



---

## **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>7</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>Title I Requirements</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>23</b>

# Palm Harbor Middle School

1800 TAMPA RD, Palm Harbor, FL 34683

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

## Demographics

**Principal: Mary Athanson**

Start Date for this Principal: 6/1/2018

<b>2018-19 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Middle School 6-8
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2018-19 Title I School</b>	No
<b>2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	38%
<b>2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups in orange are below the federal threshold)	Asian Students Black/African American Students Economically Disadvantaged Students English Language Learners Hispanic Students Multiracial Students Students With Disabilities White Students
<b>School Grade</b>	2018-19: A
<b>School Grades History</b>	2017-18: A 2016-17: B 2015-16: B 2014-15: A 2013-14: A
<b>2018-19 Differentiated Accountability (DA) Information*</b>	
<b>SI Region</b>	Southwest
<b>Regional Executive Director</b>	<a href="#">Tracy Webley</a>
<b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>	N
<b>Year</b>	A

<b>ESSA Status</b>	N/A
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, <a href="#">click here</a> .	

### School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Pinellas County School Board.

### SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F. This plan is also a requirement for Targeted Support and Improvement (TS&I) and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CS&I) schools pursuant to 1008.33 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

To be designated as TS&I, a school must have one or more ESSA subgroup(s) with a Federal Index below 41%. This plan shall be approved by the district. There are three ways a school can be designated as CS&I:

1. have a school grade of D or F
2. have a graduation rate of 67% or lower
3. have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

For these schools, the SIP shall be approved by the district as well as the Bureau of School Improvement.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F, or a graduation rate 67% or less. Districts may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing for schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at [www.floridacims.org](http://www.floridacims.org).

### Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

## Part I: School Information

### School Mission and Vision

#### Provide the school's mission statement

100% student success

#### Provide the school's vision statement

Educate and prepare each student for college, career and life.

### School Leadership Team

#### Membership

Identify the name, email address and position title for each member of the school leadership team:

Name	Title
Lampert, Michelle	Assistant Principal
Assistant Principal	
Wynn, Julius	Assistant Principal
Assistant Principal	
Comeau, Don	Assistant Principal
Assistant Principal	
Athanson, Melissa	Principal
Principal	

### Early Warning Systems

#### Current Year

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12		
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	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	0
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	0	0	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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

**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	10	1	0	0	0	0	15
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	2

**FTE units allocated to school (total number of teacher units)**

63

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

Tuesday 6/4/2019

**Prior Year - As Reported**

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

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Attendance below 90 percent		
One or more suspensions		
Course failure in ELA or Math		
Level 1 on statewide assessment		

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

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Students with two or more indicators		

**Prior Year - Updated**

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	87	80	98	0	0	0	0	265
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	30	33	0	0	0	0	78
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	14	3	0	0	0	0	25
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	81	61	100	0	0	0	0	242

**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	76	67	60	0	0	0	0	203

## Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

### School Data

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

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	65%	52%	54%	62%	50%	53%
ELA Learning Gains	58%	55%	54%	54%	50%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	58%	47%	47%	46%	42%	47%
Math Achievement	66%	55%	58%	67%	54%	58%
Math Learning Gains	59%	52%	57%	58%	54%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	48%	46%	51%	53%	48%	51%
Science Achievement	60%	51%	51%	62%	52%	52%
Social Studies Achievement	85%	68%	72%	76%	65%	72%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey				
Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)			Total
	6	7	8	
Number of students enrolled	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	0 ( )	0 ( )	0 ( )	0 (0)
One or more suspensions	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
Course failure in ELA or Math	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
	(0)	(0)	(0)	0 (0)

### Grade Level Data

NOTE: This data is raw data and includes ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.

