

Hillsborough County Public Schools

Mann Middle School



2022-23 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	15
Positive Culture & Environment	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Mann Middle School

409 E JERSEY AVE, Brandon, FL 33510

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Brad Brooks

Start Date for this Principal: 12/2/2019

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
2021-22 Title I School	Yes
2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2021-22 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	2021-22: C (50%) 2018-19: C (47%) 2017-18: C (49%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	ATSI
* 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	15
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Mann Middle School

409 E JERSEY AVE, Brandon, FL 33510

[no web address on file]

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2021-22 Title I School	2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Middle School 6-8	Yes	100%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	73%

School Grades History

Year	2021-22	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19
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.

At Horace Mann Middle School, our mission is to empower the student with the essential tools to become a responsible and contributing member of the community.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Preparing Student's For Life

School Leadership Team

Membership

For each member of the school leadership team, select the employee name and email address from the dropdown. Identify the position title and job duties/responsibilities.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Pfeffer, Jason	Assistant Principal	Mr. Pfeffer is our AP of Curriculum, he facilitates Instructional Leadership Team, and is our testing coordinator.
Jones, Dante	Principal	Mr. Jones is the captain of our ships, he meets with all SALs regularly for progress monitoring and Team Leads. Every year he meets with all students for our annual grade level assemblies and school wide climate and culture expectations.
Perez, FrancesL	Assistant Principal	Ms. Perez is our AP of Facilities, she manages our problem solving leadership team, as well as our PBIS initiative.
Dewsbury, Nicolette	Instructional Media	Mrs. Dewsbury will facilitate all SAC meetings and be the primary point of contact for SIP.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 12/2/2019, Brad Brooks

Number of teachers with a 2022 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.*

1

Number of teachers with a 2022 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.*

10

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

81

Total number of students enrolled at the school

795

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

14

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2022-23 school year.

16

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

Using prior year's data, complete the table below with the number of students by current 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	270	239	286	0	0	0	0	795	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	79	100	106	0	0	0	0	285	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	77	92	0	0	0	0	186	
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 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	94	69	92	0	0	0	0	255	
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	98	81	107	0	0	0	0	286	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level who have 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	10	39	44	0	0	0	0	93	

Using current year data, complete the table below with the number of students identified as being "retained.":

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

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 8/15/2022

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	229	218	251	0	0	0	0	698
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	62	77	99	0	0	0	0	238
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	41	49	0	0	0	0	91
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	41	56	87	0	0	0	0	184
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	82	80	86	0	0	0	0	248
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	41	42	52	0	0	0	0	135

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	23	24	0	0	0	0	47

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	4	6	8	0	0	0	0	18
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	105	85	0	0	0	0	0	190

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	229	218	251	0	0	0	0	698
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	62	77	99	0	0	0	0	238
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	41	49	0	0	0	0	91
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	41	56	87	0	0	0	0	184
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	82	80	86	0	0	0	0	248
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	41	42	52	0	0	0	0	135

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	23	24	0	0	0	0	47

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	4	6	8	0	0	0	0	18
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	105	85	0	0	0	0	0	190

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	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	38%	50%	50%				43%	51%	54%
ELA Learning Gains	45%						46%	52%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	41%						41%	47%	47%
Math Achievement	37%	36%	36%				42%	55%	58%
Math Learning Gains	54%						46%	57%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	54%						44%	52%	51%
Science Achievement	37%	52%	53%				28%	47%	51%
Social Studies Achievement	67%	58%	58%				60%	67%	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	2022					
	2019	45%	53%	-8%	54%	-9%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2022					
	2019	41%	54%	-13%	52%	-11%
Cohort Comparison		-45%				
08	2022					
	2019	39%	53%	-14%	56%	-17%
Cohort Comparison		-41%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2022					
	2019	33%	49%	-16%	55%	-22%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2022					
	2019	48%	62%	-14%	54%	-6%
Cohort Comparison		-33%				
08	2022					
	2019	11%	31%	-20%	46%	-35%
Cohort Comparison		-48%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
07	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2022					
	2019	26%	47%	-21%	48%	-22%
Cohort Comparison		0%				

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019					
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	57%	67%	-10%	71%	-14%
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019					
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	74%	63%	11%	61%	13%
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	0%	57%	-57%	57%	-57%

