

Hillsborough County Public Schools

Mclane 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	11
Planning for Improvement	16
Positive Culture & Environment	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Mclane Middle School

306 N KNIGHTS AVE, Brandon, FL 33510

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Keisha Thompson

Start Date for this Principal: 8/2/2022

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: D (37%) 2018-19: C (41%) 2017-18: C (43%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	N/A
Support Tier	N/A
ESSA Status	CSI
* 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	11
Planning for Improvement	16
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Mclane Middle School

306 N KNIGHTS AVE, Brandon, FL 33510

[no web address on file]

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2021-22 Title I School	2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Middle School 6-8	Yes	100%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	88%

School Grades History

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

All stakeholders will foster a collaborative culture to build a community of accountable critical thinkers to be successful members of society.

Provide the school's vision statement.

To build relationships through trust and mutual respect, with all stakeholders, in order to foster academic and emotional success for all students.

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
Dixon, Keisha	Principal	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Instructional Leader for curriculum, instruction and assessments - provide strategic direction in the school, Safety and Supervision, assess teaching and learning, monitor scholar achievement - lead parent involvement efforts -hire and retain staff, develop budgets, evaluate staff and -manage facilities for learning
Colston, Tonya	Assistant Principal	<p>In charge of 8th grade discipline and 7th Grade discipline A-L.</p> <p>Oversees Literacy and Social Studies departments. Responsible for bringing feedback and input from respective teachers to the leadership team.</p> <p>Creates the Master Schedule and testing schedule</p> <p>Provides feedback to teachers concerning best teaching practices. With the team, collaboratively uses data from state and district assessments and reports to help plan and implement professional development for school improvement.</p>
Clark, Danielle	Instructional Coach	<p>Assist all ELA teachers helping them to strengthen instructional practices that will yield higher student outcomes; leads and facilitates content focused PLCs and professional learning opportunities; work with struggling students to improve standards proficiency.</p>
Kemp, Donna	Math Coach	<p>Assist all Math teachers helping them to strengthen instructional practices that will yield higher student outcomes; leads and facilitates content focused PLCs and professional learning opportunities; work with struggling students to improve standards proficiency.</p>
Ravenel, Kristina	Administrative Support	<p>- Helps to create SIP plan by involving all stake holders, using data to help drive decision making and collaborating with our business partners and volunteers in the communities that Mclane serves.</p>

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Tuesday 8/2/2022, Keisha Thompson

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.*

45

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

37

Total number of students enrolled at the school

834

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

20

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

23

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	307	258	272	0	0	0	0	837
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	99	117	124	0	0	0	0	340
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	28	66	78	0	0	0	0	172
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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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	14	50	51	0	0	0	0	115

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	120	100	53	0	0	0	0	273
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	125	112	81	0	0	0	0	318

Date this data was collected or last updated

Saturday 8/20/2022

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	282	255	270	0	0	0	0	807
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	145	106	129	0	0	0	0	380
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	15	18	0	0	0	0	48
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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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	13	12	16	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	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	282	255	270	0	0	0	0	807
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	145	106	129	0	0	0	0	380
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	15	18	0	0	0	0	48
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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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	13	12	16	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	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	24%	50%	50%				29%	51%	54%
ELA Learning Gains	39%						43%	52%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	37%						43%	47%	47%
Math Achievement	24%	36%	36%				29%	55%	58%
Math Learning Gains	49%						40%	57%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	56%						45%	52%	51%
Science Achievement	18%	52%	53%				26%	47%	51%
Social Studies Achievement	45%	58%	58%				47%	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	22%	53%	-31%	54%	-32%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2022					
	2019	28%	54%	-26%	52%	-24%
Cohort Comparison		-22%				
08	2022					
	2019	27%	53%	-26%	56%	-29%
Cohort Comparison		-28%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2022					
	2019	18%	49%	-31%	55%	-37%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2022					
	2019	34%	62%	-28%	54%	-20%
Cohort Comparison		-18%				
08	2022					
	2019	18%	31%	-13%	46%	-28%
Cohort Comparison		-34%				

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	23%	47%	-24%	48%	-25%
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	44%	67%	-23%	71%	-27%
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	65%	63%	2%	61%	4%
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019					

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	9	31	30	9	35	44	2	34			
ELL	22	31	18	29	47	43	22	50			
BLK	17	31	34	16	43	54	7	34	25		
HSP	26	40	34	27	54	56	27	48	41		
MUL	39	63		32	50						
WHT	42	55		40	55	80	50	71	69		
FRL	23	39	41	23	49	56	15	45	33		
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	5	16	9	7	31	31	4	19			
ELL	15	35	28	23	36	32	8	42			
ASN	25	55		62	67						

2021 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
BLK	12	24	30	10	24	34	14	30	50		
HSP	20	33	27	25	37	32	15	43	40		
MUL	31	31		25	31						
WHT	46	44		42	45		41	65	85		
FRL	18	30	30	18	29	33	17	36	47		
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	11	47	50	11	38	46	5	20			
ELL	17	33	35	29	57	57	13	50			
ASN	50	67		71	47						
BLK	18	40	43	16	30	35	13	35	59		
HSP	32	43	43	33	51	65	30	52	68		
MUL	41	52		42	31		36				
WHT	45	45	36	46	50	56	52	58	74		
FRL	25	41	41	27	39	43	22	44	70		

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)	CSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	34
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	YES
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	5
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	9
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	341
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	96%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	24
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	30

English Language Learners	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	1
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	29
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	1
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	37
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	46
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	58
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	34
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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?

