

Pinellas County Schools

# Tarpon Springs Middle School



2022-23 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>8</b>  |
| <b>Planning for Improvement</b>           | <b>13</b> |
| <b>Positive Culture &amp; Environment</b> | <b>0</b>  |
| <b>Budget to Support Goals</b>            | <b>0</b>  |

# Tarpon Springs Middle School

501 N FLORIDA AVE, Tarpon Springs, FL 34689

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

## Demographics

**Principal: Erin Phelps**

Start Date for this Principal: 7/20/2019

|                                                                                                                                                              |                                                                                                                                                                                                                    |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <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>2021-22 Title I School</b>                                                                                                                                | No                                                                                                                                                                                                                 |
| <b>2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b><br>(as reported on Survey 3)                                                                            | 49%                                                                                                                                                                                                                |
| <b>2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b><br>(subgroups with 10 or more students)<br>(subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | 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>                                                                                                                                 | 2021-22: B (59%)<br>2020-21: (58%)<br>2018-19: C (53%)<br>2017-18: B (55%)                                                                                                                                         |
| <b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>                                                                                                          |                                                                                                                                                                                                                    |
| <b>SI Region</b>                                                                                                                                             | Central                                                                                                                                                                                                            |
| <b>Regional Executive Director</b>                                                                                                                           | <a href="#">Lucinda Thompson</a>                                                                                                                                                                                   |
| <b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>                                                                                                                               | N/A                                                                                                                                                                                                                |
| <b>Year</b>                                                                                                                                                  |                                                                                                                                                                                                                    |
| <b>Support Tier</b>                                                                                                                                          |                                                                                                                                                                                                                    |
| <b>ESSA Status</b>                                                                                                                                           | TS&I                                                                                                                                                                                                               |

\* 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](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.

Mission : To provide challenging learning experiences in a safe learning environment so that all students are prepared for college, career and life.

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

Vision: Learning gains for every student, every day.

### School Leadership Team

#### Membership

For each member of the school leadership team, select the employee name and email address from the dropdown. Identify the position title and job duties/responsibilities.:

| Name                  | Position Title      | Job Duties and Responsibilities |
|-----------------------|---------------------|---------------------------------|
| Phelps , Erin         | Principal           |                                 |
| Nash, Amber           | Assistant Principal |                                 |
| Dove, Diane           | Assistant Principal |                                 |
| Mitchell, Anthony     | Assistant Principal |                                 |
| Meyer, Erik           | Other               | Math Department Chair           |
| Savopoulos, Vasilios  | Other               | Science Department Chair        |
| Zahner, Evelyn        | Other               | Social Studies Department Chair |
| Mathews, Crissy       | Other               | ELA Department Chair            |
| Touchton, Christopher | Other               | Fine Arts Department Chair      |

### Demographic Information

#### Principal start date

Saturday 7/20/2019, Erin Phelps

**Number of teachers with a 2022 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective.** *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

2

**Number of teachers with a 2022 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective.** *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

18

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

34

**Total number of students enrolled at the school**

636

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

4

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

5

**Demographic Data**

**Early Warning Systems**

**Using prior year's data, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:**

| Indicator                                                | Grade Level |   |   |   |   |   |     |     |     |   |    |    |    | Total |
|----------------------------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|-----|-----|-----|---|----|----|----|-------|
|                                                          | K           | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6   | 7   | 8   | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |       |
| Number of students enrolled                              | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 231 | 231 | 183 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 645   |
| Attendance below 90 percent                              | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 69  | 71  | 52  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 192   |
| One or more suspensions                                  | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0   | 5   | 1   | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 6     |
| Course failure in ELA                                    | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11  | 11  | 12  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 34    |
| Course failure in Math                                   | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 35  | 5   | 5   | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 45    |
| Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment             | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 26  | 34  | 12  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 72    |
| Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment            | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 27  | 38  | 19  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 84    |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 26  | 34  | 12  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 72    |

**Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level who have two or more early warning indicators:**

| Indicator                            | Grade Level |   |   |   |   |   |    |    |    |   |    |    |    | Total |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|---|----|----|----|-------|
|                                      | K           | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6  | 7  | 8  | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |       |
| Students with two or more indicators | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14 | 25 | 12 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 51    |

**Using current year data, complete the table below with the number of students identified as being "retained.":**

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

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

Tuesday 7/5/2022

**The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:**

| Indicator                                                | Grade Level |   |   |   |   |   |     |     |     |   |    |    |    | Total |
|----------------------------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|-----|-----|-----|---|----|----|----|-------|
|                                                          | K           | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6   | 7   | 8   | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |       |
| Number of students enrolled                              | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 243 | 216 | 238 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 697   |
| Attendance below 90 percent                              | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 37  | 44  | 53  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 134   |
| One or more suspensions                                  | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0   | 1   | 3   | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 4     |
| Course failure in ELA                                    | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0   | 4   | 6   | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 10    |
| Course failure in Math                                   | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0   | 7   | 5   | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 12    |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment             | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 30  | 25  | 37  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 92    |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment            | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 27  | 23  | 30  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 80    |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13  | 5   | 2   | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 20    |

**The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:**

| Indicator                            | Grade Level |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |    |   |    |    |    | Total |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|---|----|----|----|-------|
|                                      | K           | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7  | 8  | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |       |
| Students with two or more indicators | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 24 | 21 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 45    |

**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 | 4 | 6 | 13 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 23    |
| Students retained two or more times | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 2     |

**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 | 243 | 216 | 238 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 697   |
| Attendance below 90 percent                              | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 37  | 44  | 53  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 134   |
| One or more suspensions                                  | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0   | 1   | 3   | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 4     |
| Course failure in ELA                                    | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0   | 4   | 6   | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 10    |
| Course failure in Math                                   | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0   | 7   | 5   | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 12    |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment             | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 30  | 25  | 37  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 92    |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment            | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 27  | 23  | 30  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 80    |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13  | 5   | 2   | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 20    |

**The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:**

| Indicator                            | Grade Level |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |    |   |    |    |    | Total |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|---|----|----|----|-------|
|                                      | K           | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7  | 8  | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |       |
| Students with two or more indicators | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 24 | 21 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 45    |

**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 | 4 | 6 | 13 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 23    |
| Students retained two or more times | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 2     |

**Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis**

**School Data Review**

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

| School Grade Component      | 2022   |          |       | 2021   |          |       | 2019   |          |       |
|-----------------------------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|
|                             | School | District | State | School | District | State | School | District | State |
| ELA Achievement             | 59%    |          |       | 59%    |          |       | 55%    | 52%      | 54%   |
| ELA Learning Gains          | 47%    |          |       | 59%    |          |       | 54%    | 55%      | 54%   |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile  | 30%    |          |       | 48%    |          |       | 42%    | 47%      | 47%   |
| Math Achievement            | 64%    |          |       | 58%    |          |       | 55%    | 55%      | 58%   |
| Math Learning Gains         | 59%    |          |       | 50%    |          |       | 42%    | 52%      | 57%   |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 54%    |          |       | 44%    |          |       | 37%    | 46%      | 51%   |
| Science Achievement         | 62%    |          |       | 58%    |          |       | 52%    | 51%      | 51%   |
| Social Studies Achievement  | 84%    |          |       | 68%    |          |       | 73%    | 68%      | 72%   |