Subgroup Data Review

2022 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 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21
SWD	20	37	32	22	35	40	17	33			
ELL	25	41	38	29	51	47	21	57			
BLK	29	38	43	23	49	55	33	50	80		
HSP	32	46	41	33	53	55	27	61	72		
MUL	41	46		38	57	50		70			
WHT	51	48	42	50	54	48	51	79	74		
FRL	33	44	44	32	50	56	30	61	67		
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	13	27	24	16	25	30	9	18			
ELL	21	35	35	15	18	28	14	38			
BLK	21	35	38	20	25	29	17	40	75		

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
HSP	36	38	32	31	32	35	26	39	69		
MUL	40	45		39	35		33				
WHT	41	41	30	38	37	39	24	61	70		
FRL	31	37	33	28	32	33	21	42	71		
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	19	34	35	23	44	44	4	40			
ELL	20	38	33	25	38	49	18	41			
ASN	73	67		67	42						
BLK	29	37	34	24	38	41	20	36	53		
HSP	42	45	34	43	48	41	26	61	76		
MUL	35	45		42	37		20	65			
WHT	50	50	52	49	50	52	33	70	72		
FRL	38	43	41	37	44	42	25	57	67		

ESSA Data Review

This data has not been updated for the 2022-23 school year.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	49
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	46
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	493
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	98%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	30
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	2
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	39
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES

English Language Learners	
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
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%	0
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%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	44
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	46
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	50
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
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%	0
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	55
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	46
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Part III: Planning for Improvement

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?

As a whole the school did very well improving across the board. 4 ESSA subgroups raised enough to be above 41% (Black/African Students, Economically Disadvantaged Students, and Hispanic Students) , and the two who did not increase to above 41% (Students with Disabilities, and English Language Learners) still showed marked improvement.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

ELA Achievement and Math Achievement while there was growth, still show behind the district and state, there are more gains to be made. Science which also showed marked growth of 13% points from the year before also still lags behind our district and state peers.

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

We did have long term vacancies in 6th grade ELA and Reading that were not filled last year. 6th grade is also the grade that showed the least amount of growth correlating to the lack of certified teachers in the reading and ELA classroom. Science also had absenteeism problem with their teachers. We continue to have reading vacancies this year and the long term subs that are filling in will need to be closely coached by our literacy coach Faith Evans in order to ensure that students are supported and continue to maintain growth.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

Civics EOC and Science had the most significant percentage gains. We also made significant gains in each of our ESSA categories, raising 3 above the 41% threshold. The two remaining categories students with disabilities, and English Language Learners, that did not go above 41% saw significant improvements.

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

Science had a coach last year that did small group pull outs and worked with our bubble kids to ensure gains. Civics saw a significant increase as well but, we did not test our Level 1 students last year in Civics as they will now take part in the new two year program and will not be tested until this year. Our Student Success Coach worked closely with her roster of students who match several ESSA categories in order to accelerate student achievement.

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

Teacher PLCs will be data focused in order to accelerate learning, Positive Behavior Intervention Systems will also be monitored for fidelity and success. ELA will do tutorials Wednesday/Thursday 8:30-9:15 all year to work on reading and writing skills.

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.

Behavior has been an ongoing issue with our school. This year we are implementing PBIS and a CHAMPS model to have school wide vernacular. Both trainings will be offered to our teachers.

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

A 3rd guidance counselor who is bilingual to aide in ELL acceleration. A behavior specialist who will run our PBIS/CHAMPS initiatives, a success coach who will focus on our bottom quartile students in both academics and behaviors to ensure acceleration, and a Literacy Coach to work across subjects and incorporate reading strategies.

Areas of Focus

Identify the key Areas of Focus to address your school's highest priorities based on any/all relevant data sources.

:

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups**Area of Focus****Description and****Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

Our SWD and ELL groups are still below the ESSA threshold of 41%. Although we have seen marked growth in these areas, students in these groups still struggle with comprehension.

Measurable**Outcome:**

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

Targeted students will grow 5% between baseline and midyear, and an additional 5% between midyear and end of year FAST administrations.