Review of our 2021-2022 School Data, shows SWD as our lowest achievement performing components in all content areas ELA (-33), Math (-39), Science(-48), and Social Studies (-37). Our African Americans and Hispanic also show large deficiencies in core content area

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

SWD has our lowest achievement performing components in all content areas ELA (-33), Math (-39), Science(-48), and Social Studies (-37). The one content area we drop in 2021-2022 was in the area of science (-3)

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

Review of our 2021-2022 School Data, shows SWD as our lowest performing component. Compared to the state and district it also had the largest proficiency gap. This has been a trend over the last few years. In the 2021-2022 School Year, the lack of specific professional development focused around writing, and math as well as culturally relevant teaching were lacking. Several teacher and leadership vacancies.

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

Every component except on made improvement in the 2021-2022 school year. The largest improvement was made in our Math Bottom Quartile (+22)

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

Our math department conducted FSA data chat with students. We utilized weekly standard based bellwork assessment. Utilize the color coded FSA Math Blueprint to focus on the Major Clusters and Supporting Clusters. Conducted practice FSA and before and after school tutoring. Participated in Grade and Content Level PLC to analyze common assessment data and collaborated on strategies and techniques. We conducted before and after school tutoring and pull outs, as well as organized both FSA and Algebra Bootcamp. some of the additional resource used include IXL and Edgerms.

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

Progress monitoring with immediate feedback and follow through need to be implemented with fidelity to accelerate the learning

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.

Teachers will be trained on Literacy best practices and a literacy strategy of the month to implement.

Teachers will be provided professional development on the new BEST standards through site-based PD days and bi-weekly PLCs.

Teachers will be provided professional development on using data analysis to create, implement, monitor, and revise engaging and equitable lesson plans for all students.

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

We will collaborate with our teachers, families, and community members to provide monthly updates on school goals and action steps for achieving them.

Full fidelity Tier 2 and Common planning PLCs bi-weekly

Inquiry based culturally responsive tasks and strategies in all classes weekly

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.

Teachers will continue to grow in planning to the depth of the standard and improve task alignment and progress monitoring student work. Student data will be the focal point of driving instruction.

Measurable Outcome:

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

ELA will increase learning gains by 20%. We will target all of our Tier 2 and Tier 3 students. Those students will be pulled for acceleration, writing boot campus and additional support in ELA.

Monitoring:

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

Monitoring will also occur through a combination of classroom observations, progress monitoring assessments (unit and cycle), data chats with admin and teachers, and engagement in collaborative planning and PLCs.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Keisha Dixon (keisha.dixon@hcps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:

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

Data will be used during PLC's to ensure consistent review of student work and data. Weekly classroom visits to provide feedback to teachers. We are working on student scales and our classroom culture by ongoing PD on PBIS and CCEIS.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

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

Teachers need time to reflect on their practice and collaborate with others on improvement. There needs to be celebration on successes to build on what they do right with small adjustments on improving their craft.

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.

As a whole our campus is working to increase fidelity and effectiveness of Tier 1 instructional practices by using walkthrough data to coach teachers and to assess professional development needs. Our Instructional Leadership Team (ILT) is helping to revamp our Professional Learning Communities (PLCs) by relying on data-based decision making and problem-solving processes. The Teacher Talent Developers (TDDs) are working with teacher teams to assist with lesson planning, student engagement and task alignment. This will be for our economically disadvantage group as well as our multiracial subgroups. We will continue to progress monitor and track

Person Responsible

Tonya Colston (tonya.colston@hcps.net)

Bi-weekly PLC's to work through data driven instruction and culturally relevant classroom.
 ILT feedback sessions with all teachers.
 Model classrooms' substitutes will be secured on campus.

Person Responsible

Keisha Dixon (keisha.dixon@hcps.net)

Walk through to provide feedback and support.

Person Responsible

Keisha Dixon (keisha.dixon@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.

Teachers struggled with implementing small group instruction. This was a focus to help differentiate the learning. Teachers of ESE students needed to improve classroom expectations so that all students were expected to be on grade level.

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

Math will increase there learning gains by 20%. We will target all of our Tier 2 and Tier 3 students. Those students will be pulled for acceleration, math boot camps and additional support in Math.

