

Hillsborough County Public Schools

# Pierce Middle School



## 2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

---

## Table of Contents

---

|   |           |
|---|-----------|
| <b>School Demographics</b>                | <b>3</b>  |
| <b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>     | <b>4</b>  |
| <b>School Information</b>                 | <b>7</b>  |
| <b>Needs Assessment</b>                   | <b>10</b> |
| <b>Planning for Improvement</b>           | <b>14</b> |
| <b>Positive Culture &amp; Environment</b> | <b>0</b>  |
| <b>Budget to Support Goals</b>            | <b>0</b>  |

## Pierce Middle School

5511 N HESPERIDES ST, Tampa, FL 33614

[ no web address on file ]

### Demographics

Principal: Pablo Gallejo

Start Date for this Principal: 8/2/2022

|  |   |
|--|---|
| <b>2019-20 Status</b><br>(per MSID File)   | Active  |
| <b>School Type and Grades Served</b><br>(per MSID File)  | Middle School<br>6-8  |
| <b>Primary Service Type</b><br>(per MSID File)   | K-12 General Education  |
| <b>2021-22 Title I School</b>  | Yes   |
| <b>2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b><br>(as reported on Survey 3)  | 100%  |
| <b>2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b><br>(subgroups with 10 or more students)<br>(subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Students With Disabilities*<br>English Language Learners<br>Asian Students<br>Black/African American Students*<br>Hispanic Students<br>Multiracial Students<br>White Students*<br>Economically Disadvantaged Students |
| <b>School Grades History</b>   | 2021-22: C (47%)<br>2018-19: C (50%)<br>2017-18: C (52%)  |
| <b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>  |   |
| <b>SI Region</b>   | Central   |
| <b>Regional Executive Director</b>   | <a href="#">Lucinda Thompson</a>  |
| <b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>   | N/A   |
| <b>Year</b>  |   |
| <b>Support Tier</b>  |   |
| <b>ESSA Status</b>   | TSI   |
| * As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, <a href="#">click here</a> .   |   |

## School Board Approval

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

## SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a 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](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.

---

## Table of Contents

---

|                                       |           |
|---------------------------------------|-----------|
| <b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b> | <b>4</b>  |
| <b>School Information</b>             | <b>7</b>  |
| <b>Needs Assessment</b>               | <b>10</b> |
| <b>Planning for Improvement</b>       | <b>14</b> |
| <b>Title I Requirements</b>           | <b>0</b>  |
| <b>Budget to Support Goals</b>        | <b>0</b>  |

## Pierce Middle School

5511 N HESPERIDES ST, Tampa, FL 33614

[ no web address on file ]

### School Demographics

| School Type and Grades Served<br>(per MSID File) | 2021-22 Title I School | 2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate<br>(as reported on Survey 3) |
|--|------------------------|--|
| Middle School<br>6-8                             | Yes                    | 100%   |
| Primary Service Type<br>(per MSID File)          | Charter School         | 2018-19 Minority Rate<br>(Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)               |
| K-12 General Education                           | No                     | 94%  |

### 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.

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 become productive members of the community".

### 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 |
|------------------------|---------------------|---------------------------------|
| Gallego Alvarez, Pablo | Principal           |                                 |
| Ferguson, Hailee       | Assistant Principal |                                 |

### Demographic Information

#### Principal start date

Tuesday 8/2/2022, Pablo Gallejo

**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.*

2

**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.*

11

**Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school**

39

**Total number of students enrolled at the school**

835

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

17

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

10

#### 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 | 287 | 263 | 284 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 834 |       |
| Attendance below 90 percent                              | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 81  | 53  | 98  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 232 |       |
| One or more suspensions                                  | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 16  | 55  | 49  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 120 |       |
| Course failure in ELA                                    | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 75  | 82  | 99  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 256 |       |
| Course failure in Math                                   | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 70  | 98  | 113 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 281 |       |
| Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment             | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 75  | 82  | 99  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 256 |       |
| Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment            | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 71  | 99  | 113 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 283 |       |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 135 | 133 | 157 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 425 |       |
|  | 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 | 7 | 29 | 26 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0     | 62 |