NOTE: An asterisk (\*) in any cell indicates the data has been suppressed due to fewer than 10 students tested, or all tested students scoring the same.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2019	64%	51%	13%	54%	10%
	2018	70%	49%	21%	52%	18%
Same Grade Comparison		-6%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	68%	51%	17%	52%	16%

<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>
	2018	54%	48%	6%	51%	3%
Same Grade Comparison		14%				
Cohort Comparison		-2%				
08	2019	61%	55%	6%	56%	5%
	2018	62%	55%	7%	58%	4%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison		7%				

<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	2019	48%	44%	4%	55%	-7%
	2018	59%	45%	14%	52%	7%
Same Grade Comparison		-11%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	74%	60%	14%	54%	20%
	2018	69%	59%	10%	54%	15%
Same Grade Comparison		5%				
Cohort Comparison		15%				
08	2019	36%	31%	5%	46%	-10%
	2018	35%	31%	4%	45%	-10%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison		-33%				

<b>SCIENCE</b>						
<b>Grade</b>	<b>Year</b>	<b>School</b>	<b>District</b>	<b>School-District Comparison</b>	<b>State</b>	<b>School-State Comparison</b>
08	2019	59%	51%	8%	48%	11%
	2018	61%	53%	8%	50%	11%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison						

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

  

<b>CIVICS EOC</b>					
<b>Year</b>	<b>School</b>	<b>District</b>	<b>School Minus District</b>	<b>State</b>	<b>School Minus State</b>
2019	84%	68%	16%	71%	13%
2018	76%	66%	10%	71%	5%



<b>CIVICS EOC</b>					
<b>Year</b>	<b>School</b>	<b>District</b>	<b>School Minus District</b>	<b>State</b>	<b>School Minus State</b>
Compare		8%			
<b>HISTORY EOC</b>					
<b>Year</b>	<b>School</b>	<b>District</b>	<b>School Minus District</b>	<b>State</b>	<b>School Minus State</b>
2019					
2018					
<b>ALGEBRA EOC</b>					
<b>Year</b>	<b>School</b>	<b>District</b>	<b>School Minus District</b>	<b>State</b>	<b>School Minus State</b>
2019	83%	55%	28%	61%	22%
2018	88%	57%	31%	62%	26%
Compare		-5%			
<b>GEOMETRY EOC</b>					
<b>Year</b>	<b>School</b>	<b>District</b>	<b>School Minus District</b>	<b>State</b>	<b>School Minus State</b>
2019	98%	56%	42%	57%	41%
2018	100%	56%	44%	56%	44%
Compare		-2%			

**Subgroup Data**

<b>2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS</b>											
<b>Subgroups</b>	<b>ELA Ach.</b>	<b>ELA LG</b>	<b>ELA LG L25%</b>	<b>Math Ach.</b>	<b>Math LG</b>	<b>Math LG L25%</b>	<b>Sci Ach.</b>	<b>SS Ach.</b>	<b>MS Accel.</b>	<b>Grad Rate 2016-17</b>	<b>C &amp; C Accel 2016-17</b>
SWD	21	52	57	27	40	27	38	52	56		
ELL	45	66	79	49	46	33	36	81	73		
ASN	79	71		76	64		56	100	80		
BLK	39	63	56	31	38	33					
HSP	57	57	61	59	56	46	48	76	79		
MUL	62	33	40	56	51	45	50	75	83		
WHT	67	59	58	69	61	49	64	87	81		
FRL	54	56	56	50	51	41	55	74	76		

<b>2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS</b>											
<b>Subgroups</b>	<b>ELA Ach.</b>	<b>ELA LG</b>	<b>ELA LG L25%</b>	<b>Math Ach.</b>	<b>Math LG</b>	<b>Math LG L25%</b>	<b>Sci Ach.</b>	<b>SS Ach.</b>	<b>MS Accel.</b>	<b>Grad Rate 2015-16</b>	<b>C &amp; C Accel 2015-16</b>
SWD	23	38	41	30	51	49	24	54	39		
ELL	32	57	58	56	70	47	42	50	75		
ASN	69	75		89	72		87	70	100		
BLK	32	42	38	32	46	50		80			
HSP	50	45	38	57	53	62	46	65	71		
MUL	57	52	40	63	61	71	63	92	67		

