

Pinellas County Schools

# Seminole Middle School



## 2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

---

## **Table of Contents**

---

|   |           |
|---|-----------|
| <b>School Demographics</b>                | <b>3</b>  |
| <b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>     | <b>4</b>  |
| <b>School Information</b>                 | <b>5</b>  |
| <b>Needs Assessment</b>                   | <b>9</b>  |
| <b>Planning for Improvement</b>           | <b>15</b> |
| <b>Positive Culture &amp; Environment</b> | <b>33</b> |
| <b>Budget to Support Goals</b>            | <b>33</b> |

# Seminole Middle School

8701 131ST ST, Seminole, FL 33776

<http://www.seminole-ms.pinellas.k12.fl.us>

## Demographics

**Principal: Michael Moss**

Start Date for this Principal: 7/6/2018

|  |  |
|--|--|
| <b>2019-20 Status</b><br>(per MSID File)   | Active   |
| <b>School Type and Grades Served</b><br>(per MSID File)  | Middle School<br>6-8   |
| <b>Primary Service Type</b><br>(per MSID File)   | K-12 General Education   |
| <b>2018-19 Title I School</b>  | No   |
| <b>2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b><br>(as reported on Survey 3)  | 46%  |
| <b>2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b><br>(subgroups with 10 or more students)<br>(subgroups in orange are below the federal threshold) |  |
| <b>School Grades History</b>   | 2018-19: B (56%)<br>2017-18: B (56%)<br>2016-17: C (51%)<br>2015-16: C (50%) |
| <b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>  |  |
| <b>SI Region</b>   | Southwest  |
| <b>Regional Executive Director</b>   | <a href="#">Lucinda Thompson</a>   |
| <b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>   |  |
| <b>Year</b>  |  |
| <b>Support Tier</b>  | NOT IN DA  |
| <b>ESSA Status</b>   |  |
| * As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, <a href="#">click here</a> .                       |  |

## School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Pinellas 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](http://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**

The mission of Seminole Middle School is to educate and prepare each student for college, career and life.

#### **Provide the school's vision statement**

The vision of Seminole Middle School is to provide a safe and positive educational environment that supports 100% student success.

### School Leadership Team

#### **Membership**

Identify the name, email address, position title, and job duties/responsibilities for each member of the school leadership team.:

| Name                 | Title               | Job Duties and Responsibilities          |
|----------------------|---------------------|--|
| Moss, Michael        | Principal           | Serve as school principal.               |
| Nash, Kent           | Assistant Principal | Serve as Assistant Principal.            |
| Moore, Cidney        | Teacher, K-12       | Serve as Behavior Specialist             |
| Baligian, Kelli      | Teacher, K-12       | Serve as ELA Department Chair            |
| Barkalow, Bria       | Teacher, K-12       | Serve as Mathematics Department Chair    |
| Higgins, Valeria     | Teacher, K-12       | Serve as Social Studies Department Chair |
| Hoag, Jessica        | Teacher, K-12       | Serve as Department Chair for Electives  |
| McMahon, Amy         | Assistant Principal | 6th Grade Assistant Principal            |
| Guth, Lori           | Guidance Counselor  | Guidance Chair                           |
| Johnson, Lawanda     | Assistant Principal | 7th Grade Assistant Principal            |
| Smith, Erin          | Teacher, K-12       | Science Department Chair                 |
| Walsky, Riley        | Teacher, K-12       | Reading Chair                            |
| Silkie-Rees, Marissa | Teacher, K-12       | Science Department Chair                 |
| McAvaddy, Melissa    | Teacher, K-12       | ESE Specialist - Department Leaders      |

## Demographic Information

### Principal start date

Friday 7/6/2018, Michael Moss

**Number of teachers with a 2019 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.*

**Number of teachers with a 2019 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.*

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

57

**Demographic Data**

|  |  |
|--|--|
| <b>2020-21 Status</b><br>(per MSID File)   | Active   |
| <b>School Type and Grades Served</b><br>(per MSID File)  | Middle School<br>6-8   |
| <b>Primary Service Type</b><br>(per MSID File)   | K-12 General Education   |
| <b>2018-19 Title I School</b>  | No   |
| <b>2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b><br>(as reported on Survey 3)  | 46%  |
| <b>2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b><br>(subgroups with 10 or more students)<br>(subgroups in orange are below the federal threshold) | Asian Students<br>Black/African American Students<br>Economically Disadvantaged Students<br>English Language Learners<br>Hispanic Students<br>Multiracial Students<br>Students With Disabilities<br>White Students |
| <b>School Grades History</b>   | 2018-19: B (56%)<br>2017-18: B (56%)<br>2016-17: C (51%)<br>2015-16: C (50%)   |
| <b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>  |  |
| <b>SI Region</b>   | Southwest  |
| <b>Regional Executive Director</b>   | <a href="#">Lucinda Thompson</a>   |
| <b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>   |  |
| <b>Year</b>  |  |
| <b>Support Tier</b>  | NOT IN DA  |
| <b>ESSA Status</b>   |  |
| * As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, <a href="#">click here</a> .                       |  |

**Early Warning Systems**

**Current Year****The number of students by 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 | 365 | 329 | 355 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0     | 1049 |
| Attendance below 90 percent               | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 65  | 32  | 50  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0     | 147  |
| One or more suspensions                   | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1   | 15  | 23  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0     | 39   |
| Course failure in ELA                     | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8   | 13  | 20  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0     | 41   |
| Course failure in Math                    | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14  | 29  | 10  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0     | 53   |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment  | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 52  | 50  | 65  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0     | 167  |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 48  | 47  | 66  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0     | 161  |

**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 | 39 | 34 | 47 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0     | 120 |

**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 | 8 | 15 | 3 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0     | 26 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 1 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0     | 1  |

**Date this data was collected or last updated**

Saturday 6/27/2020

**Prior Year - As Reported****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 | 333 | 364 | 361 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0     | 1058 |
| Attendance below 90 percent     | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 20  | 69  | 77  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0     | 166  |
| One or more suspensions         | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 19  | 16  | 30  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0     | 65   |
| Course failure in ELA or Math   | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 25  | 20  | 30  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0     | 75   |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 84  | 103 | 134 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0     | 321  |

**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 | 27 | 51 | 64 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0     | 142 |

**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 | 3 | 7 | 13 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0     | 23 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0     | 1  |

**Prior Year - Updated**

**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 | 333 | 364 | 361 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0     | 1058 |
| Attendance below 90 percent     | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 20  | 69  | 77  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0     | 166  |
| One or more suspensions         | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 19  | 16  | 30  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0     | 65   |
| Course failure in ELA or Math   | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 25  | 20  | 30  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0     | 75   |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 84  | 103 | 134 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0     | 321  |

**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 | 27 | 51 | 64 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0     | 142 |

