Hillsborough County Public Schools

Sergeant Paul R Smith 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

Sergeant Paul R Smith Middle School

14303 CITRUS POINTE DR, Tampa, FL 33625

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Robert Kleesattel

Start Date for this Principal: 1/16/2020

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 Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2021-22: B (59%) 2018-19: B (58%) 2017-18: B (59%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TSI

* 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

Sergeant Paul R Smith Middle School

14303 CITRUS POINTE DR, Tampa, FL 33625

[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	83%

School Grades History

Year	2021-22	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19
Grade	B		B	B

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
At Sgt. Smith, we will cultivate a learning environment that promotes scholarship, integrity, communication, and excellence.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Our Vision
Our journey at Sgt. Smith will propel us to be academically driven, self-confident, responsible citizens who will make positive contributions to 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
Kleesattel, Rob	Principal	Responsible for all operations of the school.
Anderson, Amy	Curriculum Resource Teacher	SAC Co-Chair
Crosskey, Sheriss		ESE Specialist
Daigle, David	Assistant Principal	Assistant Principal Curriculum
Stark, Fatima	Assistant Principal	Assistant Principal Administration
Jones, Michelle	Math Coach	Responsible for Math Instruction
Perfetti, Marino	Other	Responsible for PBIS

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Thursday 1/16/2020, Robert Kleesattel

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.*
38

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.*

2

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

40

Total number of students enrolled at the school

575

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

4

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

2

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	177	172	226	0	0	0	0	575
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	5	33	37	0	0	0	0	75
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	44	36	69	0	0	0	0	149
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	49	29	60	0	0	0	0	138
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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

Thursday 8/18/2022

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	192	199	282	0	0	0	0	673
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	6	1	4	0	0	0	0	11
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	15	45	45	0	0	0	0	105
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	21	46	51	0	0	0	0	118
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	2	2	0	0	0	0	8

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	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	

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	192	199	282	0	0	0	0	673
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	6	1	4	0	0	0	0	11
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	15	45	45	0	0	0	0	105
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	21	46	51	0	0	0	0	118
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	2	2	0	0	0	0	8

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	1	21	20	0	0	0	0	42

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data Review
Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school, or combination schools).

School Grade Component	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	47%	50%	50%				56%	51%	54%
ELA Learning Gains	50%						56%	52%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	38%						47%	47%	47%
Math Achievement	58%	36%	36%				59%	55%	58%
Math Learning Gains	69%						53%	57%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	66%						45%	52%	51%
Science Achievement	42%	52%	53%				55%	47%	51%
Social Studies Achievement	72%	58%	58%				76%	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	56%	53%	3%	54%	2%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2022					
	2019	50%	54%	-4%	52%	-2%
Cohort Comparison		-56%				
08	2022					
	2019	57%	53%	4%	56%	1%
Cohort Comparison		-50%				

MATH						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
06	2022					
	2019	53%	49%	4%	55%	-2%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2022					
	2019	56%	62%	-6%	54%	2%
Cohort Comparison		-53%				
08	2022					
	2019	34%	31%	3%	46%	-12%
Cohort Comparison		-56%				

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	51%	47%	4%	48%	3%
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	74%	67%	7%	71%	3%

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	83%	63%	20%	61%	22%

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	8	23	24	15	45	55	7	45			
ELL	36	44	34	45	65	63	20	65	76		
ASN	72	64		85	86		80	83	100		
BLK	36	49	45	47	72	83	32	71	92		
HSP	44	49	39	54	67	66	33	71	89		
MUL	53	64		53	60						
WHT	53	48	33	68	72	70	64	70	89		
FRL	42	48	37	52	67	68	36	69	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	12	31	33	10	23	25	16	20			
ELL	35	46	36	39	44	40	26	41	79		

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
ASN	79	72		87	70		82	90	87		
BLK	31	37	38	29	37	26	38	57			
HSP	42	45	35	42	41	36	40	50	67		
MUL	65	50		63	47						
WHT	54	47	24	58	45	19	59	79	84		
FRL	40	43	34	40	39	32	39	52	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	18	32	25	25	38	34	21	52			
ELL	26	49	54	40	55	45	20	68	64		
ASN	92	65		97	68		92	100	100		
BLK	33	42	33	42	30	20	29	83			
HSP	50	54	48	52	50	45	49	68	65		
MUL	65	56		74	53		50	85	100		
WHT	68	64	48	71	64	58	71	84	73		
FRL	50	54	46	53	50	43	48	69	65		

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)	TSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	57
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	40
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	573
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	99%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	28
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	3

English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	49
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	81
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	59
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	55
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	58
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	63
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	54
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?

Initial data from FSA shows a 36 point increase in gains for Math BQ and 6 points in gains for ELA BQ. Each core area showed gains for a total of 107 point increase overall.

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

With each core area and BQ making gains, the area for need of greatest improvement for 22-23 is SSA. The performance of 8th grade dropped 5 points compared to the previous assessment.

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

The contributing factors to the drop in SSA were on-line learning in 2020 and when students returned the classes Comp Science classes did not have a consistent teacher through the year. The classes had a total of 3 different teachers during the school year which caused loss of instructional momentum and disjointed classroom expectations from substitutes.

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

Many areas showed improvement. To highlight, Middle School Acceleration increased 15 points (77=>91). Math, ELA core all had gains. Algebra EOC gained 13 points while Civics gained 10 points. Geometry continued with a solid 100% 3 or above.