<b>2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS</b>											
<b>Subgroups</b>	<b>ELA Ach.</b>	<b>ELA LG</b>	<b>ELA LG L25%</b>	<b>Math Ach.</b>	<b>Math LG</b>	<b>Math LG L25%</b>	<b>Sci Ach.</b>	<b>SS Ach.</b>	<b>MS Accel.</b>	<b>Grad Rate 2015-16</b>	<b>C &amp; C Accel 2015-16</b>
WHT	65	55	47	69	59	51	64	78	81		
FRL	54	51	43	56	55	51	55	67	71		

**ESSA Data**

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

<b>ESSA Federal Index</b>	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index - All Students	64
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	59
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	638
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	99%

**Subgroup Data**

<b>Students With Disabilities</b>	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	41
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
<b>English Language Learners</b>	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	57
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	75
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	43
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	58
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	55
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	69
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	57
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

## Analysis

### Data Reflection

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

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

Lowest performance was in math gains, especially with the L25. Last year we did see a growth in this, however overall they dropped by 1 point. Contributing factors include deficit in fundamental skills and struggling with application of computation skills.

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

Overall math gains, especially with the L25. Factors that contributed to the decline is deficit in fundamental skills and application of computation skills.

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

When comparing scores with the state average, 8th grade math had the greatest gap of 10%. While students gains were 40%+, overall proficiency rates were lower than the state. Factors that contributed to this gap include one teacher had a high absenteeism due to personal issues. Also, there was a first year teacher.

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

ELA learning gains with the L25 showed the most improvement. Teachers and administrators did extensive data review and data chats with students to track their learning. PLC were data driven each week.

**Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern? (see Guidance tab for additional information)**

The number of retained students are an area of concern.

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

1. Overall, Mathematics proficiency and learning gains need to increase across all grade levels
2. Overall, ELA/Reading proficiency and learning gains need to continue to increase, across all grade levels
3. 8th Grade Science proficiency needs to increase significantly
4. Use of equitable practices across curriculum, differentiation of instructional methodologies, purposeful planning with tracking (standard/target alignment)
- 5.

## Part III: Planning for Improvement

### Areas of Focus:

<b>#1</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Mathematics
<b>Rationale</b>	If we allocate time to dis-aggregate data and find the areas of deficiencies, provide necessary remediation and reteach these foundation areas, then students will be better prepared to master new content with the necessary skills.
<b>State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve</b>	The percent of all student meeting proficiency will increase from 65 % to 70%, as measured by the FSA in May 2020.
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome</b>	Julius Wynn (wynnj@pcsb.org)
<b>Evidence-based Strategy</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Enhance staff capacity to identify critical content from the standards in alignment with the district resources</li> <li>-Support staff to utilize data to organize students to interact with content in manners which differentiates/scaffolds instruction to meet the needs of each student</li> <li>-Students and teachers will track performance on learning targets by standards and opportunities for remediation will be infused through re-teaching and ELP.</li> </ul>
<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy</b>	If we align lessons and resources to the standards, then FSA scores should improve. Completing data analysis and understanding the items that are not being met by students should lead to more focused lessons and remediation. Making learning visible allows for students to understand their areas of strength and weakness.
<b>Action Step</b>	
<b>Description</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. PLCs by content will be focused on collaborative structures with the course of study. Teachers will meet twice monthly to review student work, create assessments and review data. This will be facilitated by an administrator. Teachers will review student progress on formative assessments and use this data to conduct data chats with students.</li> <li>2. Administrators will conduct classroom observations to determine alignment with standards, differentiation and scaffolding is taking place. Feedback will be offered bimonthly.</li> <li>3. Provide ELP/enrichment time for all students, with emphasis on the L25.</li> <li>4. Regular data analysis of assessments to determine strengths and areas for remediation in mathematics. Unit assessments will be used throughout all aspects of math courses. Data will be used to inform and align instruction for remediation and enrichment.</li> <li>5. Professional development will be offered in equitable practices and establishing classroom culture throughout the year.</li> <li>6. Teachers will read literature / articles on current practices, research and equity prior to PLC's. These articles will allow participants to discuss challenges regarding equity &amp; social trends within classrooms.</li> </ol>