**Grade Level Data Review - State Assessments****NOTE: This data is raw data and includes ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.**

| <b>ELA</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> |
| 06                | 2022        |               |                 |                                   |              |                                |
|                   | 2019        | 54%           | 51%             | 3%                                | 54%          | 0%                             |
| Cohort Comparison |             |               |                 |                                   |              |                                |
| 07                | 2022        |               |                 |                                   |              |                                |
|                   | 2019        | 52%           | 51%             | 1%                                | 52%          | 0%                             |
| Cohort Comparison |             | -54%          |                 |                                   |              |                                |
| 08                | 2022        |               |                 |                                   |              |                                |
|                   | 2019        | 59%           | 55%             | 4%                                | 56%          | 3%                             |
| Cohort Comparison |             | -52%          |                 |                                   |              |                                |

| <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> |
| 06                | 2022        |               |                 |                                   |              |                                |
|                   | 2019        | 49%           | 44%             | 5%                                | 55%          | -6%                            |
| Cohort Comparison |             |               |                 |                                   |              |                                |
| 07                | 2022        |               |                 |                                   |              |                                |
|                   | 2019        | 65%           | 60%             | 5%                                | 54%          | 11%                            |
| Cohort Comparison |             | -49%          |                 |                                   |              |                                |
| 08                | 2022        |               |                 |                                   |              |                                |
|                   | 2019        | 21%           | 31%             | -10%                              | 46%          | -25%                           |
| Cohort Comparison |             | -65%          |                 |                                   |              |                                |

| <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> |
| 06                | 2022        |               |                 |                                   |              |                                |
|                   | 2019        |               |                 |                                   |              |                                |
| Cohort Comparison |             |               |                 |                                   |              |                                |
| 07                | 2022        |               |                 |                                   |              |                                |
|                   | 2019        |               |                 |                                   |              |                                |
| Cohort Comparison |             | 0%            |                 |                                   |              |                                |
| 08                | 2022        |               |                 |                                   |              |                                |
|                   | 2019        | 52%           | 51%             | 1%                                | 48%          | 4%                             |
| Cohort Comparison |             | 0%            |                 |                                   |              |                                |

| BIOLOGY EOC  |        |          |                       |       |                    |
|--------------|--------|----------|-----------------------|-------|--------------------|
| Year         | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2022         |        |          |                       |       |                    |
| 2019         |        |          |                       |       |                    |
| CIVICS EOC   |        |          |                       |       |                    |
| Year         | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2022         |        |          |                       |       |                    |
| 2019         | 73%    | 68%      | 5%                    | 71%   | 2%                 |
| HISTORY EOC  |        |          |                       |       |                    |
| Year         | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2022         |        |          |                       |       |                    |
| 2019         |        |          |                       |       |                    |
| ALGEBRA EOC  |        |          |                       |       |                    |
| Year         | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2022         |        |          |                       |       |                    |
| 2019         | 68%    | 55%      | 13%                   | 61%   | 7%                 |
| GEOMETRY EOC |        |          |                       |       |                    |
| Year         | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2022         |        |          |                       |       |                    |
| 2019         | 91%    | 56%      | 35%                   | 57%   | 34%                |

**Subgroup Data Review**

| 2022 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
|-------------------------------------------|----------|--------|-------------|-----------|---------|--------------|----------|---------|-----------|-------------------|---------------------|
| Subgroups                                 | ELA Ach. | ELA LG | ELA LG L25% | Math Ach. | Math LG | Math LG L25% | Sci Ach. | SS Ach. | MS Accel. | Grad Rate 2020-21 | C & C Accel 2020-21 |
| SWD                                       | 19       | 25     | 24          | 30        | 50      | 49           | 39       | 39      |           |                   |                     |
| ELL                                       | 33       | 30     | 16          | 45        | 54      | 56           | 22       | 71      |           |                   |                     |
| ASN                                       | 86       | 62     |             | 86        | 83      |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| BLK                                       | 33       | 34     | 29          | 38        | 56      | 59           | 30       | 56      |           |                   |                     |
| HSP                                       | 57       | 45     | 23          | 58        | 57      | 48           | 52       | 85      | 70        |                   |                     |
| MUL                                       | 39       | 38     |             | 71        | 57      |              | 45       | 100     |           |                   |                     |
| WHT                                       | 65       | 51     | 32          | 70        | 59      | 53           | 70       | 85      | 77        |                   |                     |
| FRL                                       | 45       | 36     | 25          | 54        | 56      | 55           | 47       | 77      | 62        |                   |                     |
| 2021 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| Subgroups                                 | ELA Ach. | ELA LG | ELA LG L25% | Math Ach. | Math LG | Math LG L25% | Sci Ach. | SS Ach. | MS Accel. | Grad Rate 2019-20 | C & C Accel 2019-20 |
| SWD                                       | 26       | 38     | 32          | 23        | 31      | 33           | 29       | 48      |           |                   |                     |
| ELL                                       | 42       | 58     | 50          | 39        | 35      | 33           | 30       | 47      | 55        |                   |                     |

