

Pinellas County Schools

# Safety Harbor Middle School



## 2019-20 School 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>6</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>Title I Requirements</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>20</b>

# Safety Harbor Middle School

901 1ST AVE N, Safety Harbor, FL 34695

<http://sh-ms.sites.pcsb.org/>

## Demographics

**Principal: Carrie Armstrong**

Start Date for this Principal: 6/18/2019

<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)	54%
<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 <b>Students With Disabilities</b> White Students
<b>School Grade</b>	2018-19: B
<b>School Grades History</b>	2017-18: B 2016-17: C 2015-16: B 2014-15: A 2013-14: B
<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

ESSA Status	TS&I
* 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

Safety Harbor Middle School embraces our diverse community by providing a safe, welcoming, and inclusive environment committed to academic and behavioral growth and success for every student every day.

#### Provide the school's vision statement

Safety Harbor Middle School is dedicated to ensuring 100% student growth by promoting success in college, career, and future life goals.

### School Leadership Team

#### Membership

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

Name	Title
Boulieris, Dionisios	Principal
Principal	
Williamson, Sarah	Assistant Principal
Assistant Principal	
Miller, Matt	Assistant Principal
Assistant 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	412	402	357	0	0	0	0	1171
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	44	64	55	0	0	0	0	163
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	28	32	34	0	0	0	0	94
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	20	4	0	0	0	0	30
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	115	130	120	0	0	0	0	365

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

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	39	52	51	0	0	0	0	142

**The number of students identified as retainees:**

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	18	0	0	0	0	0	20
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

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

52

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

Thursday 6/20/2019

**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	104	101	120	0	0	0	0	325
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	35	42	36	0	0	0	0	113
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	19	5	0	0	0	0	30
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	127	126	143	0	0	0	0	396

**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	46	59	56	0	0	0	0	161

**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	49%	52%	54%	49%	50%	53%
ELA Learning Gains	56%	55%	54%	51%	50%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	51%	47%	47%	46%	42%	47%
Math Achievement	57%	55%	58%	63%	54%	58%
Math Learning Gains	54%	52%	57%	62%	54%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	46%	46%	51%	49%	48%	51%
Science Achievement	55%	51%	51%	56%	52%	52%
Social Studies Achievement	64%	68%	72%	68%	65%	72%

**EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey**

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)			Total
	6	7	8	
Number of students enrolled	412 (0)	402 (0)	357 (0)	1171 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	44 ( )	64 ( )	55 ( )	163 (0)
One or more suspensions	28 (0)	32 (0)	34 (0)	94 (0)
Course failure in ELA or Math	6 (0)	20 (0)	4 (0)	30 (0)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	115 (0)	130 (0)	120 (0)	365 (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	46%	51%	-5%	54%	-8%
	2018	47%	49%	-2%	52%	-5%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	51%	51%	0%	52%	-1%
	2018	40%	48%	-8%	51%	-11%
Same Grade Comparison		11%				
Cohort Comparison		4%				
08	2019	51%	55%	-4%	56%	-5%
	2018	55%	55%	0%	58%	-3%
Same Grade Comparison		-4%				
Cohort Comparison		11%				

<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	38%	44%	-6%	55%	-17%
	2018	49%	45%	4%	52%	-3%
Same Grade Comparison		-11%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	62%	60%	2%	54%	8%
	2018	62%	59%	3%	54%	8%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		13%				
08	2019	25%	31%	-6%	46%	-21%
	2018	34%	31%	3%	45%	-11%
Same Grade Comparison		-9%				
Cohort Comparison		-37%				

<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	55%	51%	4%	48%	7%
	2018	56%	53%	3%	50%	6%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
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	0%	63%	-63%	65%	-65%

<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	64%	68%	-4%	71%	-7%
2018	65%	66%	-1%	71%	-6%
Compare		-1%			

<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	86%	55%	31%	61%	25%



<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>
2018	88%	57%	31%	62%	26%
Compare		-2%			
<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	100%	56%	44%	57%	43%
2018	100%	56%	44%	56%	44%
Compare		0%			