**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 | 3 | 7 | 13 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0     | 23 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0     | 1  |

**Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis**

**School Data**

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     | 2019   |          |       | 2018   |          |       |
|----------------------------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|
|                            | School | District | State | School | District | State |
| ELA Achievement            | 52%    | 52%      | 54%   | 50%    | 50%      | 53%   |
| ELA Learning Gains         | 56%    | 55%      | 54%   | 47%    | 50%      | 54%   |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | 46%    | 47%      | 47%   | 36%    | 42%      | 47%   |

| School Grade Component      | 2019   |          |       | 2018   |          |       |
|-----------------------------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|
|                             | School | District | State | School | District | State |
| Math Achievement            | 54%    | 55%      | 58%   | 58%    | 54%      | 58%   |
| Math Learning Gains         | 49%    | 52%      | 57%   | 55%    | 54%      | 57%   |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 40%    | 46%      | 51%   | 47%    | 48%      | 51%   |
| Science Achievement         | 57%    | 51%      | 51%   | 61%    | 52%      | 52%   |
| Social Studies Achievement  | 71%    | 68%      | 72%   | 65%    | 65%      | 72%   |

| EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey |                                   |     |     |       |
|---|-----------------------------------|-----|-----|-------|
| Indicator                                     | Grade Level (prior year reported) |     |     | Total |
|   | 6                                 | 7   | 8   |       |
|   | (0)                               | (0) | (0) | 0 (0) |

**Grade Level Data**  
**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                    | 2019 | 54%    | 51%      | 3%                         | 54%   | 0%                      |
|                       | 2018 | 48%    | 49%      | -1%                        | 52%   | -4%                     |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | 6%     |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| 07                    | 2019 | 49%    | 51%      | -2%                        | 52%   | -3%                     |
|                       | 2018 | 45%    | 48%      | -3%                        | 51%   | -6%                     |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | 4%     |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      | 1%     |          |                            |       |                         |
| 08                    | 2019 | 52%    | 55%      | -3%                        | 56%   | -4%                     |
|                       | 2018 | 59%    | 55%      | 4%                         | 58%   | 1%                      |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | -7%    |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      | 7%     |          |                            |       |                         |

| MATH                  |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|-----------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade                 | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 06                    | 2019 | 45%    | 44%      | 1%                         | 55%   | -10%                    |
|                       | 2018 | 42%    | 45%      | -3%                        | 52%   | -10%                    |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | 3%     |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| 07                    | 2019 | 53%    | 60%      | -7%                        | 54%   | -1%                     |
|                       | 2018 | 57%    | 59%      | -2%                        | 54%   | 3%                      |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | -4%    |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      | 11%    |          |                            |       |                         |
| 08                    | 2019 | 33%    | 31%      | 2%                         | 46%   | -13%                    |
|                       | 2018 | 32%    | 31%      | 1%                         | 45%   | -13%                    |

| <b>MATH</b>           |             |               |                 |                                   |              |                                |
|-----------------------|-------------|---------------|-----------------|-----------------------------------|--------------|--------------------------------|
| <b>Grade</b>          | <b>Year</b> | <b>School</b> | <b>District</b> | <b>School-District Comparison</b> | <b>State</b> | <b>School-State Comparison</b> |
| Same Grade Comparison |             | 1%            |                 |                                   |              |                                |
| Cohort Comparison     |             | -24%          |                 |                                   |              |                                |

| <b>SCIENCE</b>        |             |               |                 |                                   |              |                                |
|-----------------------|-------------|---------------|-----------------|-----------------------------------|--------------|--------------------------------|
| <b>Grade</b>          | <b>Year</b> | <b>School</b> | <b>District</b> | <b>School-District Comparison</b> | <b>State</b> | <b>School-State Comparison</b> |
| 08                    | 2019        | 58%           | 51%             | 7%                                | 48%          | 10%                            |
|                       | 2018        | 60%           | 53%             | 7%                                | 50%          | 10%                            |
| Same Grade Comparison |             | -2%           |                 |                                   |              |                                |
| Cohort Comparison     |             |               |                 |                                   |              |                                |

| <b>BIOLOGY EOC</b> |               |                 |                              |              |                           |
|--------------------|---------------|-----------------|------------------------------|--------------|---------------------------|
| <b>Year</b>        | <b>School</b> | <b>District</b> | <b>School Minus District</b> | <b>State</b> | <b>School Minus State</b> |
| 2019               |               |                 |                              |              |                           |
| 2018               |               |                 |                              |              |                           |

| <b>CIVICS EOC</b> |               |                 |                              |              |                           |
|-------------------|---------------|-----------------|------------------------------|--------------|---------------------------|
| <b>Year</b>       | <b>School</b> | <b>District</b> | <b>School Minus District</b> | <b>State</b> | <b>School Minus State</b> |
| 2019              | 70%           | 68%             | 2%                           | 71%          | -1%                       |
| 2018              | 65%           | 66%             | -1%                          | 71%          | -6%                       |
| Compare           |               | 5%              |                              |              |                           |

| <b>HISTORY EOC</b> |               |                 |                              |              |                           |
|--------------------|---------------|-----------------|------------------------------|--------------|---------------------------|
| <b>Year</b>        | <b>School</b> | <b>District</b> | <b>School Minus District</b> | <b>State</b> | <b>School Minus State</b> |
| 2019               |               |                 |                              |              |                           |
| 2018               |               |                 |                              |              |                           |

| <b>ALGEBRA EOC</b> |               |                 |                              |              |                           |
|--------------------|---------------|-----------------|------------------------------|--------------|---------------------------|
| <b>Year</b>        | <b>School</b> | <b>District</b> | <b>School Minus District</b> | <b>State</b> | <b>School Minus State</b> |
| 2019               | 81%           | 55%             | 26%                          | 61%          | 20%                       |
| 2018               | 94%           | 57%             | 37%                          | 62%          | 32%                       |
| Compare            |               | -13%            |                              |              |                           |

| <b>GEOMETRY EOC</b> |               |                 |                              |              |                           |
|---------------------|---------------|-----------------|------------------------------|--------------|---------------------------|
| <b>Year</b>         | <b>School</b> | <b>District</b> | <b>School Minus District</b> | <b>State</b> | <b>School Minus State</b> |
| 2019                | 89%           | 56%             | 33%                          | 57%          | 32%                       |
| 2018                | 98%           | 56%             | 42%                          | 56%          | 42%                       |
| Compare             |               | -9%             |                              |              |                           |

