Pinellas County Schools

John Hopkins Middle School

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

John Hopkins Middle School

701 16TH ST S, St Petersburg, FL 33705

http://www.hopkins-ms.pinellas.k12.fl.us

Demographics

Principal: Carlmon Jones

Start Date for this Principal: 12/5/2018

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Middle School 6-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2018-19 Title I School	Yes
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups in orange are below the federal threshold)	
School Grades History	2018-19: C (47%) 2017-18: D (34%) 2016-17: C (43%) 2015-16: D (40%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	
Year	
Support Tier	NOT IN DA
ESSA Status	

* 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 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.

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 John Hopkins Middle School is to prepare students for college and career readiness through International Bacalarueate (IB) studies and the visual and performing arts.

Provide the school's vision statement

100% student success by modeling Trojan PRIDE expectations daily.

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
Jones, Carlmon	Principal	Oversee the entire school's program including academics, operations, finance, and safety.
McIntosh, Monica	Assistant Principal	Oversees the school improvement initiatives (including school culture, PBIS, restorative practices, equity initiatives); supervises Science department

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Wednesday 12/5/2018, Carlmon Jones

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.*

0

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.*

19

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

44

Demographic Data

2020-21 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
2018-19 Title I School	Yes
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups in orange are below the federal threshold)	Asian Students Black/African American Students Economically Disadvantaged Students English Language Learners Hispanic Students Multiracial Students Students With Disabilities White Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (47%) 2017-18: D (34%) 2016-17: C (43%) 2015-16: D (40%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	
Year	
Support Tier	NOT IN DA
ESSA Status	
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here.	

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	237	257	243	0	0	0	0	737
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	35	60	30	0	0	0	0	125
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	69	82	53	0	0	0	0	204
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	3
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	4
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	87	85	91	0	0	0	0	263
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	97	90	73	0	0	0	0	260

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	208	233	213	0	0	0	0	654

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	14	37	18	0	0	0	0	69
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	40	24	14	0	0	0	0	78

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 6/8/2020

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	311	284	251	0	0	0	0	846
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	22	5	8	0	0	0	0	35
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	61	50	28	0	0	0	0	139
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	7	3	0	0	0	0	23
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	159	128	114	0	0	0	0	401

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	205	170	129	0	0	0	0	504

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	10	10	9	0	0	0	0	29
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	28	16	9	0	0	0	0	53

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	311	284	251	0	0	0	0	846
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	22	5	8	0	0	0	0	35
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	61	50	28	0	0	0	0	139
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	7	3	0	0	0	0	23
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	159	128	114	0	0	0	0	401

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	205	170	129	0	0	0	0	504

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	10	10	9	0	0	0	0	29
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	28	16	9	0	0	0	0	53

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	39%	52%	54%	28%	50%	53%

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Learning Gains	51%	55%	54%	30%	50%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	39%	47%	47%	28%	42%	47%
Math Achievement	34%	55%	58%	23%	54%	58%
Math Learning Gains	45%	52%	57%	26%	54%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	41%	46%	51%	25%	48%	51%
Science Achievement	35%	51%	51%	40%	52%	52%
Social Studies Achievement	74%	68%	72%	36%	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	40%	51%	-11%	54%	-14%
	2018	25%	49%	-24%	52%	-27%
Same Grade Comparison		15%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	39%	51%	-12%	52%	-13%
	2018	24%	48%	-24%	51%	-27%
Same Grade Comparison		15%				
Cohort Comparison		14%				
08	2019	48%	55%	-7%	56%	-8%
	2018	41%	55%	-14%	58%	-17%
Same Grade Comparison		7%				
Cohort Comparison		24%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2019	30%	44%	-14%	55%	-25%
	2018	19%	45%	-26%	52%	-33%
Same Grade Comparison		11%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	42%	60%	-18%	54%	-12%
	2018	28%	59%	-31%	54%	-26%
Same Grade Comparison		14%				
Cohort Comparison		23%				