**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	14	39	43	22	40	41	25	25	83		
ELL	25	48	45	40	48	45	22	40	79		
ASN	68	68		89	77		81	82	95		
BLK	28	44	48	29	39	42	22	39	90		
HSP	42	53	47	48	51	46	47	48	75		
MUL	46	55	40	45	49	50	41	58	88		
WHT	56	59	52	65	57	49	64	75	83		
FRL	38	51	49	44	47	45	41	53	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	10	30	33	23	33	27	13	35			
ELL	19	45	42	40	48	40	15	39			
ASN	73	51		85	76		67	88	100		
BLK	24	39	33	37	53	40	32	39	75		
HSP	38	52	46	55	59	44	52	65	82		
MUL	50	59	79	59	57		63	73	75		
WHT	56	51	47	69	64	55	62	72	82		
FRL	37	47	41	51	57	47	44	57	74		

**ESSA Data**

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

<b>ESSA Federal Index</b>	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	TS&I
OVERALL Federal Index - All Students	57
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO

<b>ESSA Federal Index</b>	
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	60
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	574
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	99%

### **Subgroup Data**

#### **Students With Disabilities**

Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	37
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0

#### **English Language Learners**

Federal Index - English Language Learners	45
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0

#### **Asian Students**

Federal Index - Asian Students	80
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	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

#### **Hispanic Students**

Federal Index - Hispanic Students	52
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

#### **Multiracial Students**

Federal Index - Multiracial Students	52
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	63
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	50
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**

Our lowest performance was the ELA achievement data which remained the same at 49%. However, our students made learning gains and our L25 population increased their achievement in this area. We are beginning to see movement and anticipate an increase based on continuation of current practices.

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

Our math data declined from an overall achievement percentage of 63% to 57%. The factors that contributed to this decline were the lack of learning gains made and the achievement of our L25 population in math.

8th grade: we had a teacher change assignment mid-year from 7th grade advanced to pre-algebra. This change was not ideal and did not work in our advantage due the difficulty of the transition in the middle of the year.

6th grade: we tried a new, self-contained instructional model with math that included small groups of 12-16 students. Our thought was the small group, in addition to an ESE

teacher, who is trained in specially designed instruction would produce gains. It did not. We are moving back to a support facilitation model in 2019-2020.

**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**

Social Studies had the biggest gap compared to the state average (64% vs 72%). Our gap is due to the fact the questions for this test are written at a high level. Our readers who can understand and break down these types of questions had the most trouble.

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

Our ELA L25s increased the most from 46% to 51%. ELA focused heavily on making sure each activity was related to the standard. Scaffolding techniques were built into each lesson. PLC's created a comprehensive remediation plan to make sure students were in contact with the essentials. Small group instruction and frequent monitoring were paramount in those plans. Seventh grade which had the biggest gain incorporated interdisciplinary text.

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

Attendance below 90%  
Level 1s

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

1. ELA Achievement
2. Math Achievement
3. Social Studies Achievement
4. L25s in Math and ELA
5. Attendance

## Part III: Planning for Improvement

### Areas of Focus:

<b>#1</b>	
<b>Title</b>	ELA
<b>Rationale</b>	ELA performance has remained stagnant despite improving gains and L25 achievement. Students who increase their reading skills can improve in Science and Social Studies as well as ELA.
<b>State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve</b>	ELA Achievement (percentage of students at proficiency or higher) will increase from 49% to 54% as evidenced by the results of the ELA FSA.
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome</b>	Sarah Williamson (williamsonsa@pcsb.org)
<b>Evidence-based Strategy</b>	Teachers will 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>	Data-driven and differentiated instruction ensures that various types of learners with varying needs will all be able to learn. Differentiated instruction will allow growth in all our sub group populations as well.
<b>Action Step</b>	
<b>Description</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Regularly assess (formally and informally) and utilize data to modify and adjust instruction. Teachers utilize ongoing formative assessments and use the information gained to adjust instruction, enrich and reteach, and provide research based interventions.</li> <li>2. Principal works with the PLC Leads to plan agendas for PLCs to ensure the process is consistent and data from the formative assessments is being utilized to plan instruction using district resources. APs will be present.</li> <li>3. Conduct regular Professional Learning Communities (PLCs) inclusive of data chats to review student responses to tasks and plan for instruction and remediation based on data. APs will attend PLCs.</li> <li>4. Teachers will include scaffolding and differentiated learning, groups, collaboration, and manipulatives in lessons to increase engagement and learning.</li> <li>5. Admin will conduct informal walk-throughs and give immediate, non-evaluative feedback to teachers and offer support if needed.</li> <li>6. Teachers will utilize differentiated stations based on Write Score data to remediate or enrich writing skills.</li> <li>7. Teachers will utilize WICOR strategies (focused notetaking and socratic first) modeled by admin and PLC leaders throughout the year.</li> <li>8. Teachers will utilize unit assessment to ensure standards mastery and to inform remediation.</li> </ol>
<b>Person Responsible</b>	Sarah Williamson (williamsonsa@pcsb.org)

