
Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	5
Needs Assessment	8
Planning for Improvement	13
Positive Culture & Environment	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Tyrone Middle School

6421 22ND AVE N, St Petersburg, FL 33710

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

Demographics

Principal: Robin Mobley N

Start Date for this Principal: 7/6/2022

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Middle School 6-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2021-22 Title I School	Yes
2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Asian Students Black/African American Students Economically Disadvantaged Students English Language Learners Hispanic Students Multiracial Students Students With Disabilities White Students
School Grades History	2021-22: F (31%) 2020-21: (36%) 2018-19: C (41%) 2017-18: C (46%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	CS&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.

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.

Tyrone Middle School-The Center for Innovation and Digital Learning will provide a safe and quality educational setting with engaging and rigorous classroom experiences that create educated, respectful, and responsible citizens who are prepared for college, career, and life.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Ensuring Success for All Scholars

Ensuring- certain practices, methods, strategies and actions are in place to make sure.
Achievement-Knowledge gain is the currency of scholar success in a formative assessment system.
For All-Yes, even that one
Scholars-Kids first in all decision making. They are the reason we chose to become an educator.

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
Helbling, Jason	Assistant Principal	Supervise Math, Technology, ESE & Magnet Coordinator.
Porter, Jeremy	Assistant Principal	Supervise Science, Social Studies, Related Arts
Williams, Danielle	Assistant Principal	Supervise Language Arts, Reading, AVID, PE & Health

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Wednesday 7/6/2022, Robin Mobley N

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.*

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.*

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

Total number of students enrolled at the school

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

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

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

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

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

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

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

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 7/6/2022

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	331	311	339	0	0	0	0	981
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	101	77	86	0	0	0	0	264
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	20	0	0	0	0	29
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	19	16	20	0	0	0	0	55
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	11	0	0	0	0	15

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	7	18	0	0	0	0	33
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1

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	331	311	339	0	0	0	0	981
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	101	77	86	0	0	0	0	264
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	20	0	0	0	0	29
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	19	16	20	0	0	0	0	55
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	11	0	0	0	0	15

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	7	18	0	0	0	0	33
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data 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	27%			28%			38%	52%	54%
ELA Learning Gains	31%			29%			44%	55%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	25%			23%			35%	47%	47%
Math Achievement	29%			35%			36%	55%	58%
Math Learning Gains	33%			39%			39%	52%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	38%			38%			38%	46%	51%
Science Achievement	24%			32%			40%	51%	51%
Social Studies Achievement	31%			41%			47%	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.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2022					
	2019	38%	51%	-13%	54%	-16%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2022					
	2019	41%	51%	-10%	52%	-11%
Cohort Comparison		-38%				
08	2022					
	2019	36%	55%	-19%	56%	-20%
Cohort Comparison		-41%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2022					
	2019	30%	44%	-14%	55%	-25%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2022					
	2019	46%	60%	-14%	54%	-8%
Cohort Comparison		-30%				
08	2022					
	2019	16%	31%	-15%	46%	-30%
Cohort Comparison		-46%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
07	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2022					
	2019	42%	51%	-9%	48%	-6%
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	46%	68%	-22%	71%	-25%
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	49%	55%	-6%	61%	-12%
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	94%	56%	38%	57%	37%

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	7	20	23	8	31	40	6	12			
ELL	22	35	31	26	29	31	5	27	17		
ASN	50	50		52	51		30	50	43		
BLK	10	22	25	9	30	34	13	18	29		
HSP	28	32	24	30	29	38	24	27	44		
MUL	32	29		37	40	40	24	27	50		
WHT	31	32	24	36	32	45	29	38	42		
FRL	21	26	26	24	32	41	21	27	43		
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	11	20	19	15	31	29	15	13			
ELL	25	35	41	35	44	46	25	38	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
ASN	48	45	40	58	48		52	65	60		
BLK	14	18	18	11	29	35	12	22	26		
HSP	25	28	31	36	43	39	26	36	65		
MUL	34	33	20	44	48	45	41	40	50		
WHT	33	31	23	44	40	37	39	49	61		
FRL	23	25	22	28	37	39	28	34	47		

2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	13	32	28	8	28	31	10	26			
ELL	24	43	37	27	35	32	23	23	36		
ASN	56	47	23	53	42	50	67	52	76		
BLK	20	36	37	17	29	28	9	25	42		
HSP	36	44	34	32	34	30	38	52	48		
MUL	37	43	20	37	44	31	36	37			
WHT	43	46	36	42	44	53	47	56	48		
FRL	33	41	37	30	36	37	31	37	41		

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)	CS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	30
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	YES
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	7
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	24
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	304
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	98%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	18
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	3

English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	25
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	1
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	47
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	21
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	3
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	29
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	1
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	35
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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 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	34
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	29
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	1

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?

