaborative PLCs, and the implementation of the HCPS K-12Instructional Frameworks leads to specific instructional delivery components that will provide students with the assistance required to increase their skills and capabilities. | | | | |
| Action Steps | to Implement | | | | |
| Step 2: Align Step 3: Create Step 4: Monite | Differentiation as students & identify needs lessons to standards e individualized learning paths or progress and formatively assess learners at the first four steps after each lesson | | | | |

Person

Peter Megara (peter.megara@hcps.net) Responsible

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the <u>SafeSchoolsforAlex.org</u>, 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.

African American males and females performed lower than other subgroups across the board academically. Upon further research into school discipline data, African American males and females were disciplined at a rate greater than their peers. The following steps will be utilized to improve the academic and social success of African American students in an effort to promote college and career readiness:

1. Identify high-risk trends within African American subgroup using data from the 2020-2021 school year.

2. Share results school-wide and identify best practices with team leaders, school counselors and the 2 assistant teachers who will be monitoring student progress.

3. Support the students through coaching and peer mentoring/tutoring.

4. Periodically monitor progress through school wide academic and discipline data (behavior tracker).

5. School-wide focus: Teachers, administrators, and students will build relationships with all students to further

enhance the school's culture and facilitate greater success.

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.

The Progress Village faculty will focus on implementing team building strategies in order to develop and maintain positive teacher-student and student-student relationships, campus-wide.

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

PV will build a positive school culture and engage students, staff, and community stakeholders through the following events and activities:

- 1. AVID Family Nights
- 2. SAC & PTSA
- 3. Iron Sharpens Iron Breakfast
- 4. Elective Parent Boosters
- 5. Recruitment "Road Shows" and Shadowing Program for potential students

- 6. PBIS and Bobcat Bucks/STAR program
- 7. Mentoring Program
- 8. End of Year Musical and Winter Extravaganza
- 9. HBCU Showcase

10. Media Center Sponsored: Hispanic Heritage trivia contest for students and a Latin Café Luncheon for staff and Black History Month daily showcasing and National African American DEAR Read-in and a "Taste of Soul" luncheon for staff.

- 11. Great American Teach-in
- 12. Girl Scouts of America Program
- 13. Media Center Sponsored: Teen Tober/ Teen Read Week
- 14. Media Center Sponsored: SLAM Showcase
- 15. Colors Club
- 16. SGA
- 17. PV's Got Talent
- 18. Start with Hello Week
- 19. Family and Career Community Leaders of America(FCCLA)
- 20.Thurgood Marshall Club
- 21. AVID club

Part V: Budget

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

| 1 | III.A. | A. Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Standards-aligned Instruction | | |
|---|--------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------|--|
| 2 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Differentiation | \$0.00 | |
| | | Total: | \$0.00 | |