MATH						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
08	2019	14%	31%	-17%	46%	-32%
	2018	4%	31%	-27%	45%	-41%
Same Grade Comparison		10%				
Cohort Comparison		-14%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
08	2019	36%	51%	-15%	48%	-12%
	2018	42%	53%	-11%	50%	-8%
Same Grade Comparison		-6%				
Cohort Comparison						

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	**School**	**District**	**School Minus District**	**State**	**School Minus State**
2019					
2018					

CIVICS EOC					
Year	**School**	**District**	**School Minus District**	**State**	**School Minus State**
2019	83%	68%	15%	71%	12%
2018	39%	66%	-27%	71%	-32%
Compare		44%			

HISTORY EOC					
Year	**School**	**District**	**School Minus District**	**State**	**School Minus State**
2019	0%	70%	-70%	70%	-70%
2018					

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	**School**	**District**	**School Minus District**	**State**	**School Minus State**
2019	65%	55%	10%	61%	4%
2018	74%	57%	17%	62%	12%
Compare		-9%			

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	**School**	**District**	**School Minus District**	**State**	**School Minus State**
2019	0%	56%	-56%	57%	-57%
2018	0%	56%	-56%	56%	-56%

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
Compare		0%			

Subgroup Data

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 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	10	26	19	8	40	41	16	29			
ELL	43	61	50	33	48						
ASN	88	63		71	69						
BLK	22	45	39	19	41	37	18	60	53		
HSP	59	60	64	42	48	39	53	86	45		
MUL	64	64		63	46		73	60			
WHT	65	62		58	50	62	78	89	84		
FRL	32	47	38	28	43	38	28	69	56		

2018 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 2015-16	C & C Accel 2015-16
SWD	6	16	18	3	16	19	8				
ELL	23	32	25	15	15						
ASN	56	50		50	25						
BLK	11	23	27	11	22	24	16	23	45		
HSP	41	40		29	25	14	79	57	60		
MUL	44	37		47	30			67			
WHT	64	40		51	36	20	79	63	80		
FRL	21	26	28	17	23	24	31	29	62		

ESSA Data

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

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	TS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	47
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	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	422
Total Components for the Federal Index	9
Percent Tested	98%

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%	2
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	47
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	73
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	37
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	55
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	62
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	

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	69
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	42
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

In referencing the 2018-19 FSA Math data, only 19% of our black students are at proficiency. There are many contributing factors to this, including: many students coming into middle school one year or more behind in grade level math standards, high teacher turnover, a lack of effective standards-based instruction, a lack of adequate supports to improve proficiency, and a lack of trust the students have with their teachers (due to high teacher turnover).

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

In referencing the 2018-19 NGSSS Science data, our 8th grade students dipped 5% points overall in Science. Factors contributing to this decline in proficiency include: two new teachers in 8th grade Science, high teacher turnover in the department as a whole, a lack of effective standards-based instruction occurring in all science classes, a lack of supports to improve proficiency and reduce learning gaps, and a lack of trust the students have with their teachers (due to high teacher turnover).

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

Our school's math achievement, based on the 2018-19 FSA data, were 22% behind the state average for the same time and metric. While we, as a school, were happy to have increased our overall math proficiency from the year prior, we understand we still have much ground to cover to reduce the proficiency gap. Factors contributing to this gap are in the process of being narrowed or eliminated, which include: greater retention of the

math instructional team (only one new teacher hire), common planning and common assessment measures, responding to the formative data from the common assessments, tier 2 and 3 interventions with our L25 students, and the use of double block class (Math 1 Advanced and Intensive Math) to improve proficiency targeted for our Level 2 students.

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

Our Civics data, based off the 2018-19 Civics EOC, showed the greatest increase. For the school year in which these scores were obtained, only 7th graders were tested. We now currently have both 7th and 8th graders enrolled in Civics. We have the most effective Social Studies teachers teaching the Civics course for the upcoming school year, based off their relationships with students, their experience teaching the course, and the high expectations they have for their students. These teachers will also plan with the district staff developer to ensure standards-based instruction is occurring in the classes, as well as co-plan with Reading teachers to expose students to Civics-related texts in their Reading classes to help better make connections and better understand Civics-related vocabulary.