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 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 5 |       |
| Students retained two or more times | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 6 |       |

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 8/25/2022

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 | 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     |

**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 | 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 | 4 | 11 | 6 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 21    |

**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 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 6     |

**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             | 37%    | 50%      | 50%   |        |          |       | 39%    | 51%      | 54%   |
| ELA Learning Gains          | 43%    |          |       |        |          |       | 46%    | 52%      | 54%   |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile  | 34%    |          |       |        |          |       | 43%    | 47%      | 47%   |
| Math Achievement            | 38%    | 36%      | 36%   |        |          |       | 49%    | 55%      | 58%   |
| Math Learning Gains         | 49%    |          |       |        |          |       | 56%    | 57%      | 57%   |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 50%    |          |       |        |          |       | 48%    | 52%      | 51%   |
| Science Achievement         | 33%    | 52%      | 53%   |        |          |       | 32%    | 47%      | 51%   |
| Social Studies Achievement  | 47%    | 58%      | 58%   |        |          |       | 51%    | 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 | 34%    | 53%      | -19%                       | 54%   | -20%                    |
| Cohort Comparison |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| 07                | 2022 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 35%    | 54%      | -19%                       | 52%   | -17%                    |
| Cohort Comparison |      | -34%   |          |                            |       |                         |
| 08                | 2022 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 39%    | 53%      | -14%                       | 56%   | -17%                    |
| Cohort Comparison |      | -35%   |          |                            |       |                         |

| MATH              |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade             | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 06                | 2022 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 39%    | 49%      | -10%                       | 55%   | -16%                    |
| Cohort Comparison |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| 07                | 2022 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 53%    | 62%      | -9%                        | 54%   | -1%                     |
| Cohort Comparison |      | -39%   |          |                            |       |                         |
| 08                | 2022 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 15%    | 31%      | -16%                       | 46%   | -31%                    |
| Cohort Comparison |      | -53%   |          |                            |       |                         |

| 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 | 30%    | 47%      | -17%                       | 48%   | -18%                    |
| Cohort Comparison |      | 0%     |          |                            |       |                         |

| BIOLOGY EOC |        |          |                       |       |                    |
|-------------|--------|----------|-----------------------|-------|--------------------|
| Year        | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2022        |        |          |                       |       |                    |
| 2019        | 0%     | 66%      | -66%                  | 67%   | -67%               |
| CIVICS EOC  |        |          |                       |       |                    |
| Year        | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2022        |        |          |                       |       |                    |
| 2019        | 48%    | 67%      | -19%                  | 71%   | -23%               |
| 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         | 89%    | 63%      | 26%                   | 61%   | 28%                |
| 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                                       | 22       | 30     | 26          | 22        | 34      | 36           | 16       | 34      |           |                   |                     |
| ELL                                       | 30       | 40     | 34          | 35        | 47      | 46           | 23       | 39      | 90        |                   |                     |
| ASN                                       | 62       | 47     |             | 90        | 83      |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| BLK                                       | 29       | 32     | 24          | 23        | 43      | 52           | 23       | 37      |           |                   |                     |
| HSP                                       | 36       | 43     | 35          | 38        | 47      | 47           | 33       | 49      | 88        |                   |                     |
| WHT                                       | 47       | 60     |             | 51        | 62      | 67           | 45       | 50      |           |                   |                     |
| FRL                                       | 37       | 43     | 35          | 39        | 49      | 49           | 34       | 47      | 90        |                   |                     |
| 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        |                   |                     |
| 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        |                   |                     |