**Person Responsible** Julius Wynn (wynnj@pcsb.org)

---

<b>#2</b>	
<b>Title</b>	ELA/Reading
<b>Rationale</b>	Strong reading is a skill that all children need throughout life. Our ELA/reading scores need to be focused on reading comprehension as well as writing strategies because it is the foundation for understanding all subjects.
<b>State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve</b>	The percent of all student reaching proficiency will increase from 65% to 70% as measured by the FSA in May 2020.
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome</b>	Michelle Lampert (lampertm@pcsb.org)
<b>Evidence-based Strategy</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Enhance staff capacity to identify critical content from the Standards in alignment with district resources.</li> <li>-Strengthen staff ability to engage students in complex tasks.</li> <li>-Enhance staff capacity to support students through purposeful activation and transfer strategies.</li> <li>-Greater exposure to informational texts in all content areas</li> </ul>
<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy</b>	ELA/Reading is seen in every class. When reviewing Write Score, FSA, reading diagnostic and lexile testing data and analyzing it with staff, it is a top priority for everyone to incorporate reading and writing skills in each class to allow higher success with students.
<b>Action Step</b>	
<b>Description</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. PLCs by content will be focused on equity, collaborative structures with the course of study. Teachers will meet twice monthly to review student work, create assessments and review data. This will be facilitated by an administrator.</li> <li>2. Administrators will conduct classroom observation to determine alignment with standards and provide feedback to teachers.</li> <li>3. Writing across the curriculum using a variety of scaffolding strategies (graphic organizers, text marking, focused note taking, etc) to develop and enhance writing skills.</li> <li>4. Provide ELP/enrichment for all students, especially those who are identified as EL, ESE and 504.</li> <li>5. Provide PD for teachers at a minimum of once a month with a focus on writing.</li> <li>6. Use of district's Road Map, along with resources provided.</li> <li>7. Utilize Core Connection training resources.</li> <li>8. Teachers to attend DWT, AVID Pathways, Core Connections</li> <li>9. Assess and Monitor iReady, Reading Inventory, Performance Assessment Accelerators, Write Score (2x/yr), FSA data and unit assessments.</li> <li>10. Conduct data chats in reading after every diagnostic &amp; ELA after unit assessments and write score. We share information with students, along with completion of reflection worksheets and meet with administrator regarding progress.</li> <li>11. Provide personalized learning targets based on data tracking sheets</li> </ol>

that are supported through assigned lessons on areas of improvement.  
12. Review placement of individual students with counselors and reading teachers.

**Person  
Responsible**

Michelle Lampert (lampertm@pcsb.org)

---



<b>#3</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Social Studies:
<b>Rationale</b>	The EOC is worth 30% of students final grades. It is imperative that all students are successful in passing the exam to be promoted. All the SS courses will be expected to show measurable performance increases.
<b>State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve</b>	The percent of all students reaching proficiency on the Civics EOC will increase from 85% to 90% as measured by the EOC in May 2020. The percent of students reaching proficiency on the World History DEOC exam will increase from 67% to 75% as measured by the DEOC in May 2020. The percent of students reaching proficiency on the US History DEOC will increase from 59% to 75% as measured by the DEOC in May 2020.
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome</b>	Don Comeau (comeaud@pcsb.org)
<b>Evidence-based Strategy</b>	-Strengthen staff ability to engage students in complex tasks. -Strengthen staff practice to utilize questions to help students elaborate on content. -Increase student engagement rate by the use of equitable practices, culturally relevant classrooms and AVID strategies infused throughout to provide engaging lessons that meet the needs of all learners.
<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy</b>	Complex tasks are embedded into the Civics EOC, as well as other content areas. Through the use of DBQs that have students elaborate on topics, students will be able to expand their thought processes, with the help of teachers, enhance their writing skills while completing rigorous questions.
<b>Action Step</b>	
<b>Description</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. PLCs by content will be organized in collaborative structures. Teachers will meet twice monthly to review student work, create assessments and review data. This will be facilitated by an administrator. During these PLC's the expectation will be to review and discuss student work samples, create and review assessments for rigor and design lessons. Review of district developed unit assessments and cycle assessments will be discussed for instructional lessons that meet the remediation and enrichment needs of the students.</li> <li>2. Usage of DBQs in all social studies classes throughout the year. This platform allows the student to lead their own learning at high levels of cognitive complexity.</li> <li>3. Teachers will incorporate scaffolding and differentiation into lessons to ensure learning is taking place and meeting the needs of all students. Teachers will use data tracking forms to drive instruction and differentiate depending on the needs of students. Data will inform teachers whether remediation or enrichment is needed.</li> <li>4. Incorporate practice EOC questions into bell work and tests to allow students exposure to the higher level questions found on the exam; utilization of interactive student notebooks.</li> <li>5. Provide ELP opportunities for students that exhibit a deficiency on a benchmark or target within a standard as determined by formative</li> </ol>