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

1) the high percentage of students with 2 or more EWS indicators
2) the high percentage of Level 1 students

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

1. Standards-based instruction occurring in all core academic classrooms
2. Establishing appropriate conditions for learning in all classrooms
3. Establishing a positive school-wide culture and climate through a PBIS system enforcing Trojan PRIDE expectations.
4. Using formative data to make informed instructional decisions for improved student outcomes
5. Reduce the number of OSS from the previous school year.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	To have "high-quality" tier 1 instruction occurring in all English-Language Arts classrooms to improve student academic outcomes.
Measureable Outcome:	To improve ELA proficiency by 3% points, based on 2018-19 FSA Achievement data.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Carlmon Jones (jonescarl@pcsb.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Equity-infused teaching practices with concepts of CRT, SEL, and UDL infused throughout all classrooms.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Many of our students come from economically depressed neighborhoods and many have experienced trauma, of some sort, in their lives. Many come to school each day not engaged in the lessons or teaching concepts exposed to them because of the trauma they've experienced or are going through, or possibly other factors. In order to be able to get the students to proficiency, we must first be able to establish trust and engage them in learning they feel is relevant to them.

Action Steps to Implement	
Common planning provided for all ELA teachers for the sole purpose of common planning and analyzing student data.	
Person Responsible	Carlmon Jones (jonescarl@pcsb.org)
Content-specific professional development focused on standards-based instruction, CRT, SEL, UDL, WICOR, and equitable grading practices; understanding writing rubric, progress monitoring, and feedback to scholars.	
Person Responsible	Carlmon Jones (jonescarl@pcsb.org)
The implementation of a departmental writing plan that will focus on the components of improving students correctly citing evidence and elaborating using their voice.	
Person Responsible	Carlmon Jones (jonescarl@pcsb.org)
Development of a tier 3 intervention plan, focused on L25 students, to assist students on improving in targeted concepts (evidence & elaboration), based on formative assessment data throughout the year. Plan will include data chats and incentives for improved outcomes.	
Person Responsible	[no one identified]

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Provide high-quality, responsive tier 1 instruction for all students in math to improve student outcomes.
Measureable Outcome:	To increase math proficiency by 3% from the 2018-19 FSA achievement data.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Carlmon Jones (jonescarl@pcsb.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Equity-infused teaching practices that will include culturally relevant teaching strategies, socio-emotional learning, universal design for learning, and WICOR strategies infused into lessons; unpacking standards; using formative data to make instructional decisions for differentiation.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Many of our students come from economically depressed neighborhoods and many have experienced trauma, of some sort, in their lives. Many come to school each day not engaged in the lessons or teaching concepts exposed to them because of the trauma they've experienced or are going through, or possibly other factors. In order to be able to get the students to proficiency, we must first be able to establish trust and engage them in learning they feel is relevant to them.

Action Steps to Implement

Common planning within the master schedule for all math teachers for the purpose of planning, analyzing student data, and professional development.

Person Responsible Carlmon Jones (jonescarl@pcsb.org)

Professional development focused on standards-based instruction, how to differentiate instruction in a math classroom using formative assessment data, rotations, CRT, SEL, UDL, unpacking standards, and differentiation in the classroom.

Person Responsible Jacqueline Harding (hardingja@pcsb.org)

An L25 pull-out intervention plan that will focus around math standards (Expressions and Equations and the Number System). Scholars will be pre-assessed for what they know / don't know, provided focus lessons and scholar tasks, and a post-test to determine progress towards proficiency.