| 2021 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
|-------------------------------------------|----------|--------|-------------|-----------|---------|--------------|----------|---------|-----------|-------------------|---------------------|
| Subgroups                                 | ELA Ach. | ELA LG | ELA LG L25% | Math Ach. | Math LG | Math LG L25% | Sci Ach. | SS Ach. | MS Accel. | Grad Rate 2019-20 | C & C Accel 2019-20 |
| ASN                                       | 92       | 70     |             | 91        |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| BLK                                       | 20       | 36     | 36          | 18        | 30      | 34           | 18       | 39      |           |                   |                     |
| HSP                                       | 59       | 63     | 59          | 50        | 47      | 35           | 46       | 60      | 76        |                   |                     |
| MUL                                       | 47       | 56     |             | 55        | 55      |              | 53       | 73      |           |                   |                     |
| WHT                                       | 67       | 61     | 49          | 68        | 55      | 51           | 68       | 77      | 82        |                   |                     |
| FRL                                       | 50       | 55     | 42          | 50        | 51      | 45           | 54       | 55      | 80        |                   |                     |
| 2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| Subgroups                                 | ELA Ach. | ELA LG | ELA LG L25% | Math Ach. | Math LG | Math LG L25% | Sci Ach. | SS Ach. | MS Accel. | Grad Rate 2017-18 | C & C Accel 2017-18 |
| SWD                                       | 26       | 37     | 25          | 20        | 35      | 39           | 26       | 43      |           |                   |                     |
| ELL                                       | 24       | 39     | 42          | 32        | 39      | 35           | 12       | 40      |           |                   |                     |
| ASN                                       | 73       | 38     |             | 100       | 58      |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| BLK                                       | 31       | 45     | 37          | 22        | 29      | 33           | 15       | 58      | 46        |                   |                     |
| HSP                                       | 42       | 50     | 39          | 44        | 45      | 34           | 30       | 71      | 52        |                   |                     |
| MUL                                       | 54       | 39     |             | 67        | 47      |              | 36       | 70      |           |                   |                     |
| WHT                                       | 63       | 58     | 46          | 63        | 43      | 44           | 63       | 76      | 69        |                   |                     |
| FRL                                       | 48       | 52     | 42          | 45        | 41      | 34           | 41       | 62      | 55        |                   |                     |

**ESSA Data Review**

This data has not been updated for the 2022-23 school year.

| ESSA Federal Index                                                              |      |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------|
| ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)                                                    | TS&I |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students                                            | 57   |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students                                    | NO   |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target                                    | 1    |
| Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency | 38   |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index                                       | 573  |
| Total Components for the Federal Index                                          | 10   |
| Percent Tested                                                                  | 97%  |
| Subgroup Data                                                                   |      |
| Students With Disabilities                                                      |      |
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities                                      | 34   |
| Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?              | YES  |
| Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%       | 0    |

| <b>English Language Learners</b>                                               |     |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|
| Federal Index - English Language Learners                                      | 41  |
| 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                                                 | 79  |
| 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                                | 42  |
| Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?        | NO  |
| Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0   |
| <b>Hispanic Students</b>                                                       |     |
| Federal Index - Hispanic Students                                              | 54  |
| 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                                           | 58  |
| 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   |
| <b>White Students</b>                                                          |     |
| Federal Index - White Students                                                 | 62  |
| 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                                | 49 |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?        | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0  |

## Part III: Planning for Improvement

### Data Analysis

Answer the following analysis questions using the progress monitoring data and state assessment data, if applicable.