assessments.

6. Teachers will attend professional development on teaching with rotations, facilitated planning, CRT, RP and AVID strategies to be incorporated into lessons.

7. Civics teachers will attend TDE on core connections and data analysis.

**Person  
Responsible**

Don Comeau (comeaud@pcsb.org)

---

**#4****Title**

Science

**Rationale**

Science FSA Scores have been stagnant. A greater focus on data, standard target alignment is needed to ensure students are being taught what is required. Through data analysis, teachers will be able to identify what content has been mastered, and areas that need remediation.

**State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve**

The percent of all students reaching proficiency will increase from 60% to 70% as measured by the FSA in May 2020.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome**

Melissa Athanson (athansonm@pcsb.org)

**Evidence-based Strategy**

- Strengthen staff ability to engage students in complex tasks.
- Enhance staff capacity to identify critical content from the Standards in alignment with district resources.
- Diaggregate data to target areas of enrichment and remediation.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy**

There is a lack of reading comprehension and higher order questioning incorporated into daily lessons. By ensuring more complex tasks, staff can challenge students to become more independent in their thinking, while aligning tasks to the standards. Greater exposure to informational text is needed for successful understanding of science concepts.

**Action Step****Description**

1. PLCs by content will be organized in collaborative structures. Teachers will meet twice monthly to review student work, create assessments and review data. This will be facilitated by an administrator. During these PLC's the expectation will be to review and discuss student work samples, create and review assessments for rigor and design lessons. Review of district developed unit assessments and cycle assessments will be discussed for instructional lessons that meet the remediation and enrichment needs of the students.
2. Classroom observations to determine alignment with standards, with feedback provided to teachers on a bimonthly basis.
3. Teachers will incorporate scaffolding and differentiation into lessons to ensure learning is taking place and meeting the needs of all students.
4. Unit data tracking on targets will be conducted throughout the year in order to better align instruction, specific to student needs.
5. Provide ELP opportunities for students that demonstrate a deficit area on a formative assessment.
6. A variety of AVID strategies used throughout the year to increase student engagement (focused note taking, marking the text, higher order questioning).

**Person Responsible**

[no one identified]

<b>#5</b>	
<b>Title</b>	STEM
<b>Rationale</b>	STEM is a focus program at PHMS, where we are preparing students to enter college and/or the work force, which is aligned with the school and district's mission.
<b>State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve</b>	The number of all students becoming industry certified will increase from 283 to 303, as measured by the Microsoft/Spark certification tests by May 2020.
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome</b>	Melissa Athanson (athansonm@pcsb.org)
<b>Evidence-based Strategy</b>	Enhance staff capacity to support students through purposeful activation and transfer strategies.
<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy</b>	Through professional development for staff, they will be properly trained and prepared to have students learn technology that can be used in high school, college and the work force.
<b>Action Step</b>	
<b>Description</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Teachers will attend district wide training throughout the year</li> <li>2. PLC meetings to discuss strategies, progress monitoring and enhance technology understanding</li> <li>3. Provide ELP time for those in need of extra support to pass certification exams</li> <li>4. A system for tracking student progress on certifications will be continued and students will be recognized.</li> <li>5. In the spring, counselors will go into the grade level classes and share information regarding classes offered, with an emphasis in the ability to earn certification in Microsoft Suite.</li> <li>6. Professional Development will be offered to teachers to utilize in their classrooms.</li> <li>7. CTAE teachers will build a incentive structure to encourage participation in certification exams.</li> <li>8. Expose students to community opportunities through field trips and gues speakers.</li> </ol>
<b>Person Responsible</b>	Melissa Athanson (athansonm@pcsb.org)