Person Responsible Jacqueline Harding (hardingja@pcsb.org)

#3. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	To continue to improve our school's culture and environment so each student and staff member can feel safe and supported by the school.
Measureable Outcome:	To reduce the number of out of school suspensions by 15% from the previous school year.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Carlmon Jones (jonescarl@pcsb.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Use of Restorative Practices to repair teacher-student relationships and work to keep students in class.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Our school has approximately 60% of its students black / African American. 83% of our out of school suspensions are issued to black students. Our black students are lagging behind in most academic metrics. We have to find a way to keep these students engaged academically and reduce the potential for disruption, which could lead to OSS, while still upholding school expectations.

Action Steps to Implement	
Utilize a school-wide Guidelines for Success protocol to identify appropriate acts of behavior in the classroom, in the hallways, restrooms, and other common areas.	
Person Responsible	Carlmon Jones (jonescarl@pcsb.org)
Teach our students what examples and non-examples are for modeling Trojan PRIDE expectations.	
Person Responsible	Carlmon Jones (jonescarl@pcsb.org)
Recurring professional development offered to our faculty and staff on Restorative Practices and how to use RP in the classroom setting.	
Person Responsible	Carlmon Jones (jonescarl@pcsb.org)
Celebrate our students and staff for modeling Trojan PRIDE expectations with incentives (including a PBIS Rewards store)	
Person Responsible	Carlmon Jones (jonescarl@pcsb.org)

#4. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Provide high-quality, responsive tier 1 instruction for all students in science, with an emphasis in 8th grade Science classes, to improve student outcomes.
Measureable Outcome:	To increase science proficiency by 5% from the 2018-19 8th grade SSA achievement data.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Monica McIntosh (mcintoshm@pcsb.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Equity-infused teaching practices that will include culturally relevant teaching strategies, socio-emotional learning, and universal design for learning strategies infused into lessons; unpacking standards; using formative data to make instructional decisions for differentiation.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Many of our students come from economically depressed neighborhoods and many have experienced trauma, of some sort, in their lives. Many come to school each day not engaged in the lessons or teaching concepts exposed to them because of the trauma they've experienced or are going through, or possibly other factors. In order to be able to get the students to proficiency, we must first be able to establish trust and engage them in learning they feel is relevant to them.

Action Steps to Implement

Common planning within the master schedule for all science teachers for the purpose of planning, analyzing student data, and professional development.

Person Responsible Monica McIntosh (mcintoshm@pcsb.org)

Equity-infused teaching practices that will include culturally relevant teaching strategies, socio-emotional learning, universal design for learning, and WICOR strategies infused into lessons; unpacking standards; using formative data to make instructional decisions for differentiation.

Person Responsible Monica McIntosh (mcintoshm@pcsb.org)

Use GAP assessment data to create learning stations within the classroom that can keep scholars focused on 8th grade standards (proficiency and enrichment) while providing distributive practice with 6th and 7th grade standards scholars can expect to see on the SSA 8th Grade Science Assessment.

Person Responsible Monica McIntosh (mcintoshm@pcsb.org)

#5. Other specifically relating to Bridging the Gap Plan	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Our current level of performance is 15% in ELA and 19% in Math of black students with an achievement level of 3 or higher, as evidenced by 2018-19 FSA scores. The problem is occurring because of the lack of culturally relevant, student centered learning environments with differentiated tasks to address the diverse needs of all students.
Measureable Outcome:	To increase ELA proficiency from 15% to 19% and Math proficiency from 19% to 23% for black scholars as determined by FSA metrics for the 2020-21 school year.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	[no one identified]
Evidence-based Strategy:	Provide targeted professional development and coaching to teachers and leaders on culturally relevant strategies, Universal Design for Learning, Socio-Emotional Learning, and WICOR strategies to increase engagement and improve pass rates and grade point averages for black students. Implement culturally relevant strategies, Universal Design for Learning, Socio-Emotional Learning, and WICOR strategies in classrooms that include restorative practices, movement, music, and monitoring with feedback.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Many of our students come from economically depressed neighborhoods and many have experienced trauma, of some sort, in their lives. Many come to school each day not engaged in the lessons or teaching concepts exposed to them because of the trauma they've experienced or are going through, or possibly other factors. In order to be able to get the students to proficiency, we must first be able to establish trust and engage them in learning they feel is relevant to them.