**Subgroup Data**

| <b>2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS</b> |                 |               |                    |                  |                |                     |                 |                |                  |                          |                                |
|--|-----------------|---------------|--------------------|------------------|----------------|---------------------|-----------------|----------------|------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------------|
| <b>Subgroups</b>                                 | <b>ELA Ach.</b> | <b>ELA LG</b> | <b>ELA LG L25%</b> | <b>Math Ach.</b> | <b>Math LG</b> | <b>Math LG L25%</b> | <b>Sci Ach.</b> | <b>SS Ach.</b> | <b>MS Accel.</b> | <b>Grad Rate 2016-17</b> | <b>C &amp; C Accel 2016-17</b> |
| SWD  | 12              | 41            | 43                 | 15               | 39             | 46                  | 9               | 41             |                  |                          |                                |
| ELL  | 29              | 55            | 50                 | 27               | 47             | 35                  |                 |                |                  |                          |                                |
| ASN  | 57              | 50            |                    | 57               | 43             |                     |                 |                |                  |                          |                                |
| BLK  | 16              | 35            | 32                 | 17               | 32             | 28                  | 16              | 37             |                  |                          |                                |
| HSP  | 38              | 58            | 52                 | 34               | 47             | 49                  | 38              | 64             | 84               |                          |                                |
| MUL  | 52              | 58            | 31                 | 50               | 49             |                     | 58              | 80             | 60               |                          |                                |
| WHT  | 60              | 59            | 51                 | 64               | 52             | 43                  | 65              | 77             | 78               |                          |                                |
| FRL  | 37              | 50            | 40                 | 37               | 41             | 37                  | 45              | 57             | 67               |                          |                                |

| <b>2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS</b> |                 |               |                    |                  |                |                     |                 |                |                  |                          |                                |
|--|-----------------|---------------|--------------------|------------------|----------------|---------------------|-----------------|----------------|------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------------|
| <b>Subgroups</b>                                 | <b>ELA Ach.</b> | <b>ELA LG</b> | <b>ELA LG L25%</b> | <b>Math Ach.</b> | <b>Math LG</b> | <b>Math LG L25%</b> | <b>Sci Ach.</b> | <b>SS Ach.</b> | <b>MS Accel.</b> | <b>Grad Rate 2015-16</b> | <b>C &amp; C Accel 2015-16</b> |
| SWD  | 18              | 34            | 31                 | 21               | 37             | 34                  | 19              | 26             |                  |                          |                                |
| ELL  | 14              | 42            | 39                 | 27               | 54             | 40                  |                 |                |                  |                          |                                |
| ASN  | 60              | 56            |                    | 63               | 59             |                     |                 |                |                  |                          |                                |
| BLK  | 17              | 44            | 45                 | 24               | 45             | 45                  | 32              | 42             | 79               |                          |                                |
| HSP  | 36              | 43            | 30                 | 42               | 54             | 33                  | 42              | 60             | 83               |                          |                                |
| MUL  | 44              | 42            | 33                 | 44               | 45             | 46                  | 36              | 64             |                  |                          |                                |
| WHT  | 58              | 48            | 35                 | 66               | 57             | 51                  | 68              | 69             | 83               |                          |                                |
| FRL  | 34              | 41            | 33                 | 41               | 48             | 42                  | 46              | 53             | 73               |                          |                                |

**ESSA Data**

This data has been updated for the 2018-19 school year as of 7/16/2019.

| <b>ESSA Federal Index</b>   |      |
|---|------|
| ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)  | TS&I |
| OVERALL Federal Index - All Students  | 56   |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students                                    | NO   |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target                                    | 2    |
| Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency | 53   |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index                                       | 556  |
| Total Components for the Federal Index  | 10   |
| Percent Tested  | 98%  |
| <b>Subgroup Data</b>  |      |
| <b>Students With Disabilities</b>   |      |
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities                                      | 31   |
| Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?              | YES  |

| <b>Students With Disabilities</b>  |     |
|--|-----|
| Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%      | 2   |
| <b>English Language Learners</b>   |     |
| Federal Index - English Language Learners                                      | 42  |
| English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?              | NO  |
| Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%       | 0   |
| <b>Asian Students</b>  |     |
| Federal Index - Asian Students   | 52  |
| Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?                         | NO  |
| Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%                  | 0   |
| <b>Black/African American Students</b>   |     |
| Federal Index - Black/African American Students                                | 27  |
| Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?        | YES |
| Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32% | 1   |
| <b>Hispanic Students</b>   |     |
| Federal Index - Hispanic Students  | 52  |
| Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?                      | NO  |
| Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%               | 0   |
| <b>Multiracial Students</b>  |     |
| Federal Index - Multiracial Students   | 55  |
| Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?                   | NO  |
| Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%            | 0   |
| <b>Native American Students</b>  |     |
| Federal Index - Native American Students                                       |     |
| Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?               | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%        | 0   |
| <b>Pacific Islander Students</b>   |     |
| 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   | 61 |
| White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?                             | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%                      | 0  |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students  |    |
| Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students                                | 46 |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?        | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0  |

## Analysis

### Data Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources (see guide for examples for relevant data sources).

#### Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year's low performance and discuss any trends

Below is a listing of data with the lowest performance with contributing factors noted:

1. Learning Gains Math L25 - 40%
2. Learning Gains ELA L25 - 46%
3. Overall Math Learning Gains - 49%
4. The proficiency of ESE students on ELA FSA is at 12% with 41% learning gains and math proficiency at 15% with 39% learning gains.
5. The proficiency of Black students on ELA FSA is at 16% with 35% learning gains and math proficiency at 17% and learning gains 32%.

The math scores grew in 2017-18 and dropped back to the district/state average in 2018-19. Increasing the level of instructional rigor and connecting assignments tightly to the standards will be a major focus. To address the performance of ESE and Black Students, additional instructional and school culture strategies will be implemented to be supported by ongoing professional development.

#### Which data component showed the greatest decline from the prior year? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this decline

Below is a breakdown of key data points with the greatest decline with contributing factors noted:

1. EOC Algebra and Geometry - Drop 10 points
3. Overall Math - Drop 4 points
4. Overall Math Learning Gains - 7 points
5. Math L25 Learning Gains - 6 points

The math scores grew in 2017-18 and dropped back to the district/state average in 2018-19. Increasing the level of instructional rigor and connecting assignments tightly to the standards will be a major focus.

**Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends**

When comparing to state averages, the following data points had the largest gaps:

1. 7th grade Math down 7 points
2. 8th grade ELA down 2 points
3. ELA and Math FSA proficiency for ESE and Black Students

**Which data component showed the most improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?**

The data below displays the greatest improvement:

1. Civics EOC increased 6 points
2. ELA Learning Gains increased 9 points
3. ELA L25 Learning Gains increased 10 points

**Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern?**

Two key areas stand out that will be a major focus to address during the 2020-2021 school year:

1. Students with excessive absences display disturbing trend data which consists of 6th grade (20); 7th grade (69); and 8th grade (77).
2. Students scoring in the Level 1 range on FSA display disturbing trend data which consists of 6th grade (84); 7th grade (103); 8th grade (134).