.

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

.

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

.

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

.

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

.

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

.

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

.

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

.

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.

Based on 21-22 FSA results, 27% of scholars school-wide were proficient. We reviewed the number/percentage of scholars enrolled in our school 22-23 that are currently a level 2.2 (12%), we expect to move these scholars to proficient by the end of the 22-23 school year.

Based on the 21022 FSA results, 33% of all scholars and 25% of bottom quartile scholars made a learning in ELA.

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

Our current level of performance is 27 % of our students are proficient on the 2022 FSA ELA. We expect our performance level to increase to 39% of our students meeting proficiency by Spring 2023 Progress Monitoring assessment(F.A.S.T.)

Our current level of performance is 33% of all scholars and 25% of bottom quartile scholars made a learning gain in ELA as measured by the FSA. We expect 50% of our scholars to make learning gains as measured by the Spring 2023 Progress Monitoring Assessment (F.A.S.T.).

Administration and instructional leadership team will monitor lesson plan creation, implementation, and data driven revision weekly though attending PLCs on Tuesday & Friday and classroom observation/ walkthroughs with feedback.

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

Admin, ISD, and teachers will use the following monitoring tools:

- Unit Assessments (performance matters)
- Write Score Data (August/December)
- Formative Assessments
- Data Chats
- Baseball Card/Performance Matters
- iReady
- iXL
- Unit Standards Mastery Checks (iready)
- Diagnostic assessment data (iready)

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Danielle Williams (williamsdanie@pcsb.org)

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

Strategy 1 - Support staff to utilize data to organize scholars to interact with content in manners which differentiates/scaffolds instruction to meet the needs of each scholar.

Strategy 2 - Strengthen staff ability to plan and engage scholars in culturally relevant, complex tasks.

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

If teachers use formative, standards-based assessment data to guide their instructional planning, implementation, and remediation, then the instruction will be aligned to the depth and rigor of the standard and differentiated to specific scholar needs.

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.

Strategy 1

1. All teachers (reading and ELA) will meet weekly in equity-centered common planning PLCs to create/ implement standards-based lesson plans with modeled responses that incorporate cognitively complex tasks (Level 3+), HOT questions, and tasks aligned to the target.
2. All teachers will consistently utilize a common assessment platform (performance matters, iReady, write score, and IXL) for collecting/assessing writing and reading standards, reviewing student data and guiding instruction during individual and common planning.
3. Teachers will create/implement common instructional/remediation plans quarterly that include, standards, goals, targets, text sets, tasks, and checks for understanding (quarterly shared cross-curriculum calendar). Teachers will reinforce these common practices through regular exchanges of scholar papers and student work protocol during common planning PLCs.
4. All Reading teachers will implement high quality, scaffolded reading intervention through iReady and Elevate curriculum based on current scholar performance and proficiency.

Person Responsible

Danielle Williams (williamsdanie@pcsb.org)

Strategy 2

1. Teachers will work with the site-based and district assigned literacy staff developer to create and implement standards-based, culturally relevant, rigorous lessons using high-yield literacy strategies with a focus on data analysis by sub-group for content differentiation and remediation as needed.
2. All teachers will implement Culturally Relevant Teaching Strategies and AVID WICORT Strategies routinely in lesson planning and implementation.
3. All teachers will utilize the planning roadmap to choose strategies and resources for use as they plan, to ensure lessons are culturally relevant, high engagement, rigor and progress monitoring.
4. Administrators will conduct regular classroom observations and provide timely feedback to teachers. Teachers will schedule and participate in scheduling quarterly peer-to-peer observations/ lesson studies.

Person Responsible

[no one identified]

#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.

Based on 21-22 FSA results, only 29% of scholars school-wide were proficient. We reviewed the number/percentage of scholars enrolled in our school 22-23, 33% of those scholars proficient and another 11% are currently a level 2.2, we expect to move these scholars to proficient by the end of the 22-23 school year.

Based on the 21022 FSA results, 33% of all scholars and 38% of bottom quartile scholars made a learning in mathematics.

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

Our current level of performance is 29% of our students are proficient on the 2022 FSA Mathematics. We expect our performance level to increase to 40% of our students meeting proficiency by Spring 2023 Progress Monitoring assessment(F.A.S.T.)