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

One of the most significant factors was the re-establishment of structure for students returning to a school building after 2 years of on-line learning. Establishing a system of progress monitoring using district produced assessments allowed for feedback on student learning.

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

Continuing Frameworks in the classroom and the professional development of teachers relative to BEST. Using the PM data will be the catalyst for PLC discussions.

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.

Coaching cycles will continue along with opening up demonstration classrooms. Ensuring lessons and grading are standards based will better align grades with assessments.

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

The site-based Instructional Leadership Team will refine coaching strategies. Establishment of solid look-for's in classrooms based on Instructional Priorities will accelerate results.

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

:

#1. Transformational Leadership specifically relating to Instructional Leadership Team	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: **Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.**	53% of current students (as of 8/26/2021) scored below proficiency in FSA ELA in 2022. 50% of current students scored below proficiency in FSA Math in 2022. Based on this data, as well as attendance indicators (as a result of COVID variant in the Fall) and the learning deficits faced, it is imperative that instructional frameworks are implemented to address all learner's needs. This will include data-driven small group instruction, formative, ongoing assessment and precise scaffolding and extension.
Measurable Outcome: **State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.**	ELA Achievement Points will be above 59; Math Achievement will be above 62. ELA Learning Gains of the lowest 25% will be at or above 53; Math Leaning Gains of the Lowest 25% will be above 69.
Monitoring: **Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.**	The site based Instructional Leadership Team will conduct regular walk-throughs of classrooms and meet every two weeks to identify trends and support needs.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Rob Kleesattel (robert.kleesattel@hcps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy: **Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.**	Implementation of the instructional frameworks, with a key focus on implementing data-driven, teacher-led small group work to address learning deficits.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: **Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.**	Targeted small group instruction meets the needs of all learners, while addressing our ESSA subgroups that require intervention: Black/African American students and Students with Disabilities. With proper implementation and ongoing support from instructional coaches, teachers will be best equipped to meet the needs of our learners. John Hattie's research on effect sizes was used to determine best practices. According to his research, Response to Intervention has an effect size of 1,29 and Scaffolding 0,82 (anything over the "hinge point" of 0.4 is considered to have a positive impact on student learning).

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.

Deploy Literacy Coach to support teachers with planning, modeling, analyzing data and implementing the data-driven small groups.	
Person Responsible	Rob Kleesattel (robert.kleesattel@hcps.net)
Math Coach will coach, model, and plan with math teachers.	
Person Responsible	Michelle Jones (michelleg.jones@dhc.k12.fl.us)

Each department (Science, Social Studies, ELA, Math) will request data spreadsheets from all teachers in order to effectively group students based on needs.	
Person Responsible	Rob Kleesattel (robert.kleesattel@hcps.net)
Literacy Coach will design and present professional development that focuses on authoring objectives that are standards based, standards based activities, small group instruction and BEST based gradebooks.	
Person Responsible	Rob Kleesattel (robert.kleesattel@hcps.net)
Math Coach will provide professional development that focuses on planning and implementing date-driven group work using the instructional frameworks and BEST.	
Person Responsible	Michelle Jones (michelleg.jones@dhc.k12.fl.us)
ESE Specialist will provide professional development to teachers focused on strategies to promote student learning relative to BEST.	
Person Responsible	Sheriss Crosskey (sheriss.crosskey@hcps.net)

#2. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to PBIS	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: **Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.**	During the 2021-2022 SY, we experienced an increase of disobedient/insubordinate and disruptive incidents. To counter the increase we will strengthen our PBIS to create a positive, safe and inclusive environment.
Measurable Outcome: **State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.**	Reduce the number of referrals (784) by 30%.
Monitoring: **Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.**	Behavior data will be shared monthly at PBIS meetings and monthly at faculty meetings. Incidents are tracked through Behavior Tracker, Behavior Footprint and the Remediation Plan.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Rob Kleesattel (robert.kleesattel@hcps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy: **Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.**	Implementation of PBIS plan.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: **Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.**	PBIS is a research-based framework for implementing schoolwide systems of behavioral support, in a tiered continuum based on student responsiveness to intervention, to help prevent and reduce undesired behavior and improve social and academic outcomes for all students in a school. (from www.pbis.org)
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.	
Monthly PBIS Committee Meetings Monthly Student Steering Committee PBIS Store (Shark Store) Shark Fin Initiative Spirit Week Events	
Person Responsible	Marino Perfetti (marino.perfetti@hcps.net)

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.

Throughout the school year, multiple opportunities are available to students outside of academics. Some of those opportunities include:
PBIS - Spirit week, theme days, Friendship Week (Spring)
Hispanic Heritage night
Student Advisory Council
NJHS
Clubs during and after school
Competitions
Literacy Week
Sports
Additionally, our school's School Advisory Council (SAC) will be a group of stakeholders (teachers, administrators, business partners, community members and students) who reflect our school's demographics. The group will be composed of mostly non-instructional members (students, community members, business partners) will continue to monitor the SIP and support/promote positive school culture initiatives.
Sgt. Smith also operates with grade-level teams and team leaders. In these teams, students who need additional support will be identified and the team will discuss interventions.

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

SAC, Literacy Week - Alexandria Mansfield, Literacy Coach; Amy Anderson, ELA SAL
PBIS Incentives & Initiatives - Marino Perfetti, Success Coach & FACE Liaison
RTI - Grade Team Leaders, Sheriss Crosskey, ESE Specialist; Fatima Stark, Assistant Principal