<b>#2</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Math
<b>Rationale</b>	Our school wide percentage of mathematics proficiency was our greatest declining area. We need to refocus our efforts in math and return to a higher achievement percentage.
<b>State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve</b>	The percent of all students scoring proficient will increase from 57% to 63%, as measured by FSA Mathematics.
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome</b>	Matt Miller (millermat@pcsb.org)
<b>Evidence-based Strategy</b>	Teachers will 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>	Data driven and differentiated instruction helps to increase the learning of all students. Teachers and admin will know when/if students have mastered a standard. Differentiated instruction will allow our SWD population to achieve higher as well.
<b>Action Step</b>	
<b>Description</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Regularly assess (formally and informally) and utilize data to modify and adjust instruction. Teachers utilize ongoing formative assessments and use the information gained to adjust instruction, enrich and reteach, and provide research based interventions.</li> <li>2. Principal works with the PLC Leads to plan agendas for PLCs to ensure the process is consistent and data from the formative assessments is being utilized to plan instruction. APs will be present.</li> <li>3. Conduct regular Professional Learning Communities (PLCs) inclusive of data chats to review student responses to tasks and plan for instruction and remediation based on data. APs will attend PLCs.</li> <li>4. Teachers will include scaffolding and differentiated learning, groups, collaboration, and manipulatives in lessons to increase engagement and learning. Teachers will utilize differentiated stations based on cycle assessment data to remediate or enrich content.</li> <li>5. Admin will conduct informal walk-throughs and give immediate, non-evaluative feedback to teachers and offer support if needed.</li> <li>6. Teachers will utilize WICOR strategies modeled by admin and PLC leaders throughout the year.</li> <li>7. Teachers will include small groups for standards-based remediation.</li> <li>9. Implement professional development specific to mathematical practices that will help teachers provide HQ instruction that ensures mastery of standards.</li> </ol>
<b>Person Responsible</b>	Matt Miller (millermat@pcsb.org)

<b>#3</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Social Studies
<b>Rationale</b>	To improve student performance in Social Studies which would result in schoolwide academic performance.
<b>State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve</b>	By the end of the 2019-2020 school year, the percent of all students scoring proficient will increase from 64% to 69%, as measured by the state testing.
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome</b>	[no one identified]
<b>Evidence-based Strategy</b>	Teachers will 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>	Data driven and differentiated instruction helps to increase the learning of all students. Teachers and admin will know when/if students have mastered a standard. Differentiated instruction will allow our SWD population to achieve higher as well.
<b>Action Step</b>	
<b>Description</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Regularly assess (formally and informally) and utilize data to modify and adjust instruction. Teachers utilize ongoing formative assessments and use the information gained to adjust instruction, enrich and reteach, and provide research based interventions.</li> <li>2. Principal works with the PLC Leads to plan agendas for PLCs to ensure the process is consistent and data from the formative assessments is being utilized to plan instruction. APs will be present.</li> <li>3. Conduct regular Professional Learning Communities (PLCs) inclusive of data chats to review student responses to tasks and plan for instruction and remediation based on data. APs will attend PLCs.</li> <li>4. Teachers will include scaffolding and differentiated learning, groups, collaboration, and manipulatives in lessons to increase engagement and learning. Teachers will utilize differentiated stations based on cycle assessments data to remediate standards.</li> <li>5. Admin will conduct informal walk-throughs and give immediate, non-evaluative feedback to teachers and offer support if needed.</li> <li>6. Teachers will utilize WICOR strategies modeled by admin and PLC leaders throughout the year.</li> <li>7. 7th grade ELA teachers will support Civics by incorporating rigorous, interdisciplinary texts; for example, teachers will use texts with Social Studies based content.</li> </ol>
<b>Person Responsible</b>	[no one identified]