**Rank your highest priorities (maximum of 5) for schoolwide improvement in the upcoming school year**

1. Increase overall Learning Gains for all students in Math and ELA
2. Increase Learning Gains for the L25 in Math and ELA
3. Increase the achievement level for Black Students in all subjects
4. Increase the passing rates for EOC Exams
5. Increase the achievement levels for ESE Students in all subjects
6. Decrease the number of discipline referrals for all students by 25%

**Part III: Planning for Improvement**

**Areas of Focus:**

**#1. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Equity & Diversity**

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** The area of focus centers around the use of equitable practices (UDL strategies, student-led conferences, restorative practices, and increasing relational capacity). These areas were identified through multiple data points: student and parent interviews, teacher input, staff survey data, administrative walk-throughs, and from recommendations made by the SMS Equity Team.

Both quantitative and qualitative data will be used to measure success of implementation.

**Measureable Outcome:** Baseline data will be collected in August utilizing the UDL Checklist and from an Equity Checklist created by the SMS Equity Team to compare to a mid-year and year-end data collection with the intended outcome of a 50% increase in the use of identified strategies being implemented with fidelity in classrooms by the year end.

The risk-ratio to receive a discipline referral for all sub-groups will decrease to one-to-one during the 2020-21 school year.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** Michael Moss (mossm@pcsb.org)

**Evidence-based Strategy:** Seminole Middle School will continue building more equitable classroom environments through implementing UDL practices, shifting to equity-centered PLCs, and improving upon restorative practices while also inviting students to be stakeholders in their own learning and improvement.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** These strategies are research-based and promoted as best practices in the current educational literature. These approaches are also listed in the PCS Bridging the GAP Plan.

**Action Steps to Implement**

1. The Equity Team will meet during the summer to discuss the core strategies to implement, establish timelines, plan training, and evaluate our current equity practices (July - August)

**Person Responsible** Michael Moss (mossm@pcsb.org)

2. The Equity Team will present the Equity Plan and provide a 4-hour block of professional development to the staff during pre-school (August)

**Person Responsible** Michael Moss (mossm@pcsb.org)

3. All staff will be encouraged to participate in the UDL Now book study facilitated by the Equity Team (Aug - April) The Equity Team will share a UDL Strategy each month during our Staff Meetings (Aug - May)

**Person Responsible** Michael Moss (mossm@pcsb.org)

4. All class will conduct the Monday Morning Restorative Circle (Aug - May)



**Person Responsible** Michael Moss (mossm@pcsb.org)

5. Administrators will train PLC facilitators to implement equity-based protocols and discussions during PLCs (August - May)

**Person Responsible** Michael Moss (mossm@pcsb.org)

6. On-going administrative walk-throughs will occur to monitor effectiveness of implementation utilizing the UDL Checklist and Equity Checklist (Aug - May)

**Person Responsible** Michael Moss (mossm@pcsb.org)

7. Monthly Equity Team meetings will be held to monitor initiatives and follow the cycle of continuous improvement (Aug - May)

**Person Responsible** Michael Moss (mossm@pcsb.org)

## #2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

### Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Our current level of performance is 54% mathematics achievement, as evidenced in the 2018-19 School Grade Report. We expect our performance level to be 60% by the 2020-21 School Grade Report. The area of focus is to improve the alignment of learning targets and learning tasks to the standards; increase the level of instructional rigor through complex tasks; and enhance differentiated instruction. These strategies are based on feedback from instructional walk-throughs, feedback from district ISM visits, and from analyzing data trends.

**Measureable Outcome:** The percentage of students achieving math proficiency will increase from 54% to 60% as measured by the 2020-21 Florida State Assessment (FSA).

### Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Michael Moss (mossm@pcsb.org)

### Evidence-based Strategy:

1. Improve the staff's ability to align the learning targets and tasks to the course standards.
2. Support the staff's capacity to engage students in complex tasks that increase the level of instructional rigor.
3. Enhance the staff's ability to utilize student data to organize students to interact with content in a manner which differentiates/scaffolds instruction and learning.

### Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Aligning learning targets and tasks to the standards, improving differentiated instruction, and increasing the level of instructional rigor through complex tasks will increase student achievement. These are all research-based strategies and best practices advocated by the National Council of Teachers of Mathematics (NCTM).

## Action Steps to Implement

1. The master schedule is created to allow for weekly planning to allow teachers to utilize systemic documents (adopted curriculum, pacing guides, etc.) to effectively plan for mathematics units that incorporate the Standards for Mathematical Practice; align targets to tasks, differentiated instruction, and create rigorous/complex performance tasks aligned to Mathematics Florida Standards (MAFS).

**Person Responsible** Michael Moss (mossm@pcsb.org)

2. PLCs will meet two times per month to review student responses to standards aligned tasks and formative assessments; to utilize student data to support the intervention/remediation needs of students; the ongoing lesson planning processes; and the differentiation/scaffolding needs of students.

**Person Responsible** Michael Moss (mossm@pcsb.org)

3. Teachers will receive ongoing professional development supporting the alignment of learning targets and tasks to standards, differentiated instruction, and increasing the level of instructional rigor through complex tasks. A professional development calendar will be created for the school year.

**Person Responsible** Michael Moss (mossm@pcsb.org)

4. Teachers will attend ongoing Facilitated Planning trainings to receive support for 1) planning for the implementation of complex tasks aligned to the standards; 2) increasing instructional rigor by planning for student engagement in complex tasks; 3) utilizing student data to create and implement differentiated/scaffolded instruction.

**Person Responsible** Michael Moss (mossm@pcsb.org)

5. Administrators observe teacher identification of critical content, implementation of standards aligned target/tasks, utilization of data to plan for differentiated/scaffolded instruction, and the increase of rigor through the implementation of complex tasks. Administrators will provide timely and actionable feedback to teachers as a result of the observation. The Rigor Walkthrough Checklist will be used as a tool to measure growth.

**Person Responsible** Michael Moss (mossm@pcsb.org)

**#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA**

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** Our current level of performance is 52% reading achievement, as evidenced in the 2018-19 School Grade Report. We expect our performance level to be 57% by the 2020-21 School Grade Report. The area of focus centers around increasing the level of rigor of the learning targets and learning tasks to ensure the ELA standards are mastered. This area of focus was determined through data analysis, observations from administrative walkthroughs, and from PCS ISM feedback.

**Measurable Outcome:** The percentage of students achieving ELA proficiency will increase from 52% to 57% as measured by the 2020-2021 Florida State Assessment (FSA).

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** Amy McMahon (mcmahona@pcsb.org)

**Evidence-based Strategy:** PLC's/Common Planning will be data driven and focus on purposeful planning that enhances the level of instructional rigor of learning targets and tasks for all students.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** PLCs/Common Planning will promote a collaborative data driven culture to help support the needs of all students. This strategy is research-based and promoted by PCS as a best practice to implement.