**ESSA Data Review**

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

| <b>ESSA Federal Index</b>   |     |
|---|-----|
| ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)  | TSI |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students  | 45  |
| 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 | 31  |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index                                       | 450 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index  | 10  |
| Percent Tested  | 99% |
| <b>Subgroup Data</b>  |     |
| <b>Students With Disabilities</b>   |     |
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities                                      | 26  |
| Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?              | YES |
| Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%       | 3   |
| <b>English Language Learners</b>  |     |
| Federal Index - English Language Learners                                       | 42  |
| English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?               | NO  |
| Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%        | 0   |
| <b>Native American Students</b>   |     |
| 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   |
| <b>Asian Students</b>   |     |
| Federal Index - Asian Students  | 71  |
| Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?                          | NO  |
| Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%                   | 0   |
| <b>Black/African American Students</b>  |     |
| Federal Index - Black/African American Students                                 | 33  |
| Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?         | YES |
| Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%  | 0   |

| Hispanic Students  |     |
|--|-----|
| Federal Index - Hispanic Students  | 45  |
| 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   |     |
| Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?                       | N/A |
| 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                                | 45  |
| 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?

Looking at a three year data we continue to see a lower than expected number of students scoring at the proficient level in ELA with the 8th grade group showing the largest drop from 3 years ago. Science continues to score at a low level of proficiency with no change in the past 3 years staying at 31% passing.

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

Looking at the FSA data, we continue to struggle reaching our bottom quartile students in ELA with only 35% of the students demonstrating gains last year.

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

Language acquisition as well as lack of direct instruction in the 2 prior years are a considerable factor to the lower performance on ELA, specially the bottom quartile students.

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

Our Algebra students score at a 94% passing rate on the EOC.  
There was also a ten point growth in math for students in the bottom quartile.

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

Data-driven decision making. Differentiation instruction based on individual student needs. Small groups identified and targeted within each class period.

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

Continue looking at individual student data, small group instruction and planning with student individual needs in mind.

**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 PD, demonstration classrooms, best practices for identifying student data.

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

District DRT, push in and pull outs by site-based academic coaches. Tutoring before, during and after school for targeted students.

**Areas of Focus**

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

:

**#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA****Area of Focus Description and****Rationale:**

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

6th, 7th and 8th grades continue to score below 40% proficiency level. Continue to have students with low English proficiency and lack of access to outside resources to enhance their learning and understanding, which contributes to their low performance.

**Measurable Outcome:**

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

The goal is to score at a 40% proficiency or above in all three grade levels for this academic year, based on the progress monitoring assessment exams.

**Monitoring:**

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

Looking at data from the PM1 and PM2 and any other common assessments throughout the year.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Pablo Gallego Alvarez (pablo.gallegoalvarez@hcps.net)

**Evidence-based Strategy:**

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

Targeting students that are lacking the skills, and providing the support needed during the year. This will be accomplished with tutoring, push ins and pull outs.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:**

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

Providing extra supports, such as tutoring and other outside resources will enhance learning and improve proficiency for students with lack of outside resources.

**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.

Intentional planning and support through PLC's to identify and target students. Differentiated instruction and weekly meeting with instructional coach and DRTs. Utilizing digital resources and new technology.

To support students with disabilities we provide co-teach classes to meet their needs as well as pull outs and small group instruction.

**Person Responsible**

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



**#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science**

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**  
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

For the last three years we have scored a 31% proficiency for 8th grade science. Lack of growth in this area is a concern.

**Measurable Outcome:**

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

Our goal is to score 35% proficiency or higher for this year.

**Monitoring:**

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

Looking at data from the district science exam in August and December and then in turn for the state exam in May, and any other common assessments throughout the year.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

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

**Evidence-based Strategy:**

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

Small-group instruction to identify and meet the individual needs of all students.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:**

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

Small-group instruction will allow for the teachers to identify and focus on all student needs to then be able to increase the proficiency of students.

**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.

*No action steps were entered for this area of focus*

**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.

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 and 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.

The Sunshine Committee will establish/organize several events outside of the school for teachers to build positive school culture and socialize. There will also be community service days involving faculty, parents and students.

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

PBIS team is responsible for implementation of the school-wide system of rewards called Archer Bucks. The Boys and Girls Club provides out 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.