Action Steps to Implement

Provide targeted professional development and coaching to teachers on CRT, UDL, SEL, and WICOR strategies on a recurring bases

Person Responsible Carlmon Jones (jonescarl@pcsb.org)

Monitor implementation of school-embedded professional development via classroom walk-throughs with specific substantive feedback provided.

Person Responsible Carlmon Jones (jonescarl@pcsb.org)

Target black scholars for specific Tier 2 interventions that will include the before and after school Extended Learning Program to provide tutoring, remediation, and enrichment for ELA, Math, and Civics activities.

Person Responsible Monica McIntosh (mcintoshm@pcsb.org)

Teachers use WICOR and UDL strategies to allow black scholars to demonstrate their understanding and mastery of standards-based content taught in a variety of ways.

Person Responsible Carlmon Jones (jonescarl@pcsb.org)

#6. Other specifically relating to Family and Community Engagement	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	To have greater parental involvement in school activities and improve the relationship between the school and the parents/guardians of its scholars.
Measureable Outcome:	To have a minimum of 50% of our parents actively involved in participating in at least two school-sponsored activities per semester that includes (6th grade orientation, Back to School Night, attending a PTSA or SAC meeting, or parent-teacher conference).
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Carlmon Jones (jonescarl@pcsb.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Use a Parent Support Card (one card per family) that parents will receive at the beginning of the school year. The Support Card will have a list of all eligible activities for each semester in which the parents can attend. For each activity the parent completes, they will earn participation points towards school-specific incentives. Parents meeting the highest threshold of pre-determined points will be formally recognized at the end of the school year.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Parent involvement seems to dwindle off as scholars transition from elementary to middle school. We understand that in order for a child to be successful, there must be a partnership between the school and parents. We want parents to know who is interacting with their children on a daily basis. By using a Parent Support Card, we want to provide opportunities for parents to be able to choose (ahead of time) which activities and events they can support in order to support their children and give incentives for the parents who are taking time out of their schedule to support their child and their child's school.

Action Steps to Implement	
Determine school-wide activities and meetings ahead of time (per semester).	
Person Responsible	Carlmon Jones (jonescarl@pcsb.org)
Create Parent Support Cards and make available for distribution.	
Person Responsible	Carlmon Jones (jonescarl@pcsb.org)
Use School Messenger and School Messenger email blasts to inform parents of the initiative and how they will receive their Parent Support Card.	
Person Responsible	Carlmon Jones (jonescarl@pcsb.org)
Train administration and faculty on what this initiative is and that they may be able to sign off of the Parent Support Card for parents achieving certain goals on the card.	
Person Responsible	Carlmon Jones (jonescarl@pcsb.org)
Develop school incentives for parents earning pre-determined threshold of points.	

Person Responsible	Carlmon Jones (jonescarl@pcsb.org)

Monitor parent guardian participation data monthly and for each semester.

Person Responsible	Carlmon Jones (jonescarl@pcsb.org)

#7. Other specifically relating to Attendance

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	To have and maintain high scholar daily attendance for increased scholar academic outcomes.
Measureable Outcome:	John Hopkins' average daily attendance for the 2019-2020 school year (pre-COVID-19) hovered around 92%. Our goal is to increase average daily scholar attendance to 95%, as determined by the attendance teachers will take daily through FOCUS.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Carlmon Jones (jonescarl@pcsb.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Implement a progressive-tiered approach to communicate with parents/ guardians of scholars who have been identified for having excessive absences within a grading period.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Many of the parents/guardians of excessively absent scholars may not be aware their child is missing school due to many factors. As a school, we want to keep the lines of communication open to discontinue this behavior and give the child a better opportunity for academic success.

Action Steps to Implement

Members of the Student Services Team know and understand their role on the team and how they can best contribute.