**Action Steps to Implement**

1. The master schedule is created to allow for weekly planning to allow teachers to utilize systemic documents (adopted curriculum, pacing guides, etc.) to effectively plan for ELA units that incorporate the Standards for ELA Practice and align targets to tasks and create rigorous/complex learning opportunities for students.

**Person Responsible** Amy McMahon (mcmahona@pcsb.org)

2. To help address the diverse learning needs of students when planning for increased levels of instructional rigor, Equity-based activities will be utilized - see the Equity Goal.

**Person Responsible** Amy McMahon (mcmahona@pcsb.org)

3. To enhance the effectiveness of PLCs/Collaborative Planning, facilitators will be trained utilizing protocols to analyze data to help plan for appropriately increasing the levels of instructional rigor to master the standards.

**Person Responsible** Amy McMahon (mcmahona@pcsb.org)

4. To assist students in charting their progress mastering the rigorous standards, teachers facilitate data chats with students (Write Score, unit assessments).

**Person Responsible** Amy McMahon (mcmahona@pcsb.org)

5. To support students mastering the rigorous standards, WICOR strategies on focus note taking will be emphasized.

**Person Responsible** Amy McMahon (mcmahona@pcsb.org)

6. Ongoing professional development opportunities will be provided to support planning the implementing the appropriate levels of instructional rigor with learning targets and tasks. A professional development calendar will be created.

**Person Responsible** Amy McMahon (mcmahona@pcsb.org)

7. The administrative team will conduct daily instructional walkthroughs utilizing The Rigor Walkthrough Checklist to provide teachers with timely and actionable feedback.

**Person Responsible** Amy McMahon (mcmahona@pcsb.org)

**#4. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Social Studies**

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

1. Our current level of performance is 70%, as evidenced in the FSA Civics EOC during the 2018-19 school year.
2. We expect our performance level to be 75% by the end of the 2020-2021 school year as measured by the FSA Civics EOC exam.
3. We will focus on providing instruction with the appropriate level of rigor and on using data to differentiate instruction to meet the needs of all Social Studies students.
4. By increased training and support in developing and implementing rigorous lessons and using data to differentiate instruction an increase of 5% in student achievement on the FSA Civics EOC exam will occur.

**Measureable Outcome:** The percentage of students achieving civics proficiency will increase from 70% to 75% as measured by the 2020-21 Florida State Assessment (FSA) Civics EOC exam.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** Kent Nash (nashk@pcsb.org)

**Evidence-based Strategy:**

- Support teachers to effectively implement data driven instruction that organizes students to interact with content in manners which differentiates/scaffolds instruction to meet the needs of each student.
- Support teachers to effectively implement data driven remediation using the district unit assessment content focus report
- Teach students protocols to establish goals, monitor their data and self-reflection to support continuous improvement.
- Enhance staff capacity to identify critical content from the Standards in alignment with district resources.
- Strengthen staff ability to engage students in complex tasks.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** The above strategies are well embedded in the research and are aligned to the district's strategic plan.

**Action Steps to Implement**

1. Utilize data driven instruction to differentiate and scaffold instruction and remediation at every level to maximize student performance.
2. Engage teachers in data-driven PLC's where they will plan differentiated/scaffolds instruction to meet the needs of each student.
3. Teachers will provide extensive inquiry-based instruction including research, critical thinking, and writing opportunities.
4. Teachers will use standards, learning goals, and scales to develop rigorous aligned lesson plans and assessments.

**Person Responsible** Kent Nash (nashk@pcsb.org)

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

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

1. Our current level of performance is 58%, as evidenced in SSA Assessment results.
2. We expect our performance level to be 63% by the end of the 2020-21 school year as measured by the SSA.
3. The problem/gap is occurring because differentiated standard based instruction with the appropriate level of rigor needs to be implemented consistently at every grade level.
4. There is a need to implement standard based instruction at the appropriate level of rigor and utilize research-based strategies that promote equity in the classroom. We believe that if this occurs then we will see an increase on the SSA by 5%.

**Measureable Outcome:** The percent of all students achieving science proficiency will increase from 58% to 63%, as measured by the SSA.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** LaWanda Johnson (johnsonlawa@pcsb.org)

**Evidence-based Strategy:**

1. Teachers will effectively implement data driven instruction at every grade level to differentiate and scaffold instruction to meet the needs of all students and provide appropriate opportunities for remediation.
2. Teachers will identify critical content from the Standards in alignment with district resources through collaboration with colleagues and engage students in research based strategies that will promote equity and extensive inquiry based learning opportunities at a high level of rigor.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** The above strategies are well embedded in the research and are aligned to the district's strategic plan. They have shown to be proven to increase the schools district and SSA score. Additionally, by incorporating more equitable strategies, it will not only increase district and SSA scores, but also close the science educational gap.

**Action Steps to Implement**

Teachers will utilize AVID/WICORT, UDL and PBIS strategies within all science classes to provide extensive inquiry-based instruction including research, scientific thinking, and writing opportunities (claims and evidence.) This ties into strategy #2

- Examples:
- Teachers will follow the 5E model of science instruction to provide for student centered learning opportunities.
  - Teachers will release ownership of learning to students
  - Science teachers utilize the parallel teaching approach teaching Nature of Science in context with Content.
  - Using Project Based Learning during the elaborate phase of the 5E instructional model, teachers will help students make real world content connections to make content meaningful.

**Person Responsible** LaWanda Johnson (johnsonlawa@pcsb.org)

Teachers meet in PLC's at least once per month to review student data (including responses to tasks, formative assessment data, gap assessment data, and quarterly district assessment data) and use standards as well as learning goals to develop lesson plans at the appropriate level of rigor. This ties to strategy #1 & #2

**Person Responsible** LaWanda Johnson (johnsonlawa@pcsb.org)

Utilize data to differentiate and scaffold instruction and remediate at every grade level to maximize student performance. This ties to strategy #1

**Person Responsible** LaWanda Johnson (johnsonlawa@pcsb.org)

Teach students protocols to establish goals, monitor their data and self-reflection to support continuous improvement. This ties to strategy #1

**Person Responsible** LaWanda Johnson (johnsonlawa@pcsb.org)

Teachers collaborate with the PBIS Team, Equity Team, and AVID Site Team to discuss and incorporate strategies that will promote equity and extensive inquiry. This ties to strategy #2

**Person Responsible** LaWanda Johnson (johnsonlawa@pcsb.org)



**#6. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to African-American**

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** The area of focus is to improve our overall school practice in the use of data to enhance the staff's effectiveness to provide differentiated learning through UDL, remediation, and enrichment. Our current level of performance is 16% of students are achieving proficiency, as evidenced in the 2018-19 ELA FSA. We expect our performance level to be 35% proficiency on the ELA FSA by 2020-21. This strategy were developed by the SBLT, Equity Team, and Ridgecrest 360 community partners.