Monitoring:

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

Targeted students will have their midyear assessment evaluated for growth, and their FAST PM3.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jason Pfeffer (jason.pfeffer@hcps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

Tier 1 Strong strategy for reading interventions for students in middle grades: Routinely use a set of comprehension-building practices to help students make sense of the text

Part 3A. Build students' world and word knowledge so they can make sense of the text
Part 3B. Consistently provide students with opportunities to ask and answer questions to better understand the text they read
Part 3C. Teach students a routine for determining the gist of a short section of text
Part 3D. Teach students to monitor their comprehension as they read

Rationale for Evidence-based**Strategy:**

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

Our students struggle to identify unknown words and have a limited world knowledge, exposing them to more text and giving them more opportunities to practice will expose them to more complex ideas and information. Tier 1 Strong strategy for reading interventions for students in middle grades according to what works clearinghouse is to routinely use a set of comprehension-building practices to help students make sense of text.

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

ELA and Reading will be conducting targeted tutorials using the baseline of the FAST test to determine who will be targeted. The tutorials will use a set of comprehension building practices to help students make use of text and provide students with more opportunities to ask and answer question to better understand the text they read.

Person Responsible Faith Evans (faith.evans@hcps.net)

The largest problem for students in Civics is that they struggle with reading the test questions. Civics will be targeting students based on their baseline for the Civics test and pulling them for targeted tutorials through lunch and learns. Students will be using stretch text on Achieve 3000 in order to build comprehension and ease with identifying unfamiliar words. This will aide them in understanding the Civics test.

Person Responsible Patrice Johnson (patrice.johnson@hcps.net)

Micro trainings on incorporating Students with Disabilities accommodations will be given through faculty meetings that demonstrate what an accommodations might look like in various subject areas

Person Responsible Shannon Granger (shannon.granger@hcps.net)

Academic family nights will be held twice a year allowing parents to learn strategies to aid their students at home.

Person Responsible Faith Evans (faith.evans@hcps.net)

ELL Teacher Mr. Rivera will be conducting tutorials as well before school, targeting our ELL students to help them increase their comprehension.

Person Responsible Jason Pfeffer (jason.pfeffer@hcps.net)

#2. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Behaviors and Interventions**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

Last year one of the primary complaints of teachers was that student behavior in the classroom was disruptive and interfered with instruction. Our discipline data shows that disobedience/insubordination and disruptive behavior were two of our top 3 incident types.

Measurable Outcome:

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

There were 859 incidents that fell under the disobedience/insubordination category last year. Through our interventions we expect to see referrals in those categories fall by 20%

Monitoring:

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

Mr. Caiati is monitoring monthly referral data, as well as monthly data on teacher usage of our positive intervention system "Dollarghs"

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Matthew Caiati (matthew.caiati@hcps.net1)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

We will be incorporating a PBIS model, (Positive Behavior Intervention System), students can earn "Dollarghs" by behaving positively, and meeting behavior goals set for them by the RTI team.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

Hattie ranks behavioral intervention programs at a .62 efficacy rate, and teacher student relationships as a .52. By incorporating PBIS we are targeting both strategies.

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

We will be incorporating a PBIS model, (Positive Behavior Intervention System), students can earn "Dollarghs" by behaving positively, and meeting behavior goals set for them by the RTI team. Dollargh data is monitored monthly for teacher fidelity, and student reception.

Person Responsible

Matthew Caiati (matthew.caiati@hcps.net1)

Teachers will be trained in CHAMPS, and CHAMPS will be used school wide to aide in school wide verbiage for procedures. Discipline data is reviewed monthly by leadership team to analyze for trends and fidelity.

Person Responsible

Matthew Caiati (matthew.caiati@hcps.net1)

Monthly communications will be sent home via Parentlink, and the school wide behavior plan will be posted to the website for parental information.

Person Responsible

Matthew Caiati (matthew.caiati@hcps.net1)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Collaborative Planning**Area of Focus Description and****Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

While Science has increased significantly in the last year (13 points), there is still a marked need for improvement based on comparing us to the district, and state scores. Students struggle with retaining content from prior years when tested in 8th grade.

Measurable Outcome:

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

FSSA scores will increase 10% points at the end of the year.

Monitoring:

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

Students bellwork answers will be compared between both teachers for growth and correct answers. Baseline data will be compared to midyear and then the FSSA for efficacy and fidelity.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Kathleen Yates (kathleen.yates@hcps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

Both 8th grade science teachers will incorporate 6th/7th grade content, targeting the lowest scoring standards from the baseline using common planning an assessment.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

Common/Collaborative planning according to Hattie has a large effect size.

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Both 8th grade science teachers will incorporate 6th/7th grade content, targeting the lowest scoring standards from the baseline, into their daily bellwork. Every Monday will also be used to target week standards from prior years. Students data will be reviewed at the end of every quarter.