<b>#4</b>	
<b>Title</b>	SWD
<b>Rationale</b>	All students have the right to learn at rigorous levels and to be included in the least restrictive environment possible.
<b>State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve</b>	Student achievement will increase from 37% to 41% based on the ESSA Criteria.
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome</b>	Dionisios Boulieris (boulierisd@pcsb.org)
<b>Evidence-based Strategy</b>	We are instituting a district/administrator created support facilitation model and students are strategically placed for optimal success.
<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy</b>	Students will receive rigorous instruction with appropriate scaffolding with the necessary ESE support in the least restrictive environment.
<b>Action Step</b>	
<b>Description</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Strategically schedule students.</li> <li>2. Ensure support facilitation as specified by IEP.</li> <li>3. FDLRS UDL Training PD for all staff on October 14th.</li> <li>4. Case managers will closely monitor cycle assessments and final quarter grades to ensure success, and will review IEPs, services, and placement if the student is not being successful.</li> <li>5. ESE Support Facilitators have common planning with their content teachers.</li> </ol>
<b>Person Responsible</b>	Dionisios Boulieris (boulierisd@pcsb.org)



<b>#5</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Science
<b>Rationale</b>	Our Science proficiency dropped 1% from 56% to 55%.
<b>State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve</b>	Our 8th grade student proficiency will increase from 55% to 60%, as measured by the SSA.
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome</b>	Dionisios Boulieris (boulierisd@pcsb.org)
<b>Evidence-based Strategy</b>	Data-driven and differentiated instruction ensures that various types of learners with varying needs will all be able to learn. Differentiated instruction will allow growth in all our sub group populations as well.
<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy</b>	Differentiated instruction in science will allow all our students access to the content and the ability to learn.
<b>Action Step</b>	
<b>Description</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Regularly assess (formally and informally) and utilize data to modify and adjust instruction. Teachers utilize ongoing formative assessments and use the information gained to adjust instruction, enrich and reteach, and provide research based interventions.</li> <li>2. Principal works with the PLC Leads to plan agendas for PLCs to ensure the process is consistent and data from the formative assessments is being utilized to plan instruction. APs will be present.</li> <li>3. Conduct regular Professional Learning Communities (PLCs) inclusive of data chats to review student responses to tasks and plan for instruction and remediation based on data. APs will attend PLCs.</li> <li>4. Teachers will include scaffolding and differentiated learning, groups, collaboration, and manipulatives in lessons with a focus on increasing engagement and scientific inquiry.</li> <li>5. Admin will conduct informal walk-throughs and give immediate, non-evaluative feedback to teachers and offer support if needed.</li> <li>6. Teachers will utilize differentiated stations based on cycle assessment data to remediate or enrich Science content.</li> <li>7. Teachers will utilize WICOR strategies modeled by admin and PLC leaders throughout the year.</li> <li>8. Teachers will include small groups for standards-based remediation.</li> </ol>
<b>Person Responsible</b>	Dionisios Boulieris (boulierisd@pcsb.org)