**#6****Title**

Bridging the Gap with Equity for All: Black Students

**Rationale**

Through district and state studies of black students, they have been identified to receive more referrals and be less exposed to advanced learning opportunities in the learning environment.

**State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve**

The percent of black students that are proficient in ELA will increase from 39% to 45% in ELA as 31% to 36% mathematics as measured by the FSA in May 2020.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome**

Melissa Athanson (athansonm@pcsb.org)

**Evidence-based Strategy**

-Ensure equity by providing easy access for black students to on-site, college readiness testing in each school (PSAT in October 2019 and SAT in Spring 2020)

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy**

As seen in Portal, the number of black students enrolled into advanced courses is not equitable compared to other sub-groups in the school. With black students exposed to higher level learning opportunities, there is the ideology that student success on the FSA ELA/reading and mathematics tests will increase.

**Action Step****Description**

1. Increase the number of black students to take the SAT in the Spring 2020.
2. Increase the enrollment of black students into advanced classes, AVID and ELP, as measured in Focus.
3. Increase supports through behavioral specialist, social worker and school psychologist for black students.
4. Decrease MTSS referrals for black students.
5. Decrease the disciplinary infractions of black students through increasing use of our PBIS program, mentoring program and CRT training with all staff as measured by Focus.
6. Increase positive interactions between staff members and black students and implement Restorative Practices throughout the school.
7. Continue to utilize supports from the district office to ensure interventions are in place and being implemented for black students who receive consent for evaluation.

**Person Responsible**

Melissa Athanson (athansonm@pcsb.org)

<b>#7</b>	
<b>Title</b>	ESE
<b>Rationale</b>	All students given proper interventions and support should be able to demonstrate proficiency on all FSA assessments. Less than 39% of our ESE students are proficient in ELA and mathematics as evidenced on the FSA tests.
<b>State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve</b>	The number of ESE students becoming proficient in ELA and mathematics will increase from 39% to 45% as measured by the FSA in May 2020.
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome</b>	Melissa Athanson (athansonm@pcsb.org)
<b>Evidence-based Strategy</b>	-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). -Support staff to utilize data to organize students to interact with content in manners which differentiates/scaffolds instruction to meet the needs of each student.
<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy</b>	If students are given the least restrict environment, then scores on the FSA should increase with the proper supports such as differentiation and scaffolding for individuals.
<b>Action Step</b>	
<b>Description</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. ESE teachers will be meeting monthly through PLCs to discuss and review student placements and data, as well as interventions.</li> <li>2. Teachers will incorporate differentiated instruction and provide support to ESE students in general education courses</li> <li>3. Classroom observations and feedback from administrators to teachers to determine alignment with standards</li> <li>4. Invite students to ELP for additional support and remediation purposes and utilize PLP for individuals.</li> <li>5. Teachers to attend IEP training as needed.</li> <li>6. ESE teachers will meet with core teachers to discuss effective strategies, supports and data to improve student achievement.</li> <li>7. Review placement of students into proper level reading, ELA and mathematics courses.</li> </ol>
<b>Person Responsible</b>	Melissa Athanson (athansonm@pcsb.org)

**Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities (optional)**

**After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities (see the Guidance tab for more information)**

Equity with Excellence for All: Our job as educators is to make sure we are making grades more meaningful. Grades should communicate the skills and knowledge students possess.