Person Responsible	Carlmon Jones (jonescarl@pcsb.org)

Student Services Team develop their MTSS process for addressing excessive absenteeism and the interventions to reduce the frequency of the absenteeism.

Person Responsible	[no one identified]

Implementation of the MTSS Intervention supports to reduce the frequency of the absenteeism.

Person Responsible	Carlmon Jones (jonescarl@pcsb.org)

Monitoring of the effectiveness of the MTSS intervention plan to see if our average daily attendance is improving and if there is a reduction of chronically absent scholars. Celebrate successes and tweak processes in which no positive movement has been made.

Person Responsible	Carlmon Jones (jonescarl@pcsb.org)

#8. Other specifically relating to Healthy Schools

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Measureable Outcome:

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: [no one identified]

Evidence-based Strategy:

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Action Steps to Implement

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

#9. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Social Studies	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	To have "high-quality" tier 1 instruction occurring in all Social Studies classrooms, with a focus on Civics, to improve student academic outcomes.
Measureable Outcome:	To achieve a 55% proficiency score on the Civics EOC for the 2020-21 school year.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	[no one identified]
Evidence-based Strategy:	Equity-infused teaching practices with concepts of CRT, SEL, and UDL infused throughout all classrooms.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Many of our students come from economically depressed neighborhoods and many have experienced trauma, of some sort, in their lives. Many come to school each day not engaged in the lessons or teaching concepts exposed to them because of the trauma they've experienced or are going through, or possibly other factors. In order to be able to get the students to proficiency, we must first be able to establish trust and engage them in learning they feel is relevant to them.

Action Steps to Implement	
Common planning provided for all Social Studies teachers for the sole purpose of common planning and analyzing student data.	
Person Responsible	Kimberly Vongsyprasom (vongsyprasomk@pcsb.org)
Content-specific professional development focused on standards-based instruction, CRT, SEL, UDL, WICOR, and equitable grading practices, progress monitoring, and feedback to scholars.	
Person Responsible	Kimberly Vongsyprasom (vongsyprasomk@pcsb.org)
8th grade Civics teachers collaborating and planning together with 8th grade Reading teachers to make Civics text more relevant and understandable for the scholars.	
Person Responsible	Kimberly Vongsyprasom (vongsyprasomk@pcsb.org)
A Civics Boot Camp to remediate, re-teach, and enrich Civics standards to 7th and 8th grade Civics scholars.	
Person Responsible	Kimberly Vongsyprasom (vongsyprasomk@pcsb.org)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

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.

Building a positive school culture and climate cannot be achieved alone, if we aspire to achieve the optimal results. This process will need to involve all stakeholders, to include faculty/staff, students, parents, and community partners.

To get buy-in from faculty, staff, and students, it is imperative to get their feedback on their perception of where the school currently is as it pertains to our climate and culture. We will use their feedback to develop a team comprising of faculty/staff, students, parents, and community partners to develop strategies to embrace all stakeholder input into improving our current climate and culture. Feedback will be obtained through surveys and conversations.

School culture and climate data will be shared to all stakeholders quarterly (i.e. faculty meetings, SAC, virtual assemblies, etc.), at a minimum to celebrate successes and to revisit areas identified for improvement.

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

1	**III.A.**	**Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA**	**$0.00**
2	**III.A.**	**Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math**	**$0.00**
3	**III.A.**	**Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports**	**$0.00**
4	**III.A.**	**Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Science**	**$0.00**
5	**III.A.**	**Areas of Focus: Other: Bridging the Gap Plan**	**$0.00**
6	**III.A.**	**Areas of Focus: Other: Family and Community Engagement**	**$0.00**
7	**III.A.**	**Areas of Focus: Other: Attendance**	**$0.00**
8	**III.A.**	**Areas of Focus: Other: Healthy Schools**	**$0.00**

9	**III.A.**	**Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Social Studies**	**$0.00**
		Total:	**$0.00**