**Measureable Outcome:** The percent of African-American Students achieving proficiency of the ELA FSA will increase from 2018-19 to 2020-21, from 16% to 35%.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** Michael Moss (mossm@pcsb.org)

**Evidence-based Strategy:** Data-based professional learning communities to disaggregate data of African-American students will be utilized as a tool to support differentiated learning (UDL practices, remediation, enrichment)

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** The above mentioned strategy is research-based and aligned to the PCS Strategic Plans and Bridging the Gap Plans.

**Action Steps to Implement**

1. Professional Learning Communities meet twice a month reviewing student data - protocols will be utilized to support the disaggregation of students data to identify gaps for remediation and to support differentiated learning (Aug - May)

**Person Responsible** Michael Moss (mossm@pcsb.org)

2. All staff will be encouraged to participate in the UDL Now book study facilitated by the Equity Team (Aug - April) with monthly instructional technique shared during staff meetings.

**Person Responsible** Michael Moss (mossm@pcsb.org)

3. Each grade level administrator will maintain a data book monitoring the progress of African-American students for their grade level (Aug - May)

**Person Responsible** Michael Moss (mossm@pcsb.org)

4. African-American students will be provided additional opportunities to receive tutoring/remediation/enrichment through the Extended Learning Program (ELP) and Gradi partnership.

**Person Responsible** Michael Moss (mossm@pcsb.org)

5. On-going administrative walk-throughs will occur to monitor effectiveness of instruction providing timely and actionable feedback (Aug - May)

**Person Responsible** Michael Moss (mossm@pcsb.org)

**#7. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Student Attendance**

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** The area of focus is to improve student attendance through the use of a check-and-connect program for students displaying excessive absences. This strategy was identified by the SBLT after reviewing school-wide data trends and looking at best practices from other middle schools.

**Measureable Outcome:** The percentage of students who miss more than 90% of school days will decrease from 7.5% in 2018-19 to 6.0% in 2020-21.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** Michael Moss (mossm@pcsb.org)

**Evidence-based Strategy:** Utilize a check-connect student mentoring program for students displaying excessive absences

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** The above strategy is research-based and promoted by PCS as a best practice to improve student attendance.

**Action Steps to Implement**

1. During MTSS student attendance will be monitored for each grade level. (Grade level administrator and counselor)
2. Social Worker will be informed when students display a pattern of excessive absences - follow up with home visits to share the check-and-connect program with parents. (Grade level administrator and counselor)
3. Students with excessive absences from the previous year will be identified and monitored and candidates for mentors for check-connect. (Grade level administrator and counselor)
4. Students will be taught goal setting protocols to monitor attendance by their check-and-connect mentor (Social Worker)
5. Quarterly celebrations will be held for students who model positive attendance. (PBIS Team)

**Person Responsible** Michael Moss (mossm@pcsb.org)

**#8. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Career & Technical Education**

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** Our current level of performance is 78% of students earning credit for accelerated coursework. The area of focus is to expand course offerings for students and improve tutoring/remediation/enrichment. If course offerings are expanded and additional tutoring/remediation/enrichment occurs, we expect the percentage of students earning credit for accelerated coursework to increase by 10% points. The SBLT identified this as a critical need after reviewing school-wide trend data.

**Measureable Outcome:** The percentage of all students earning credit for accelerated coursework will increase from 78% in 2018-19 to 88% in 2020-21 as measured by qualifying scores, course credit scores, and/or industry certification exams earned.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** Kent Nash (nashk@pcsb.org)

**Evidence-based Strategy:** -Enhance access to opportunities for students to engage in advanced/accelerated coursework.  
-Provide students with expanded tutor/remediation/enrichment

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** The strategies are research-based and promoted as best practices to improve student success.

**Action Steps to Implement**

1. Increase the number of course offerings to earn industry certification.
2. Increase the number of students enrolled in accelerated courses by identifying students as candidates. Special emphasis will be placed on increasing the number of African-American students in the classes.
3. Inform parents about the accelerated course offerings and strategies to help their student be successful - this will include holding parent workshops in August and May.
4. Closely progress monitor students in accelerated/advanced courses and provide additional supports through tutoring/remediation/enrichment through ELP and in-class differentiation.
5. Administrators will conduct daily instructional walkthroughs to provide timely and actionable feedback for improvement.

**Person Responsible** Kent Nash (nashk@pcsb.org)

**#9. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Community Involvement**

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** The data provided in the Needs Assessment and Analysis notes this to be an area of focus. The research clearly displays a relationship between family engagement and student achievement.

**Measureable Outcome:** Due to the current situation with schools utilizing online learning and visitor access limited to schools, our social media tools (website, Facebook, and YouTube pages) will be emphasized. Our goal is to increase by 30% the number of parents and community members utilizing these forums to support family and community involvement/engagement with the school.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** Michelle Alfred (alfredm@pcsb.org)

**Evidence-based Strategy:** 1. Maintain effective social media platforms to enhance communication with families with training provided to families to better utilize  
2. Continue growing partnerships with community organizations

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** The above strategies are research-based and promoted by PCS as best practices to strengthen family involvement.

**Action Steps to Implement**

1. Work closely with the Family/Community Liaison and PTSA/SAC.
2. Continue to update and enhance the school Facebook and Website; working with staff members to add critical information timely.
3. Maintain communication to the school community through weekly calls, emails, Facebook, website, marquee, Peachjar, PTSA/SAC; encouraging families to utilize our social media outlets.
4. Recruit and train mentors/volunteers to build relationships (including virtually) with our students' by offering them guidance, support, and encouragement to help cultivate positive and healthy development.
5. Coordinate resources, services, and trainings for families and students to support academic success.
6. Create/host a variety of family and community events (through videotelephony or pre-recorded school events while visitor access is limited) to engage caregivers and community.
7. Work with community-based organizations, Ridgecrest 360 Community Coalition, YoungLife, Anona UMC, Seminole Chamber of Commerce, Seminole EcoSystem to improve the school-to-home partnership.

**Person Responsible** Michelle Alfred (alfredm@pcsb.org)

**#10. Other specifically relating to Conditions for Learning**

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** Our current level school-wide referrals is 494, as evidenced in the 2019-2020 school profiles report. We expect our referrals to decrease to 395 referrals as reported in the 2020-201 school profile report. The area of focus will be to increase the staff's ability to establish and maintain positive relationships with all students and strengthen our equitable practices that engage students in acknowledging and adhering to processes and procedures that promote our SMS Guidelines for Success.

**Measureable Outcome:** The number of discipline referrals will decrease from 494 in 2019-2020 to 395 2020-2021 as evidenced in the School Profiles Behavior Dashboard.