A leading scholar of grading systems, has noted, most teachers have received little training on grading practices and fair assessment. In order to create a more uniform and systematic points-based grading system, administrators and faculty must take steps to ensure that grades are accurate, meaningful, consistent, and equitable. To reach our goal, the following will be implemented:

1. Administrators will attend various PLCs each month
2. Ground data conversations in looking at dis-aggregated data for all ESSA categories.
3. Encourage staff members to participate in professional development on equity; continuing education. This includes becoming an Equity Champion.
4. Create learning environment where students feel they belong and are welcomed.
5. The YMCA will provide academic and social support to some of our struggling male students during lunch and periodic class pullouts.
6. Teachers will read and discuss the article, How Our Language Feeds Inequity by Robin Avelar La Salle and Ruth S. Johnson. The article will allow participants to discuss challenges to equity with our talk.
7. Provide other professional development to all teachers including: equitable grading practices, implementing equitable grading practices, intro to foundations of a more equitable education, equity champion continued education, and equity and excellence facilitators collaborative learning.

Family and Community Engagement: To increase the number of volunteers, mentors and community involvement to enhance student sense of belonging, while utilizing resources found in our community. To reach our goal, the following will be implemented:

1. Work with the YMCA of Palm Harbor. They will facilitate a co-hort of male students on peer coaching, social skills and self-advocacy.
2. Continue to work with the Rotary Club to identify student excellence on a monthly basis.
3. Utilize volunteers in the classroom for tutoring purposes, guest speakers and clerical assistance.
4. The principal will continue to reach out to the businesses for support, and to provide school supplies and other school donations.
5. PHMS will open their for the annual Veteran's Day Assembly to the community in November 2019.

Healthy School Goal: Our school will be eligible in 4 out of 6 modules for bronze recognition by April 2020, as evidenced by the Alliance for a Healthier Generation’s healthy School Program Assessment. To reach our goal, the following will be implemented:

1. Review all assessment items to determine the most feasible items to improve in one module to achieve recognition level.
2. Complete at least 4 of the 6 modules to become eligible for the national bronze recognition for the Healthy School Program.
3. Our school cafeteria will work with our Gardening Club to promote healthy living choices through education and choices offered in our cafeteria.

**Part V: Budget**

1	III.A	Areas of Focus: Mathematics				\$3,000.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20
	3336	239-Other	3191 - Palm Harbor Middle School	School Improvement Funds		\$3,000.00

						<i>Notes: Purchase of school wide site license for IXL. This program will help re-mediate and enrich students grades 6-8 in all math courses.</i>
<b>2</b>	<b>III.A</b>	<b>Areas of Focus: ELA/Reading</b>				<b>\$0.00</b>
<b>3</b>	<b>III.A</b>	<b>Areas of Focus: Social Studies:</b>				<b>\$500.00</b>
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20
	6400	140-Substitute Teachers	3191 - Palm Harbor Middle School	School Improvement Funds		\$500.00
						<i>Notes: Provide opportunities for our teachers to attend TDE's</i>
<b>4</b>	<b>III.A</b>	<b>Areas of Focus: Science</b>				<b>\$1,000.00</b>
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20
	6400	140-Substitute Teachers	3191 - Palm Harbor Middle School	School Improvement Funds		\$1,000.00
						<i>Notes: Provide opportunities to attend professional development and pay for TDE's.</i>
<b>5</b>	<b>III.A</b>	<b>Areas of Focus: STEM</b>				<b>\$0.00</b>
<b>6</b>	<b>III.A</b>	<b>Areas of Focus: Bridging the Gap with Equity for All: Black Students</b>				<b>\$0.00</b>
<b>7</b>	<b>III.A</b>	<b>Areas of Focus: ESE</b>				<b>\$500.00</b>
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20
	6400	140-Substitute Teachers	3191 - Palm Harbor Middle School	School Improvement Funds		\$500.00
						<i>Notes: Provide opportunities for our teachers to attend professional development and we provide the TDE.</i>
					<b>Total:</b>	<b>\$5,000.00</b>