Person Responsible

Kathleen Yates (kathleen.yates@hcps.net)

No description entered

Person Responsible

[no one identified]

RAISE

The RAISE program established criteria for identifying schools for additional support. The criteria for the 2022-23 school year includes schools with students in grades Kindergarten through fifth, where 50 percent or more of its students, for any grade level, score below a level 3 on the most recent statewide English Language Arts (ELA) assessment.

Area of Focus Description and Rationale

Include a description of your Area of Focus (Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA) for each grade below, how it affects student learning in literacy, and a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed. Data that should be used to determine the critical need should include, at a minimum:

- The percentage of students below Level 3 on the 2022 statewide, standardized ELA assessment. Identification criteria must include each grade that has 50 percent or more students scoring below level 3 in grades 3-5 on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.
- The percentage of students in kindergarten through grade 3, based on 2021-2022 end of year screening and progress monitoring data, who are not on track to score Level 3 or above on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.
- Other forms of data that should be considered: formative, progress monitoring and diagnostic assessment data.

Grades K-2: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

N/A

Grades 3-5: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

N/A

Measurable Outcomes:

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each grade below. This should be a data based, objective outcome. Include prior year data and a measurable outcome for each of the following:

- Each grade K-3, using the new coordinated screening and progress monitoring system, where 50 percent or more of the students are not on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment.
- Each grade 3-5 where 50 percent or more of its students scored below a level 3 on the most recent statewide, standardized ELA assessment and
- Grade 6 measurable outcomes may be included, as applicable.

Grades K-2: Measureable Outcome(s)

N/A

Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

N/A

Monitoring:

Describe how the school's Area(s) of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcomes. Include a description of how ongoing monitoring will take place with evaluating impact at the end of the year.

N/A

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Evidence-based Practices/Programs:

Describe the evidence-based practices/programs being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each grade and describe how the identified practices/programs will be monitored. The term "evidence-based" means demonstrating a statistically significant effect on improving student outcomes or other relevant outcomes as provided in 20 U.S.C. Â§7801(21)(A)(i). Florida's definition limits evidence-based practices/programs to only those with strong, moderate or promising levels of evidence.

- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs meet Florida's definition of evidence-based (strong, moderate or promising)?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align with the district's K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align to the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards?

N/A

Rationale for Evidence-based Practices/Programs:

Explain the rationale for selecting the specific practices/programs. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting the practices/programs.

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs address the identified need?
- Do the identified practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

N/A

Action Steps to Implement:

List the action steps that will be taken to address the school's Area(s) of Focus. To address the area of focus, identify 2 to 3 action steps and explain in detail for each of the categories below:

- Literacy Leadership
- Literacy Coaching
- Assessment
- Professional Learning

Action Step**Person Responsible for Monitoring**

N/A

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 is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies that impact the school culture and environment. 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.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment.

This year we are implementing a PBIS system schoolwide. DOLLAARGHs, (Accountable, Respectful, Growth, and Honesty), will be used schoolwide to reward students for following schoolwide norms. CHAMPS will also bring school wide consistency with procedures and school norms. This initiative will be run by Mr. Caiati.

We will also to continue to use our SEL coordinator Jill Adair to help push and encourage teachers to build a positive relationship with students and parents through SEL and particularly the 7 mindsets. TELL survey results and PFE (No TELL or PFE - we used Panorama) survey results are used to plan engaging programs that help to meet parents and student needs. SAC Chair and Title One coordinator will collaborate with the AVID coordinator on engaging Family Nights including the Fall Family Night, AVID college night, Camp Raider (incoming 6th graders), and a Reading Family Night. These programs will help parents with strategies for student and parent success. Field trips are conducted through AVID, band, intensive reading and science that include college visits, and DISNEY educational programs. (one period). We have set up a food pantry in collaboration with ECHO as well as continuing community partnerships with the Tampa Bay Lightning, Caspers (Mcdonalds), First Tee, and CVS.

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

AP Frances Perez and Jill Adair are co-chairing the 7 mindsets committee
 Media Specialist Nicolette Dewsbury, SAC chair, Family Night committee
 Mr. Caiati Behavior Specialist and lead on PBIS/Champs
 Reading Coach/Title I Parent and Family Engagement Liaison Faith Evans
 Trinetta Williams, Student Success Coach, working with a rostered group of high needs students to ensure acceleration.