The risk ratio for African American students will decrease from 2.91 to 2.04 as evidenced in the School Profiles Behavior Dashboard.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** Amy McMahan (mcmahona@pcsb.org)

**Evidence-based Strategy:**

1. Strengthen the ability of all staff to establish and maintain positive relationships with all students.
2. Support the development and/or implementation of school-wide ownership of equitable practices that engage students in acknowledging and adhering to processes and procedures to support the SMS Guidelines for Success.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** The strategies listed above are all well-grounded in the research as proven best practices and are aligned to the PCS Strategic Plan. Data was used to determine the strategies and action steps within our SIP. The strategies and action steps are aligned to our school needs.

**Action Steps to Implement**

1. Train staff on the PBIS plan during pre-school with on-going training and coaching as needed to staff on Equity and CRT to enhance school culture and student learning.
2. The PBIS team creates lessons for students to learn the school's processes, expectations, and SMS Guidelines for Success.
3. Conduct weekly Monday Morning Circles to build community and relationships.
4. Post PBIS expectations across the school and conduct Tier 1 PBIS/RP Walkthroughs.
5. Each month the SBLT and PBIS team will use an equity centered problem solving approach that improves conditions for learning.
6. Provide students with positive incentives and reinforcement for following school-wide HAWKS expectations to include the quarterly SMS PBIS Celebrations.
7. Administrators conduct daily walk-throughs to monitor fidelity and provide feedback for improvement.

**Person Responsible** Amy McMahan (mcmahona@pcsb.org)

**#11. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities**

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** Our current level of performance is 12% of ESE students achieving proficiency on the ELA portion of the 2018-19 FSA, and 15% proficiency on the Math portion of the 2018-19 FSA. We expect the proficiency levels to increase to 25% in 2020-21 in both the ELA and Math FSA. The area of focus is to improve differentiated standards-based planning and instruction to better meet the needs of our ESE students. This area of focus was determined from the SBLT after reviewing ESE trend data and from feedback provided by the PCS ISM Team.

**Measureable Outcome:** The percentage of ESE students achieving proficiency will increase from 12% to 25% on the ELA FSA and 15% to 25% on the Math FSA during the 2020-21 school year.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** LaWanda Johnson (johnsonlawa@pcsb.org)

**Evidence-based Strategy:** PLCs will be used as a forum to discuss data to organize ESE students to interact with content in manners which differentiates/scaffolds instruction to meet the needs of each ESE student.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** The strategy is research-based for middle school education and well-grounded in the education literature as best practices to improve ESE/SWD student achievement.

**Action Steps to Implement**

The ESE Team will meet twice a month to review data of ESE students to identify strengths and gaps to address. General education Teachers who provide mainstreaming will participate in the data meetings.

**Person Responsible** LaWanda Johnson (johnsonlawa@pcsb.org)

The data discussed during the PLCs will be utilized to support the common/collaborative planning of teachers to design and implement effective differentiation strategies to address the learning needs of ESE students.

**Person Responsible** LaWanda Johnson (johnsonlawa@pcsb.org)

Department Chair/ESE Specialist will facilitate monthly professional development sessions to enhance differentiated teaching strategies for ESE students.

**Person Responsible** LaWanda Johnson (johnsonlawa@pcsb.org)

Administrators will conduct daily instructional walkthroughs to provide timely and actionable feedback to promote continuous improvement.

**Person Responsible** LaWanda Johnson (johnsonlawa@pcsb.org)

**#12. Other specifically relating to Gifted Education**

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** Our current level of performance is 70% of gifted students scoring a level 4 or 5 based on the 2018-19 mathematics portion of the FSA. We expect our performance level to increase to 75% by 2020-21. The area of focus will be to enhance differentiated learning opportunities with the appropriate levels of rigor.

**Measureable Outcome:** The percentage of gifted students scoring at a level 4 or 5 will increase from 70% in 2018-19 to 75% in 2020-21 as measured by the FSA Math.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** Michael Moss (mossm@pcsb.org)

**Evidence-based Strategy:**

1. Strengthen staff ability to engage students in differentiated complex tasks with increased levels of rigor.
2. Support staff to utilize data to organize students to interact with content in manners which differentiate/scaffold instruction to meet the needs of every student.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** The above strategies are research-based approaches promoted by the National Association of Gifted Children (NAGC).

**Action Steps to Implement**

1. Provide opportunities for gifted learners that incorporate complex high-order thinking skills

**Person Responsible** Michael Moss (mossm@pcsb.org)

2. Teachers obtain the gifted micro-credential and/or the gifted endorsement so they can better engage gifted learners in complex tasks

**Person Responsible** Michael Moss (mossm@pcsb.org)

3. Cluster group gifted and talented students so that the process of differentiating is more effective for gifted learners

**Person Responsible** Michael Moss (mossm@pcsb.org)

4. Through collaborative planning teachers plan for differentiated activities that provide students with challenging and complex tasks.

**Person Responsible** Michael Moss (mossm@pcsb.org)

5. Monitor student progress through data-based PLCs to observe the impact on improving the level of differentiated instruction and increasing the level of instructional rigor.

**Person Responsible** Michael Moss (mossm@pcsb.org)

6. Administrators perform instructional walkthroughs utilizing the NAGC checklist and Rigor Walk Checklist to provide timely and actionable feedback for improvement.



**Person Responsible** Michael Moss (mossm@pcsb.org)

**#13. Other specifically relating to Healthy Schools**

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** Our current level of performance is 4 out of 6 topics “Working Towards” Bronze level recognition, as evidenced in Alliance for a Healthier Generation, Healthy Schools Program Framework.

**Measureable Outcome:** We expect to be eligible to achieve bronze level recognition by April 2021. The problem/gap is occurring because we have not met all of the criteria for the Nutrition and Smart Snack Guidelines. If our healthy school team can monitor the implementation of the administrative guidelines for wellness our school would have a great opportunity to be eligible for recognition.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** Kent Nash (nashk@pcsb.org)

**Evidence-based Strategy:** Our school will be eligible in 6 out of 6 topics for bronze level recognition by April 2021 as evidenced by the Alliance for a Healthier Generation’s Healthy Schools Program Framework.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** We will enhance staff capacity to support students through purposeful activation and transfer strategies.

**Action Steps to Implement**

Assemble a Health / Wellness team to include the Wellness champion, classroom teachers and PE teacher to meet monthly to discuss wellness goals.

**Person Responsible** Kent Nash (nashk@pcsb.org)

Attend District supported professional development for wellness.

**Person Responsible** Kent Nash (nashk@pcsb.org)

SMS will complete Healthy Schools Program Assessment and develop an action plan.

**Person Responsible** Kent Nash (nashk@pcsb.org)

We will incorporate ways to celebrate healthy school changes/activities.

**Person Responsible** Kent Nash (nashk@pcsb.org)

**Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities**



After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities.

