Hillsborough County Public Schools

Progress Village Middle Magnet

2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Progress Village Middle Magnet

8113 ZINNIA DR, Tampa, FL 33619

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Peter Megara

Start Date for this Principal: 1/15/2018

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	No
2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	89%
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: B (59%) 2018-19: A (62%) 2017-18: A (63%)
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

Progress Village Middle Magnet

8113 ZINNIA DR, Tampa, FL 33619

[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	No	89%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	75%

School Grades History

Year	2021-22	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19
Grade	B		A	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 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
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
Megara, Peter	Principal	
Hildebrand, Nicole	Assistant Principal	

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Monday 1/15/2018, Peter Megara

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.*
13

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
43

Total number of students enrolled at the school
777

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2021-22 school year.
9

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2022-23 school year.
9

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	223	267	0	0	0	0	777
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	38	53	59	0	0	0	0	150
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	21	23	0	0	0	0	57
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	0	0	0	0	0	5
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	0	0	0	0	0	5
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	50	36	53	0	0	0	0	139
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	61	58	74	0	0	0	0	193
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	3	11	7	0	0	0	0	21

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	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
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

Friday 9/2/2022

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

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

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

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

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	59%	50%	50%				60%	51%	54%
ELA Learning Gains	52%						57%	52%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	45%						51%	47%	47%
Math Achievement	51%	36%	36%				61%	55%	58%
Math Learning Gains	55%						58%	57%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	54%						45%	52%	51%
Science Achievement	54%	52%	53%				55%	47%	51%
Social Studies Achievement	81%	58%	58%				87%	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	59%	53%	6%	54%	5%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2022					
	2019	60%	54%	6%	52%	8%
Cohort Comparison		-59%				
08	2022					
	2019	62%	53%	9%	56%	6%
Cohort Comparison		-60%				

MATH						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
06	2022					
	2019	46%	49%	-3%	55%	-9%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2022					
	2019	70%	62%	8%	54%	16%
Cohort Comparison		-46%				
08	2022					
	2019	28%	31%	-3%	46%	-18%
Cohort Comparison		-70%				

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	55%	47%	8%	48%	7%
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	87%	67%	20%	71%	16%

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	88%	63%	25%	61%	27%

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	100%	57%	43%	57%	43%

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	28	40	33	27	49	47	19	64			
ELL	48	51	56	35	40	65	21	80			
BLK	45	48	48	40	46	48	38	70	73		
HSP	57	53	39	50	55	62	54	82	84		
MUL	55	43		50	55	45	61	77	91		
WHT	79	59	52	67	65	62	70	95	89		
FRL	49	50	48	43	51	53	42	75	80		

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	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 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	20	39	39	24	39	31	19	48	82		
ELL	39	65	61	40	56	50	23	80			
ASN	100	92		100	83						
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		

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	59
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	534
Total Components for the Federal Index	9
Percent Tested	98%

Subgroup Data	

Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	38
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0

English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	50
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	51
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	60
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	60
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	71
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	55
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?

All grade levels and content areas assessed exhibited an instability in growth trends. Based on data before and after 2020-2021 (a time when educating students during a pandemic created learning gaps), students in most subgroups showed consistent growth in all grade levels and content areas assessed. According to 2021-2022 assessment data, ELA achievement increased by 4 points and science increased by 10 points. Math achievement decreased by 2 points and civics decreased by 3 points. As noted above, majority of subgroups showed consistent growth before and after 2020-2021; however, trends concerning the Students with Disabilities subgroup indicated an instability in growth trends. This subgroup had lowest achievement in English Language Arts((ELA), Math, and Science. Students with Disabilities subgroup data shows a 28% achievement in ELA, 27% achievement in Math, and 19% achievement in Science.

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

The greatest need for improvement is overall math achievement. Math Achievement indicates an instability in growth trends. Based on recurring trends in data, Math Achievement Points has continuously decreased within the last 4 years. Though, Math decreased only 2% from 2021 to 2022, over the last 4 years there has been a decrease of 17 points. This data is aligned with overall Math Learning Gains Points within the last four years, as well. Based on FSA Assessment data, there has been a 13 point decrease within the last four years. However, based on 2022 data, there appeared to be a 3 point increase. This trend transcends to Math Achievement for bottom quartile (Lowest 25%) students which indicated unstable growth trends within the last four years, but a significant increase of 10 points from 2022 assessment data.

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 Covid-related schedule changes as well as district mandated unit losses, students schedules were impacted and changes of teachers occurred, which ultimately impacts learning. Standards-based lesson planning and teaching to the rigor of the standard will help improve student learning. Analyzing progress monitoring assessment data and collaboration regarding next steps for targeted small group instruction will also help improve student learning.