Our current level of performance is 33% of all scholars and 38% of bottom quartile scholars made a learning gain in mathematics as measured by the FSA. We expect 50% of our scholars to make learning gains as measured by the Spring 2023 Progress Monitoring Assessment (F.A.S.T.).

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

- Data Chats
- Weekly assessments
- iXL
- Remediation based on assessment data
- Pacing Guides
- Teacher/School created Assessments/Unit Assessments
- Standards based comparative data discussed in PLCs
- Common Planning
- Performance Matters

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jason Helbling (helblingj@pcsb.org)

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

1. Support staff to utilize data to organize students to interact with content in manner which differentiates/scaffolds instruction to meet the needs of each student.

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

If teachers use formative, standards-based assessment data to guide their instructional planning, implementation, and remediation, then the instruction will be aligned to the depth and rigor of the standard and differentiated to specific scholar needs.

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. All teachers will conduct standards-based Weekly/Bi-weekly assessments, review the scholar achievement data at a deeper level and utilize data to provide timely, focused feedback to scholars and plan future differentiated classroom instruction.
2. Teachers utilize systematic documents to effectively plan for mathematics units that incorporate the standards for mathematical practice and rigorous performance tasks aligned to mathematics Florida

standards.

3. Teachers utilize mathematics unit assessments and use the assessments during unit planning and analyze the data by standard for their class and across the grade level.
4. All teachers will meet weekly in common PLCs to create/ implement standards-based lesson plans that incorporate cognitively complex tasks (Level 3+) and tasks aligned to the target, using AVID WICORT strategies.
5. Administrators monitor teacher practice/provide teachers comments to support professional enhancement and growth.
6. Develop common assessment practices and reinforce these common practices

Person Responsible Jason Helbling (helblingj@pcsb.org)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science

Area of Focus

Description and Rationale:

Based on 21-22 FSA results, 24% of 8th grade scholars school-wide were proficient on the SSA-Science Assessment. We reviewed the number/percentage of incoming 8th grade scholars enrolled in our school 22-23, 23% of them are proficient in literacy and 31% of them are proficient in math, additionally, there are 11% of scholars that are currently a level 2.2 in literacy or math, we expect to move these scholars to proficient by the end of the 22-23 school year.

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

Measurable Outcome:

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

Our current level of performance is 24% of our 8th grade scholars are proficient on the 2022 SSA Science. We expect our performance level to increase to 38% of our students meeting proficiency by Spring 2023 Progress Monitoring assessment(F.A.S.T.)/SSA-Science Assessment.

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

The science team will use equity centered PLCs to design, analyze, implement, and monitor student data to create and differentiate inquiry-based instruction using AVID and CRT strategies.

Additionally, the team will focus on developing formative and summative assessments to track and review student progress to standards mastery.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jeremy Porter (porterje@pcsb.org)

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

Strategy 1-Teachers will provide extensive inquiry based instruction which includes opportunities for students to think scientifically through research, content exploration, and writing opportunities (claims and evidence).

Strategy 2-Science teachers will utilize data to differentiate and scaffold instruction to increase student performance.

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

If teachers use formative, standards-based assessment data to guide their instructional planning, implementation, and remediation, then the instruction will be aligned to the depth and rigor of the standard and differentiated to specific scholar needs.

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.

Strategy 1

1. Teachers will utilize common lab formats and rubrics

2. Teachers use common short and extended performance-based tasks for assessment of student mastery of content.
3. Science teachers utilize the parallel teaching approach teaching Nature of Science in context with Content.
4. Science teachers provide students with opportunities to write lab summaries during inquiry-based science projects.
5. Teachers provide students the opportunity to make a claim, test it and defend their results with evidence using WICORT strategies in their writing.
6. Using Project Based Learning, teachers will help students make real world content connections to make content meaningful.
7. All teachers will meet weekly in common planning PLCs, review scholar responses to tasks and formative assessments, and utilize systemic documents (adopted curriculum, pacing guides, CRT planning resources, etc.) to create standards-based lesson plans with modeled responses that incorporate cognitively complex tasks (Level 3+) aligned targets.
8. Teachers monitor and provide feedback to scholars

Person Responsible Jeremy Porter (porterje@pcsb.org)

Strategy 2

1. Teachers will regularly incorporate checks for understanding (formative assessments) in each phase of 5E instruction and use the data to gauge scholar mastery of the content.
2. All Teachers will meet weekly in equity-centered common planning Professional Learning Communities (PLCs), inclusive of 'data chats', to review scholars' responses to tasks and formative assessments and plan for instructional lessons, following the 5E model, 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.
3. Teachers will meet to collaboratively create and implement common bi-weekly differentiated instructional plans that include, standards, goals, targets, text dependent questions, close and critical reading, checks for understanding, and complex tasks/texts based on student performance data.
4. Administrator will conduct regular classroom visits to monitor teacher instructional practice

Person Responsible Jeremy Porter (porterje@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.