<b>#6</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Family and Community Engagement
<b>Rationale</b>	Our mission is to embrace our diverse community by providing a safe, welcoming, and inclusive environment committed to academic and behavioral growth and success for every student every day. Additionally, schools with a higher level of family and community engagement typically have higher student achievement. Safety Harbor Middle School would like all stakeholders to feel comfortable, welcome, and heard.
<b>State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve</b>	We will once again earn a 5 Star School rating.
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome</b>	Dionisios Boulieris (boulierisd@pcsb.org)
<b>Evidence-based Strategy</b>	Use social media to recruit volunteers, reiterate important information, and increase community participation.
<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy</b>	Social media can reach more people and can send information faster and more efficiently.
<b>Action Step</b>	
<b>Description</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Administration will rotate the responsibility of making announcements via school messenger, so parents and students hear from all members of the admin team.</li> <li>2. We will create a positive social media presence on Instagram and Facebook to improve the perception of the school and spread information more quickly and efficiently.</li> <li>3. We will host a Seahawk Camp to allow incoming 6th graders a chance to tour the school, gather information, and buy necessary supplies before school begins.</li> <li>4. Each grade level will host an Open House to invite family members into the school and classrooms.</li> <li>5. We will seek parent and community input through surveys to inform our practices and policies.</li> <li>6. Each member of administration will work with a public entity (SAC, PTSA, Chamber of Commerce) to increase community support of the school.</li> </ol>
<b>Person Responsible</b>	Dionisios Boulieris (boulierisd@pcsb.org)

**#7**

<b>Title</b>	Bridging the Gap
<b>Rationale</b>	Black students have been identified as receiving more referrals and have less exposure to advanced academic opportunities. All students should be learning at high levels in all content areas and should receive equitable treatment within discipline processes.
<b>State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve</b>	African American students will increase proficiency in ELA by 10%, from 24% to 34%, as measured by the FSA.
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome</b>	Dionisios Boulieris (boulierisd@pcsb.org)
<b>Evidence-based Strategy</b>	Teachers will 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>	Data-driven and differentiated instruction ensures that various types of learners with varying needs will all be able to learn. Differentiated instruction will allow growth in all our sub group populations as well.
<b>Action Step</b>	
<b>Description</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Administrators and counselors will create PMP's for all black students.</li> <li>2. Black students will be targeted for ELP in areas of weakness.</li> <li>3. Throughout the year, all staff will receive professional development infused with cultural relevance.</li> <li>4. Administrators will monitor teacher lessons for culturally relevant texts and activities that engage black students.</li> <li>5. Black students will be strategically scheduled into advanced, rigorous courses.</li> <li>6. All staff will build positive relationships with students to increase the likelihood of student success.</li> <li>7. Administration will schedule equity-centered PLCs throughout the year and give PLC leads the resources to ask equity-centered reflection questions to teachers to ensure equity in lesson planning.</li> <li>8. Black students will be targeted for clubs and activities, such as 5000 Role Models, to build a sense of belonging and achievement.</li> </ol>
<b>Person Responsible</b>	Dionisios Boulieris (boulierisd@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)**

Our child study team will continue to work on the problem of students with less than 90% attendance. We will meet to discuss various options and incentives to promote positive attendance. Additionally, we will work with the PBIS committee to reward higher

attendance. We will continue to email/call parents to ascertain the issue and offer support if necessary.

<b>Part V: Budget</b>						
<b>1</b>	<b>III.A</b>	<b>Areas of Focus: ELA</b>				<b>\$5,000.00</b>
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20
			3741 - Safety Harbor Middle School	School Improvement Funds		\$5,000.00
			<i>Notes: Professional learning regarding AVID CRT, Equity, Intentional planning, UDL,</i>			
<b>2</b>	<b>III.A</b>	<b>Areas of Focus: Math</b>				<b>\$5,000.00</b>
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20
			3741 - Safety Harbor Middle School	School Improvement Funds		\$5,000.00
			<i>Notes: Professional learning regarding AVID CRT, Equity, Intentional planning, UDL, etc.</i>			
<b>3</b>	<b>III.A</b>	<b>Areas of Focus: Social Studies</b>				<b>\$0.00</b>
<b>4</b>	<b>III.A</b>	<b>Areas of Focus: SWD</b>				<b>\$0.00</b>
<b>5</b>	<b>III.A</b>	<b>Areas of Focus: Science</b>				<b>\$0.00</b>
<b>6</b>	<b>III.A</b>	<b>Areas of Focus: Family and Community Engagement</b>				<b>\$0.00</b>
<b>7</b>	<b>III.A</b>	<b>Areas of Focus: Bridging the Gap</b>				<b>\$0.00</b>
					<b>Total:</b>	<b>\$10,000.00</b>