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

Based on the 2022 state assessment, science showed the most improvement with a 10 point increase from 44% to 54% proficiency.

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

Standards identified as areas of need from the baseline and mid-year assessments were retaught prior to the end of year assessment. Teachers implemented the new 8th grade connected units and evaluated student performance on a daily basis. They embedded the Nature of Science standards throughout their lessons and accelerated learning by reviewing 6th and 7th grade standards, as needed, throughout the year. In addition, targeted instructional methods and Instructional Framework C were utilized to increase student understanding. Progress monitoring instruments and formative assessment data were used to drive instructional decisions.

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

In all content areas, baseline data, common and formative assessments, and on- going progress monitoring data (including state progress monitoring data, district interims, and district and state mid-year assessments) will be utilized to determine students' growth and mastery of standards and pinpoint areas of focus to implement in small group and differentiated instruction. Teachers will implement standard- aligned assessments (formatives and summatives) to assess grade level standards for targeted student growth and accelerate standards, as needed, in all content areas.

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.

Teacher and school leaders will be engaged in monthly professional development that focuses on cooperative learning strategies, standards- based lesson planning, and implementation of the instructional frameworks during instruction. Professional learning communities in every content area will

focuses on analyzing student assessment data, student work samples, unit planning, planning for small group and differentiated instruction, designing common formative assessments, and individualized goal setting based on students' needs.

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

Teachers will receive support from school leaders, subject area leaders (SALs), district resource teachers/ supervisors that focus on the newly implemented B.E.S.T. Standards in ELA and Math content areas.

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 Students with Disabilities	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.	This area of focus is based on 2022 FSA Assessment data's subgroup of Students with Disabilities. This year's data concluded that our students with disabilities scored the lowest of all of the subgroups. Overall achievement within this subgroup indicated a 38% proficiency rate in all assessed areas. Social Studies was one of the assessed areas that indicated growth. Students made a 3% growth, from 61% to 64%, based on assessment data from 2020-2021. Though overall English Language Arts (ELA) achievement was a 28%, this was a 8% gain from the 2020-2021 data. Also, overall Math achievement 27%, which indicated a 1% gain from the previous year's data. The data from this subgroup which has the greatest decline was science achievement of 19%. This data indicated a 13% decline from 2020-2021 assessment data.
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	Learning Gains in the Students with Disabilities subgroup will increase from 38% to 41%. This outcome will contribute to our school goal which is to increase our total points earned as a school by the end of the third progress monitoring period. Our goal is to increase our school grade from an "B" to that of an "A". An increase of 3% will need to be earned by the end of the third progress monitoring period.
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	Professional Learning Communities with Exceptional Student Education (ESE) Specialist and teachers Learning Walks (Walkthrough Feedback) Professional Development on Differentiation and small group instruction Coaching Cycles utilizing the ESE Specialist and content area SALs, when needed,
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Peter Megara (peter.megara@hcps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being	Differentiated instruction that focuses on Students with Disabilities (SWD) subgroup Instructional Frameworks model to use as a resource for small group instructional practices that focuses on remediation and enrichment of strategies for growth and/or mastery of grade level standards. Common formative and summative assessment data that show trends of student growth and areas of improvement to remediate and/ or enrich instruction. Professional Learning Communities (PLCs) utilized to discuss progressing monitoring data and instructional practices implemented for student growth and achievement.

implemented for this Area of Focus.	Professional Development that focuses on the instructional pedagogy that align with B.E.S.T standards and Next Generation Sunshine State Standards in Science
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.	Differentiated instruction (DI) yields continual growth focusing on individualized students' needs for growth and/ or mastery of grade level standards. DI ensures equitable learning practices for all students and subgroups of students. Small group instruction provides students with a more concentrated focus on standard-alignment instruction geared toward student growth and achievement within each grade level's content area and subgroup assessed. Data analysis is utilized to drive instructional practices in all content areas. Various assessment data indicates strengths and areas of improvement of grade level standards. Data analysis provide teachers with concrete information to accelerate, remediate, or enrich standards. When PLCs are implemented with fidelity, teachers have more of a collegial and collaborative relationship that results in student growth and achievement. Professional Development increases teacher pedagogy and instructional practice based on grade level standards that improves instruction and increase student growth and achievement.

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.