#### What trends emerge across grade levels, subgroups and core content areas?

The proficiency level increased to 71% in both math and ELA for 7th grade, Civics proficiency increased 16 points, Science proficiency increased, and overall math levels increased. 6th grade and 8th grade ELA proficiency levels and learning gains decreased.

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

Learning gains in all grade levels for ELA and learning gains in grade 6 (rising 7th) math.

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

Contributing Factors: Consistency among teachers providing specific feedback to students. Increased student accountability.

New Actions: Intentional course placement adjustments. For example, ensuring students have an opportunity at accelerated coursework and great exposure to rigorous coursework.

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

Proficiency in grade 7 Math and grade 7 ELA; Social Studies

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

Summer math prep with focus on the fundamentals; IXL monitoring with applied feedback; intentional and specific instruction for social studies.

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

Intentional monitoring with timely and specific feedback. Increased side by side coaching.

#### Based on the contributing factors and strategies identified to accelerate learning, describe the professional development opportunities that will be provided at the school to support teachers and leaders.

Small group PLC support for both content areas and grade levels; Strategy walks to observe model classrooms with follow up discussion/feedback.

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

Increased instructional walk throughs with specific coaching. Instructional boot camps.

**Areas of Focus**

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

:

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

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

Increase proficiency levels to 60% of students demonstrating proficiency/"on grade level" status as we should continue to work toward increasing proficiency levels through learning gains so we ultimately close achievement gaps.

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

Increase the percentage of students demonstrating proficiency from 59% to 60% as measured by the FAST.

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

Intentional tracking of student progress through the progress monitoring cycles, with coaching support where needed.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Erin Phelps (phelpse@pcsb.org)

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

Read aloud to students, introduction and application of academic vocabulary, daily oral grammar exercises, re-teach and enrich sessions, provide timely and specific feedback to students and teachers, holding all accountable.

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

Data obtained from student work and student assessments demonstrates that many students, especially students who fall in the bottom quartile, are lacking the basic vocabulary, fluency, and writing skills.

**Action Steps to Implement**

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

1. Ensure students are appropriately placed by conducting a schedule review (July/August).
2. Review student ELA FSA data and MAP data, diagnostic data, cycle data, and student work to assess needs.
3. Provide site based professional development for teachers to ensure they understand the schoolwide writing plan and how to effectively implement in the classroom.
4. Introduce students to academic vocabulary (including cross-curricular).
5. Practice with writing strategy and monitor through the use of common BEST writing rubrics.
6. Roll out school wide reading and writing plan to SS, Science, Reading, and LA.
7. ELA/Reading teachers utilize the progress monitoring platform for collecting and assessing reading and guiding instruction.
8. Administrator monitors teacher practice, including student evidence, and provides feedback to support growth.

**Person Responsible**

Erin Phelps (phelpse@pcsb.org)

**#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math****Area of Focus Description and****Rationale:**

**Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.**

Approximately 60% of students are demonstrating on grade level success and the number of students reaching proficiency should increase each year if we are working to close achievement gaps.

**Measurable Outcome:**

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

At least 65% of students will demonstrate proficiency/on grade level success as measured by the FAST.

**Monitoring:**

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

Classroom walk throughs, admin-teacher discussions during PLCs, and student PM and IXL data review.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Amber Nash (nasha@pcsb.org)

**Evidence-based Strategy:**

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

common bell work, benchmark assessment with re-teach and engage.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:**

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

Differentiation and scaffolding will ensure learning is maximized for all learners no matter the level they are on.  
2. Students ability to elaborate on the content will show evidence that they understand it at the level of the benchmark and not just a superficial level.