Based on 21-22 Civics EOC results, 31% of scholars school-wide were proficient. We reviewed the number/percentage of 7th and 8th scholars enrolled in our school 22-23 that will be placed in a Civics course, of these scholars we expect 62% of them to be proficient on the Civics EOC by the end of the 22-23 school year.

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

Our current level of performance is 31% of our 7th & 8th grade scholars are proficient on the 2022 Civics EOC. We expect our performance level to increase to 62% of our scholars meeting proficiency by Spring 2023 Progress Monitoring assessment(F.A.S.T.)/Civics EOC.

Teachers will implement in their classrooms the use of formative assessments, DBQs, and will consistently analyze student responses and other data points within their instructional practices.

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

As a department, each teacher will analyze their cycle data to drive their instructional decisions. Tyrone Middle School will also utilize district designed unit assessments to monitor for desired outcomes throughout the year. Additionally, teachers will actively engage in weekly equity-centered PLC meetings to collaborate and analyze their data throughout the school year.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jeremy Porter (porterje@pcsb.org)

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

Strategy 1-Support staff to effectively utilize diagnostic, cycle, and unit assessment data to guide the planning for instructional decisions that organize scholars to interact with content in manners which differentiates/scaffolds instruction to meet the needs of each scholar.

Strategy 2-Strengthen staff ability to engage scholars in complex tasks.

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

If teachers use formative, standards-based assessment data to guide their instructional planning, implementation, and remediation, then the instruction will be aligned to the depth and rigor of the standard and differentiated to specific scholar needs.

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.

Strategy 1

1. All teachers will meet weekly in equity-centered common planning PLCs, review scholar response to tasks and formative assessments, and utilize systemic documents (adopted curriculum, pacing guides, planning tools, culturally relevant teaching resources, DBQs, etc.) to create standards-based lesson plans with modeled responses that incorporate cognitively complex tasks (Level 3+) aligned to the target.
2. All teachers will implement Culturally Relevant Teaching Strategies & AVID WICORT Strategies (Focused Note Taking & Collaborative Study Groups) routinely in lesson planning and implementation.
3. Teachers will use inquiry based culturally responsive strategies to increase rigor in all classes.
4. Teachers monitor and provide feedback to scholars to support learning.

Person Responsible Jeremy Porter (porterje@pcsb.org)

Strategy 2

1. Ensure all social studies teachers attend district provided PD to support growth and development of instructional practices (facilitated planning, democratic classrooms, purposeful instructional technology and the social justice standards).
2. Ensure teachers receive professional development around how to create and structure short response, text-dependent questions based on primary source documents.
3. Utilize supplemental resources and integrate LAFS for Literacy to social studies content via Document Based Questions (DBQs) project materials and collaboration between the reading and social studies departments.
4. Teachers will collaboratively create and implement common bi-weekly instructional plans quarterly that include, standards, goals, targets, text dependent questions, close and critical reading, checks for understanding, and skills/strategy-based groups to support success with complex tasks/texts.
5. Administrator will conduct regular classroom visits to monitor teacher instructional practice, strategy implementation, and provide feedback to teachers to support teacher growth.
6. Teachers monitor and provide feedback to scholars to support learning.

Person Responsible Jeremy Porter (porterje@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 current level of performance of SWD is 7% proficient and in ELA and 8% proficient in math as evidenced in the 2021/2022 Florida Standards Assessment.

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

The percent of SWD achieving proficiency in math will increase from 8% to 15% by the end of the school year as measured by the FAST assessment. The percent of SWD achieving proficiency in ELA will increase from 7% to 15% by the end of the school year as measured by the FAST assessment.

Monitoring:

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

We will monitor the learning of ESE scholars by regularly reviewing assessment data and frequent classroom walkthroughs.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Miranda Scibbe (scibbem@pcsb.org)

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

Students requiring ESE services work towards mastery of meaningful Individualized Education Plan (IEP) goals while learning the foundational skills they need to engage in rigorous, grade-level content in the Least Restrictive Environment (LRE).