PLCs are utilized to discuss this subgroups progress monitoring and assessment data and their growth and/or areas of focus in all content areas.
Teachers will collaborate with ESE teachers as they plan lessons for SWD.
Teachers will implement differentiated Instruction within their classroom instruction to meet the needs of students.
Teachers will implement the Instructional Frameworks model to use as a resource for small group instruction that focuses on growth/ mastery of grade level standards for all subgroups.
Teachers will assess students and identify individualized students' needs.
Teachers will align lessons to standards with equitable approaches to learning.
School leaders and teachers will create individualized learning paths for students in this subgroup.
School leaders and teachers will progress monitor and formatively assess learners with the opportunity to reteach, remediate, or accelerate when necessary.
School leaders will provide feedback on standard aligned instructional and best instructional practices for student growth/ achievement.

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

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: **Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.**	This area of focus was identified as a need based on the Math Florida Standards Assessment 2022 data results. A. Math data indicating a steady decline within the last 4 years from 68% to 51% B. Math data indicated a 2% decline from 2021 data to 2022 data C. A hold in Math Achievement data for the following subgroups over a 2 year assessment period for the subgroup of Black/ African American 40% and Economically Disadvantage 43% D. A decrease in 1% for subgroups of Hispanic and Student with Disabilities (SWD) students, a 3% decrease in the White subgroup, 7% for the Multiracial subgroup, and 3% decrease for the English Language Learner subgroup.
Measurable Outcome: **State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.**	Learning Gains in Math will increase from 51% to 54%.
Monitoring: **Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.**	Professional Learning Communities Learning Walks (Walkthrough Feedback) Professional Development Coaching Cycles utilizing the Math SAL (subject area leader)
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Nicole Hildebrand (nicole.hildebrand@sdhc.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy: **Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.**	Differentiated instruction that focuses Tier 2/3 students, students in the bottom quartile, and Students with Disabilities. Instructional Frameworks model to use as a resource for small group instructional practices that focuses on remediation and acceleration strategies for mastery of grade level standards. Common formative and summative assessment data that show trends of student growth and areas of improvement to remediate, accelerate, and/ or enrich instruction. Professional Learning Communities (PLCs) utilized to discuss progressing monitoring data and instructional practices implemented for student growth and achievement. Professional Development that focuses on the instructional pedagogy that align with B.E.S.T standards.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: **Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.** **Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.**	Differentiated instruction yields continual growth my focusing on individualized students' needs for growth and/ or mastery of grade level standards. DI ensures equitable learning practices for all students and subgroups of students. Small group instruction provides students with a more concentrated focus on standard- align areas of improvement within each grade level. Data analysis is utilized to drive instructional practices in Math. Various assessment data indicates strengths and areas of improvement of grade level standards. Data analysis provide teachers with concrete information to accelerate, remediate, or enrich standards. When PLCs are implemented with fidelity, teachers have more of a collegial and collaborative relationship that results in student growth and achievement.

Professional Development increases teacher pedagogy and instructional practice based on grade level standards that improves instruction and increase student growth and achievement.

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.

Teachers will prepare standard- align lesson objectives based on the B.E.S.T. Standards.
Teachers and school leaders will use data to determine appropriate acceleration, enrichment and/or remediation strategies and teacher-led small group instructional practices.
Teachers will develop instructional activities/lessons/ assessments relevant to B.E.S.T standards.
Teachers and School leaders will utilize ongoing progress monitoring to determine effectiveness of strategies and student
progress.
Teachers will enrich and remediate standards with support of resource staff and Instructional Leadership Team.
Teachers will engage in professional development related to content area instructional strategies, practices, and (supplemental) resources.
Teachers, school leaders, and subject area leaders will participate in PLCs to discuss math progress monitoring data based on Mathematics grade level standards.
School leaders will provide feedback on standard aligned instructional and best instructional practices for student growth and achievement.

Person Responsible Nicole Hildebrand (nicole.hildebrand@sdhc.k12.fl.us)

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.

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

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

PV will build a positive school culture and engage students, staff, and community stakeholders through the following events and activities:
SAC and PTSA
Iron Sharpens Iron Breakfast
Elective Parent Boosters
Recruitment Road Shows and Shadowing Program for potential students
PBIS and Bobcat Bucks
End of the Year Musical and Winter Extravaganza

HBCU Showcase
Media Center Sponsored - Hispanic Heritage trivia contest for students and Latin Cafe Luncheon for staff; Black History Month daily showcasing and National African American DEAR Read-In and Taste of Soul Luncheon for staff
Great American Teach-In
Media Center Sponsored - Teen Tober/Teen Read Week and SLAM Showcase
Colors Club
SGA
PV's Got Talent Show
Start With Hello Week
Family and Career Community Leaders of America (FCCLA)