**School leadership team will engage teachers in data driven PLC's that analyze district unit assessments. Data analysis reflection protocols will be used to guide teachers in analyzing their student data to make informed data driven decisions. Teachers will use this information to plan remediation and differentiation to meet the needs of individual students.**

## Part IV: 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 to employ school improvement strategies that impact the positive school culture and environment are critical. 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.

Stakeholders play a key role in school performance and addressing equity. Consulting various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment ensuring all stakeholders are involved.

Numerous teacher-led committees are in place with the focus to enhance school culture. The two primary committees are the PBIS Team and Equity Team. The PBIS Team meets monthly and plans during the summer. Data are reviewed and teacher input analyzed to make adjustments to the plan following the process of continuous improvement. The PBIS Plan serves as the framework of the school-wide behavior plan. The key tenants of the plan are: Monday Morning Restorative Circles, School-Wide Guidelines for Success, Character Education, School Celebrations to recognize success, and providing teachers with tools/strategies to improve class culture. Another key committee is the Equity Team which is tasked to equipping teachers with strategies to empower students, improve relationships, change staff/student mindsets, and better address the needs of all learners. The SMS Students Against Violence Everywhere (SAVE) Club, serves as a student-led organization that conducts numerous events that promotes a positive school culture through numerous events. Over twenty additional clubs are in place to provide students with a multitude of opportunities to deepen their involvement with the school. To engage parents and community members, the Parent-Teacher-Student-Association (PTSA) and School Advisory Council (SAC) meet monthly. The community-based Ridgecrest 360 Coalition and Seminole EcoSystem meet quarterly with the primary goal to discuss ways to leverage community resources to enhance the educational experiences for all students.

### **Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link**

The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.

## Part V: Budget

|   |               |  |                               |                          |     |                   |
|---|---------------|--|-------------------------------|--------------------------|-----|-------------------|
| <b>1</b>  | <b>III.A.</b> | <b>Areas of Focus: Culture &amp; Environment: Equity &amp; Diversity</b> |                               |                          |     | <b>\$1,000.00</b> |
|   | Function      | Object   | Budget Focus                  | Funding Source           | FTE | 2020-21           |
|   |               |  | 3931 - Seminole Middle School | School Improvement Funds |     | \$1,000.00        |
| <i>Notes: Support Equity Initiative</i>                     |               |  |                               |                          |     |                   |
| <b>2</b>  | <b>III.A.</b> | <b>Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math</b>                      |                               |                          |     | <b>\$1,000.00</b> |
|   | Function      | Object   | Budget Focus                  | Funding Source           | FTE | 2020-21           |
|   |               |  | 3931 - Seminole Middle School | School Improvement Funds |     | \$1,000.00        |
| <i>Notes: Support mathematics instruction</i>               |               |  |                               |                          |     |                   |
| <b>3</b>  | <b>III.A.</b> | <b>Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA</b>                       |                               |                          |     | <b>\$7,500.00</b> |
|   | Function      | Object   | Budget Focus                  | Funding Source           | FTE | 2020-21           |
|   |               |  | 3931 - Seminole Middle School | Other                    |     | \$7,500.00        |
| <i>Notes: Support ELA and Reading instruction.</i>          |               |  |                               |                          |     |                   |
| <b>4</b>  | <b>III.A.</b> | <b>Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Social Studies</b>            |                               |                          |     | <b>\$1,000.00</b> |
|   | Function      | Object   | Budget Focus                  | Funding Source           | FTE | 2020-21           |
|   |               |  | 3931 - Seminole Middle School | School Improvement Funds |     | \$1,000.00        |
| <i>Notes: Support social studies instruction</i>            |               |  |                               |                          |     |                   |
| <b>5</b>  | <b>III.A.</b> | <b>Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Science</b>                   |                               |                          |     | <b>\$1,000.00</b> |
|   | Function      | Object   | Budget Focus                  | Funding Source           | FTE | 2020-21           |
|   |               |  | 3931 - Seminole Middle School | School Improvement Funds |     | \$1,000.00        |
| <i>Notes: Support science instruction</i>                   |               |  |                               |                          |     |                   |
| <b>6</b>  | <b>III.A.</b> | <b>Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: African-American</b>                   |                               |                          |     | <b>\$1,000.00</b> |
|   | Function      | Object   | Budget Focus                  | Funding Source           | FTE | 2020-21           |
|   |               |  | 3931 - Seminole Middle School | Other                    |     | \$1,000.00        |
| <i>Notes: Support enrichment, tutoring, and remediation</i> |               |  |                               |                          |     |                   |
| <b>7</b>  | <b>III.A.</b> | <b>Areas of Focus: Culture &amp; Environment: Student Attendance</b>     |                               |                          |     | <b>\$500.00</b>   |

|  | Function      | Object  | Budget Focus                  | Funding Source | FTE           | 2020-21            |
|--|---------------|---|-------------------------------|----------------|---------------|--------------------|
|  |               |   | 3931 - Seminole Middle School | Other          |               | \$500.00           |
| <i>Notes: Support Check and Connect Program</i>        |               |   |                               |                |               |                    |
| <b>8</b>   | <b>III.A.</b> | <b>Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Career &amp; Technical Education</b> |                               |                |               | <b>\$0.00</b>      |
| <b>9</b>   | <b>III.A.</b> | <b>Areas of Focus: Culture &amp; Environment: Community Involvement</b>         |                               |                |               | <b>\$500.00</b>    |
|  | Function      | Object  | Budget Focus                  | Funding Source | FTE           | 2020-21            |
|  |               |   | 3931 - Seminole Middle School | Other          |               | \$500.00           |
| <i>Notes: Support family and community involvement</i> |               |   |                               |                |               |                    |
| <b>10</b>  | <b>III.A.</b> | <b>Areas of Focus: Other: Conditions for Learning</b>                           |                               |                |               | <b>\$1,000.00</b>  |
|  | Function      | Object  | Budget Focus                  | Funding Source | FTE           | 2020-21            |
|  |               |   | 3931 - Seminole Middle School | Other          |               | \$1,000.00         |
| <i>Notes: Support PBIS initiative</i>                  |               |   |                               |                |               |                    |
| <b>11</b>  | <b>III.A.</b> | <b>Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities</b>                |                               |                |               | <b>\$1,500.00</b>  |
|  | Function      | Object  | Budget Focus                  | Funding Source | FTE           | 2020-21            |
|  | 0000          |   | 3931 - Seminole Middle School | IDEA           |               | \$1,500.00         |
|  |               |   | 3931 - Seminole Middle School |                |               | \$0.00             |
| <b>12</b>  | <b>III.A.</b> | <b>Areas of Focus: Other: Gifted Education</b>                                  |                               |                |               | <b>\$0.00</b>      |
| <b>13</b>  | <b>III.A.</b> | <b>Areas of Focus: Other: Healthy Schools</b>                                   |                               |                |               | <b>\$0.00</b>      |
|  |               |   |                               |                | <b>Total:</b> | <b>\$16,000.00</b> |