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

Monitored through classroom observations, teacher/administrator conversations, teacher/district created progress monitoring assessments, and collaboration among the team in PLCs.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Keisha Dixon (keisha.dixon@hcps.net)

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

The evidence-based strategy being implemented for this area of focus includes school wide incorporation of structured classroom and discussions during PLCs.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

When teachers utilize data to organize students and plan differentiated instruction, student needs will be addressed and math proficiency will increase across subgroups.

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.

Provide coaching and support in data driven instruction weekly-reflection and classroom visits.

Person Responsible

Donna Kemp (donna.kemp@hcps.net)

#3. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports

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

Our students with Disabilities are more likely to receive an office referral because there is a lack of positive relationships among all stakeholders (students, teachers, and families). If we increase the awareness or acknowledgement of cultural differences it will allow us to build the relationships.

Measurable Outcome:

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

We expect to see at least a 50% reduction in the rate of incidents/referrals.

Monitoring:

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

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

[no one identified]

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

- Specific trainings about how to build personal, culturally, socially, and educationally relevant interactions with students (authentic interactions lead to authentic relationships)
- Teach the why, how, and what behind those interactions

Teachers are unaware of the cultural and social economic statuses of student population (implicit bias), and teachers do not have the skills and knowledge of how to build positive relationships with students that are culturally, socially, and educationally relevant which leads to a disconnect with the student and their respective class and/or teacher(s).

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

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

- Our focus groups report that teachers do not try to get to know students and/or do not know them.
- Parents/Students report that they do not have a relationship with teacher or that they have not heard from the teachers.
- Students report that they lack relationships with their teachers and report that the teachers do not care about them.

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.

Initial Steps (Tier 1):

- Positive morning greetings to students (Tier 1), via either personal/face-to-face greetings and/or whole-school announcements
- Positive referrals for each student (Tier 1) during pre-set timeframes (positive phone calls, text messages, emails, social media posts, etc.)
- 'Award Walls' in a high-traffic area/cafeteria to commemorate student successes ("Who's R.O.A.R ing")
- Mid- and end-of-quarter student-to-teacher evaluations for the course (with questions which help the student and teacher identify best practices, improvement strategies, etc.)
- Faculty book study to aid in building student-to-faculty relationships

Follow-Up Steps (Tier 2):

The RTI-B facilitator will triage meetings for Tier 2 behavior targeting students with 5 or more out of school suspensions (OOS). This facilitator will also maintain the CCEIS triage database for the targeted students who received OOS. As a priority, the RTI-B facilitator will also monitor students referred to RTI/FBA and help to establish mentoring programs and outreach.

This individual will not only mentor students (with use of 'behavioral support push-in' methods to mentor and model to faculty positive behavioral options), he or she will also utilize a check in system embedded for intervention purposes. A variety of Professional Development will be offered to the teachers on relationship building and how to relate to students. Facilitating training will be based on those needs, introducing plans for teachers to utilize best practices. Teachers will be trained on Insights for Behavior to understand the functionality of students' behavior. Job embedded professional development will be offered monthly as follow up throughout the school year. We will also implement Social Emotional Learning skills for students; therefore, funding will be needed to implement a "Train up First"(TUF) Program at our school site that will service our Tier 2 students. We would also require some funds to introduce some incentive programs, which will be used to host movie nights/days, "The Breakfast Club" (morning meetings), special food, treats, offer mentoring programs, and develop a system that would allow students to be rewarded for good behavior and improved behavior.

Person Responsible

[no one identified]

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.

McLane builds a positive school culture and environment from a multifaceted approach. Our PBIS system operates on principles that we expect from our students. It is our expectation that our Vikings are Respectful, On-Time, Accountable, and Reflective which makes up the Acronym R.O.A.R. The students are incentivized with quarterly celebrations for students who adhere to the R.O.A.R. principles, Recognition passes, field trips, etc. Students also have access to "Treasure Island," our Viking store that offers candy, snacks, prizes, drinks, and a game room area. It's conveniently located near the lunchroom for student use during their mealtime. In addition, Social Emotional Learning lessons are taught by our Student Services team during classroom guidance. Counselors go into classroom and discuss a variety of topics to help students manage their emotions and navigate through middle school successfully. Our school Social Worker offers Second Step lessons to students and teachers monthly. PBIS, SEL lessons, and Second Step Lessons combined align with the Viking vision and mission. We launched a Student Accountability Council, a component of restorative practice. The council is composed of 7th and 8th grade students who are trained to hear, evaluate, and rule on cases of low-level infractions. Council members mediate with conflicting parties, give presentations to their peers, and provide input administrative about behavior trends. The council has an effective way of helping their peers recognize misbehavior without punitive

consequence. The main objective of the council is to improve the culture and climate of the school through positive peer pressure and reflection.

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

Community and Business Partners are sponsoring different culture events on campus.

Brandon High School and McLane has building a Community School Partnership

We have an established PTSA to receive input and support from parents

We have established Student Government (SGA) to have student voice in promoting a positive school culture.