**Action Steps to Implement**

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

- 1.1...Teachers participate in professional learning activities, including PLCs, peer collaboration, and Facilitated Planning, to strengthen, practice and plan for data driven differentiation.
- 1.2...Teachers utilize student data from formative/summative assessments, (i.e. IXL, Khan, etc.), to individualize student planning/instructional implementation.
- 1.3...Teachers utilize student data to conduct data chats and design a differentiated/scaffolded plan.
- 1.4...Administrator monitor for the teachers' use of student data for implementation of differentiated/scaffolded instruction and the administrator provides actionable and timely feedback.
- 2.1...Teachers participate in professional learning activities, including PLCs, peer collaboration, and Facilitated Planning, to identify and develop higher order questions that will elicit students to elaborate on the content.
- 2.2...Teachers plan for the use of purposeful questions that elicit students to interact with and elaborate on the content which could include making connections with previous content, real-world and mathematical situations.
- 2.3...Administrator monitors and provides actionable and timely feedback to support teacher growth.

**Person Responsible**

Amber Nash (nasha@pcsb.org)



**#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science****Area of Focus Description and****Rationale:**

**Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.**

Science proficiency levels increased from 58% to 62% and need to continue to improve as we work toward increasing the overall proficiency levels of our students.

**Measurable Outcome:**

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

At least 65% of our 8th grade students will demonstrate proficiency in science as measured by the end of year science assessment.

**Monitoring:**

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

GAP assessment data, cycle assessment data, student evidence will all be monitored for benchmark proficiency.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Diane Dove (doved@pcsb.org)

**Evidence-based Strategy:**

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

#1. Teachers implement literacy strategies in science to engage in reading and analyzing complex text. Engage students with text dependent questions and performance tasks aligned to standards.  
#2. Regularly assess (formally and informally) and utilize data to modify and adjust instruction. Teachers utilize ongoing formative assessment and use the information gained to adjust instruction, enrich and reteach, and provide research-based interventions.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:**

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

By implementing a school-wide reading plan, students will build reading endurance and comprehension skills needed for success, along with intentional placement in science courses. Culturally Relevant Teaching practices will increase student engagement in Science and understanding of the content.

**Action Steps to Implement**

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

1. Teachers across content integrate reading/literacy strategies - Science teachers provide students with opportunities to read informational and argumentative texts, write about the process and outcomes of their investigations, and use the language of science as they work through each lab.
2. Using supplemental texts, teachers will regularly include shorter, challenging, and technical passages that elicit close reading and re-reading.
3. Conduct regular, monthly, Professional Learning Communities (PLCs) inclusive of 'data chats' to review student responses to tasks and formative assessments and plan for instructional lessons that include text-dependent questions, close and critical reading and skill/strategy-based groups to implement during core instruction to support success with complex texts.
4. Monitor cycle assessment data and provide remediation early to fill in deficiency gaps and plan for instructional lessons that meet the remediation and enrichment needs of students.

**Person Responsible**

Diane Dove (doved@pcsb.org)

**#4. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Social Studies****Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

We need to continue to increase the overall proficiency levels.

**Measurable Outcome:**

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

The overall proficiency level in Civics will increase from an 84% to 85% as measured by the Civics EOC.

**Monitoring:**

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

Student progress will be monitored through classroom evidence and cycle assessment data.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Anthony Mitchell (mitchellant@pcsb.org)

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

Targeted lessons based on assessed benchmarks. Focus on writing for increased Depth of Knowledge and exposure to complex text. Demonstrate purpose for learning so students understand the connection between the Civics content and their life.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:**

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

Data shows that student engagement increases with a genuine understanding for the purpose of the learning and an overall connection to the learning. Additionally, exposure to on-grade level and above-grade-level text with an applied application of writing increases the level of rigor and ultimately overall understanding of the content.

**Action Steps to Implement**

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

1. Ensure teachers have a clear plan and timeline of rolling out the curriculum with assessing the appropriate benchmarks each week.
2. Daily bellwork that either previews upcoming content or checks/monitors for student understanding of the content.
3. Meet with teachers regularly during PLCs and beyond to discuss student progress and student remediation plans when necessary.
4. Intentional use of intervention time.
5. Weekly writing assignments that demonstrate application of the content.
6. Weekly vocabulary roll out with assessment.