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

If teachers and scholars are educated and using IEP plans to drive their instructional planning, implementation, and remediation, then the instruction will be standards-based to the depth and rigor of the standard while still aligned to specific scholar needs.

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.

- Implement a process for placing students requiring ESE services in master schedules first in order to optimize service delivery and focused on a clustering process to meet student needs.
- Provide opportunities for ESE and general education teachers to co-plan for differentiated instruction and support delivery of services.
- ESE will provide additional professional development to full faculty on implementation of accommodations and to team teaching partners on collaborative planning and high leverage strategies.
- Special education teachers will develop quality IEPs that include specific specially designed instruction to meet individual scholar need
- Use evidence-based practices for students with disabilities to teach foundational literacy and math skills as a pathway to grade level work.

Person Responsible

Miranda Scibbe (scibbem@pcsb.org)

#6. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Multi-Racial

Area of Focus Description and

Rationale: Our current level of performance is 21% are proficient in ELA and 17% in Math are proficient as evidence in the 2021-2022 FSA.
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

Measurable Outcome: The number of teachers utilizing culturally relevant teaching practices effectively and consistently and the change in rate of observable culturally relevant teaching practices as observed in classroom visits.
State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

Monitoring: Classroom visits and walkthroughs
Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome. Monitoring of teacher gradebooks.
 Lesson plan review.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: [no one identified]

Evidence-based Strategy: Strengthen Equitable Practices (Culturally Relevant Teaching, Equitable Grading and Restorative Practices)
Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: To ensure the academic, behavioral and emotional needs of each scholar is known and met.
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

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.

- Develop a process to gain a better understanding of who our learners are (cultural perspectives that influence how they engage, access and express learning).
- Ensure that all scholars who show potential to succeed in an advance level course are scheduled into an appropriate course and provided supports.
- All teachers will complete Culturally Relevant Teaching and Equitable Grading Practices Professional Learning
- All teachers will implement Culturally Relevant Teaching Strategies routinely in lesson planning and implementation.
- Ensure staff has access to real-time data for scholars in order to have effective data chats and targeted support for improved learning.
- Facilitate Equity Centered PLCs in all subject areas. Dissaggreate common standards based assessments, identify gaps and utilize PLC protocols that promote more robust data discussions around race.
- Administrator will conduct regular classroom visits to monitor teacher instructional practice and observe lessons to monitor equitable practices (Culturally Relevant and restorative practice) strategy

Person Responsible [no one identified]

#7. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Economically Disadvantaged

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

1. Our current level of performance is 33% are proficient in ELA (41% made learning gains, 37% L25 made learning gains) and 30% in Math are proficient (36% made learning gains, 37% L25 made learning gains), as evidenced in 2018-2019 FSA.
2. We expect our performance level to be 40% for ELA proficiency and 75% for Learning Gains and 40% for Math proficiency and 75% for Learning Gains by end of the school year .
3. The problem/gap is occurring because there needs to be a focus on targeted scholars for progress.

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

The percent of black scholars who are proficient in ELA and Math will increase from 20% in ELA and 17% in Math to 30% for both ELA and Math, as measured by FSA ELA or Math. The percent of black scholars who will make learning gains will increase from 36% in ELA and 29% in Math to 75% in both ELA and Math.

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

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jason Helbling (helblingj@pcsb.org)

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

Strengthen Equitable Practices (Culturally Relevant Teaching, Equitable Grading and Restorative Practices)

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

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

To ensure the academic, behavioral and emotional needs of each scholar is known and met.

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.

- Develop a process to gain a better understanding of who our learners are (cultural perspectives that influence how they engage, access and express learning).
- Develop a process to gain a better understanding of who our families are (cultural perspectives that influence how they can support their learners).
- Ensure that all scholars who show potential to succeed in an advance level course are scheduled into an appropriate course and provided supports.
- All teachers will complete Culturally Relevant Teaching and Equitable Grading Practices Professional Professional Learning
- All teachers will implement Culturally Relevant Teaching Strategies routinely in lesson planning and implementation.
- Ensure staff has access to real-time data for scholars in order to have effective data chats and targeted support for improved learning.
- Facilitate Equity Centered PLCs in all subject areas. Dissaggreate common standards based

assessments, identify gaps and utilize PLC protocols that promote more robust data discussions around race.

Person Responsible

Jason Helbling (helblingj@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

.

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

.

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)

.

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

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?

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?

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****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.

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