**Person Responsible**

Anthony Mitchell (mitchellant@pcsb.org)

**#5. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities****Area of Focus Description and****Rationale:**

**Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.**

Our ESE students are currently performing below the adequate federal index level.

**Measurable Outcome:**

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

Our ESE subgroup will perform at a federal index level of 42% as measured by the FAST assessment, EOCs, and Science FCAT.

**Monitoring:**

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

Student progress will be monitored through classroom work, cycle data, progress monitoring assessments, and student IEPs.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Anthony Mitchell (mitchellant@pcsb.org)

**Evidence-based Strategy:**

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

Chunking, scaffolding of instruction, vocabulary lists with definitions, reading fluency with read and respond to text practice, practice at identifying the prompt and turning it into a question, and close reading strategy.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:**

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

Breaking the content into digestible bites often allows students to better understand the material and not feel overwhelmed/frustrated. Repetition and assessment of vocabulary provides a foundational knowledge for the learning.

**Action Steps to Implement**

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

1. Make sure there is a genuine understanding of who falls in the ESE subgroup - Who are the ESE students and what are their accommodations?
2. Staff PD on ESE accommodations/supports (pre-school).
3. Implementation of accommodations with follow up to determine effectiveness of the implementation/the actual accommodation.
4. Admin. review of IEPs to ensure appropriate and intentional updates are occurring.
5. Intentional walk throughs to ensure the needs of all students (including ESE students) are being met.
6. Review of student work and cycle assessment, and PM data to determine if adequate progress is being made.

**Person Responsible**

Anthony Mitchell (mitchellant@pcsb.org)

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

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

**Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.**

Data reveals there is a consistent performance gap between black and non-black students in all academic areas.

**Measurable Outcome:**

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

Black/African American proficiency rates will increase from 37% to 45% in math and from 40% - 45% as measured by the FAST.

**Monitoring:**

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

Classroom work samples, student PM data, and cycle assessment data will be used to monitor student progress.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Anthony Mitchell (mitchellant@pcsb.org)

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

Writing across the content areas, chunking content, scaffolding to meet the needs of all learners, and demonstrating a clear purpose for learning/relevance of the learning.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:**

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

Research demonstrates that student engagement increases when there is a clear purpose for learning and the content is relevant. Students often need additional supports understanding academic vocabulary and language, and applying content through writing.

**Action Steps to Implement**

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

1. Identify students not demonstrating proficiency.
2. Connect below-grade level students with mentors and conduct bi-weekly check and connect sessions to discuss student progress.
3. Hold specific student-led conferences where students discuss their PM data for math and ELA and next steps.
4. Provide ELP and re-teach interventions when/where needed.

**Person Responsible**

Anthony Mitchell (mitchellant@pcsb.org)

**#7. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to College and Career**

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

Student success in higher level courses is important when promoting higher education or continuing education.

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

At least 80% of students will receive a level 3 or higher as measured by the Algebra/Geometry EOC and/or will receive an industry certification.

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

Monitoring will occur through a combination of classroom observations and engagement in collaborative planning and PLCs.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Diane Dove (doved@pcsb.org)

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

Students will be enrolled in an academically rigorous course that provides an opportunity for them to receive high school credit and/or will take a CAPE certification course.

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

Placement in higher level courses opens opportunities for students to receive high school credits/industry certifications.

**Action Steps to Implement**

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

1. Review student course placement and meet with teachers to ensure appropriate business ed. industry cert. course placement.
2. Review student data during SBLT and PLC meetings and provide student support where needed to increase student success.
3. Provide practice opportunities through software to measure student proficiency prior to taking the certification exam.
4. Monitor student and teacher success through review of assessment data and administrative walk throughs.
5. Administrators will provide support to teachers to promote professional growth.

**Person Responsible**

Diane Dove (doved@pcsb.org)

**RAISE**

The RAISE program established criteria for identifying schools for additional support. The criteria for the 2022-23 school year includes schools with students in grades Kindergarten through fifth, where 50 percent or more of its students, for any grade level, score below a level 3 on the most recent statewide English Language Arts (ELA) assessment.

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale**

Include a description of your Area of Focus (Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA) for each grade below, how it affects student learning in literacy, and a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed. Data that should be used to determine the critical need should include, at a minimum:

- The percentage of students below Level 3 on the 2022 statewide, standardized ELA assessment. Identification criteria must include each grade that has 50 percent or more students scoring below level 3 in grades 3-5 on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.
- The percentage of students in kindergarten through grade 3, based on 2021-2022 end of year screening and progress monitoring data, who are not on track to score Level 3 or above on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.
- Other forms of data that should be considered: formative, progress monitoring and diagnostic assessment data.

**Grades K-2: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA**

N/A

**Grades 3-5: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA**

N/A

**Measurable Outcomes:**

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each grade below. This should be a data based, objective outcome. Include prior year data and a measurable outcome for each of the following:

- Each grade K-3, using the new coordinated screening and progress monitoring system, where 50 percent or more of the students are not on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment.
- Each grade 3-5 where 50 percent or more of its students scored below a level 3 on the most recent statewide, standardized ELA assessment and
- Grade 6 measurable outcomes may be included, as applicable.

**Grades K-2: Measureable Outcome(s)**

N/A

**Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)**

N/A

**Monitoring:**

Describe how the school's Area(s) of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcomes. Include a description of how ongoing monitoring will take place with evaluating impact at the end of the year.

N/A

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

**Evidence-based Practices/Programs:**

Describe the evidence-based practices/programs being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each grade and describe how the identified practices/programs will be monitored. The term "evidence-based" means demonstrating a statistically significant effect on improving student outcomes or other relevant outcomes as provided in 20 U.S.C. Â§7801(21)(A)(i). Florida's definition limits evidence-based practices/programs to only those with strong, moderate or promising levels of evidence.

- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs meet Florida's definition of evidence-based (strong, moderate or promising)?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align with the district's K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align to the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards?

N/A

**Rationale for Evidence-based Practices/Programs:**

Explain the rationale for selecting the specific practices/programs. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting the practices/programs.

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs address the identified need?
- Do the identified practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

N/A

**Action Steps to Implement:**

List the action steps that will be taken to address the school's Area(s) of Focus. To address the area of focus, identify 2 to 3 action steps and explain in detail for each of the categories below:

- Literacy Leadership
- Literacy Coaching
- Assessment
- Professional Learning

**Action Step**

**Person Responsible for Monitoring**

N/A



## Positive Culture & Environment

A positive school culture and environment reflects: a supportive and fulfilling environment, learning conditions that meet the needs of all students, people who are sure of their roles and relationships in student learning and a culture that values trust, respect and high expectations. Consulting with various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies that impact the school culture and environment. Stakeholder groups more proximal to the school include teachers, students and families of students, volunteers and school board members. Broad stakeholder groups include early childhood providers, community colleges and universities, social services and business partners.

### Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment.

Building a positive community in which a variety of stakeholders are involved is imperative to the overall success of a school. Tarpon Springs MS will sustain a positive school culture by building upon/maintaining the following:

1. Continue with frequent communication consisting of call outs, emails, posting on school website, and posting on the school sign.
2. Foster relationships with local businesses including, but not limited to, City Hall, TSPD, the CAP Center, American Legion, UPS, Starbucks, and Publix.
3. Ensure SAC and PTSA are composed of equitable representation that matches the demographics of our school community. Provide SAC with timely and relevant information to keep families in the know.
4. Invite students to sit on a school council for a clear voice and bring representation to PTSA and SAC meetings.
5. Include families in school meetings, concerts, celebrations, etc. and clearly communicate upcoming events and information in a timely manner.
6. Hold meetings with families of "at risk" students to clearly discuss, review, and plan for the academic progress of their student.

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

Diane Dove - Works with the PTSA to build community and parent/stakeholder involvement.

Erin Phelps and Amber Nash - Work with SAC to build school stakeholder involvement.

Anthony Mitchell - Collaborates with coaches and sponsors to build student involvement in extracurricular activities.