

Hillsborough County Public Schools

Greco Middle Magnet School



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	5
Needs Assessment	11
Planning for Improvement	17
Positive Culture & Environment	19
Budget to Support Goals	21

Greco Middle Magnet School

6925 E FOWLER AVE, Temple Terrace, FL 33617

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Andrew Olson

Start Date for this Principal: 11/24/2018

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Middle School 6-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2018-19 Title I School	Yes
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	90%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups in orange are below the federal threshold)	
School Grades History	2018-19: C (42%) 2017-18: D (39%) 2016-17: D (38%) 2015-16: C (42%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	
Year	N/A
Support Tier	N/A
ESSA Status	
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here .	

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Hillsborough 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

To provide a rigorous and relevant education and the supports which enable each student to excel as a successful and responsible citizen.

Provide the school's vision statement

We support the District's vision of Preparing Students for Life, and are working to ensure that our students leave our school equipped with the tools they need to graduate on time. Our District's graduation rate goal is 90% by 2020. With that in mind, we have developed the following Vision for our school:

Preparing students for lifelong success

School Leadership Team

Membership

Identify the name, email address, position title, and job duties/responsibilities for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Olson, Andrew	Principal	<p>Leadership team meetings can include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Principal Assistant Principal / ELP Coordinator Guidance Counselor SAC Chairs School Psychologist/ Behavior team Representative School Social Worker/ Attendance Committee Representative Academic Coaches (Reading, Math, etc. and other specialists on an ad hoc basis) ESE teachers PLC Liaisons for each grade level and/or content area District support (including Area Superintendents, Support Specialist, District Coaches) <p>The Leadership team meets regularly (e.g., bi-weekly/ monthly). The purpose of the core Leadership Team is to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Collaborate and problem solve to ensure the implementation of high quality instructional practices utilizing the RtI/MTSS process: at the core (Tier 1) and intervention/enrichment (Tiers 2/3) levels. 2. Support the implementation of high quality instructional practices at the core (Tier 1) and intervention/enrichment (Tiers 2/3) levels. 3. Review ongoing progress monitoring data at the core to ensure fidelity of instruction and attainment of SIP goal(s) in curricular, behavioral, and attendance domains. 4. Communicate school-wide data to PLCs and facilitate problem solving within the content/grade level teams. <p>A collaborative culture of shared responsibility is established through Leadership Team Meetings and PLCs.</p> <p>Research consistently bears out that the school leader is the most important element in teachers choosing to go to, and then remain at, a school site. To that end, HCPS works to ensure that principals are selected and placed with great care. HCPS works to develop strong leaders through the Hillsborough Principal Pipeline. As stated above, The Hillsborough Principal Pipeline offers unique and valuable opportunities for teachers to experience and prepare for a school leadership position by helping them gain the skills, experience and confidence that are crucial to becoming a high-performing leader. Pursuing school leadership provides the opportunity to</p>

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		<p>make a direct impact on school culture and positively influence instructional quality, which will result in improved outcomes and higher long-term success rates for students in Hillsborough County.</p> <p>HCPS' vision for instructional improvement is to have a highly effective teacher in every classroom and a highly effective principal in every school. This vision is founded in the research-based tenet that teacher quality has a larger impact on student achievement than any other schooling factor. Further research demonstrates the impact of a principal's leadership on outcomes for students and teachers. Over the past decade, HCPS has developed a Human Capital Management System (HCMS) to further the district's vision of instructional improvement.</p> <p>Several Teacher Interview Days and Recruitment Fairs occur throughout the summer months, under the oversight of Human Resources. All applicants must be pre-approved by the District to attend these events. Certified teachers with an Effective or Highly Effective performance evaluation, teaching in field, at our highest needs schools are eligible for salary differential. This program was established with the purpose of helping to create stability and equity in harder to staff schools, recruiting and retaining highly qualified instructional staff, increasing student achievement, and promoting a culture of ongoing professional development.</p> <p>Compensation is grounded in a performance-based salary structure that explicitly ties salary increases to sustained high-level performance, while career ladder positions, such as Instructional Mentors, are available to effective educators. The base teacher salary schedule is designed to provide substantial increases in compensation to teachers who have demonstrated positive student impact. Once hired, teacher induction and teacher retention are supported through fully-released instructional mentors assigned to every new educator for up to two years to increase effectiveness and decrease recidivism. Educator effectiveness ratings that differentiate educator quality are used to assist principals in determining teachers' transfer options</p>

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		and promotion into leadership positions. HCPS has linked PD opportunities to HR functions so that school-level and district-level trainings are developed and deployed in response to areas of need identified by educator evaluations. Training course completions can also be tracked by HR Partners to inform human capital decisions.
Lewis, Mikel	Teacher, Career/ Technical	
Lewis, Dornnette	Teacher, K-12	
Maurice, Blaine	Teacher, K-12	
Chisholm, Robert	Assistant Principal	
Cadet, Edwin	Teacher, K-12	
Russ, Ciciler	Other	
Johnson, Lillie	Assistant Principal	
Butler, Jennifer	Instructional Coach	

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Saturday 11/24/2018, Andrew Olson

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

3

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

22

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

50

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Middle School 6-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2018-19 Title I School	Yes
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	90%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups in orange are below the federal threshold)	Black/African American Students Economically Disadvantaged Students English Language Learners Hispanic Students Multiracial Students Students With Disabilities White Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (42%) 2017-18: D (39%) 2016-17: D (38%) 2015-16: C (42%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	
Year	N/A
Support Tier	N/A
ESSA Status	
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here .	

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	322	312	252	0	0	0	0	886
Attendance below 90 percent	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	
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 ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	100	104	78	0	0	0	282	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	135	126	105	0	0	0	366	

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	

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	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	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 7/2/2020

Prior Year - As Reported

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Attendance below 90 percent	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	
Course failure in ELA or Math	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	

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	

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	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

Prior Year - Updated

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

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	329	237	299	0	0	0	0	865
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	28	27	0	0	0	0	0	55
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	33	35	0	0	0	0	0	68
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	28	28	0	0	0	0	0	56
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	235	130	182	0	0	0	0	547

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	65	63	0	0	0	0	0	128

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	34	38	0	0	0	0	0	72

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	32%	51%	54%	31%	52%	53%
ELA Learning Gains	43%	52%	54%	45%	53%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	47%	47%	47%	49%	48%	47%
Math Achievement	32%	55%	58%	27%	56%	58%
Math Learning Gains	46%	57%	57%	36%	59%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	44%	52%	51%	33%	52%	51%
Science Achievement	28%	47%	51%	28%	47%	52%

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
Social Studies Achievement	33%	67%	72%	39%	66%	72%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)			Total
	6	7	8	
	(0)	(0)	(0)	0 (0)

Grade Level Data

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

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2019	34%	53%	-19%	54%	-20%
	2018	29%	52%	-23%	52%	-23%
Same Grade Comparison		5%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	29%	54%	-25%	52%	-23%
	2018	25%	52%	-27%	51%	-26%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2019	27%	53%	-26%	56%	-29%
	2018	29%	54%	-25%	58%	-29%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison		2%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2019	25%	49%	-24%	55%	-30%
	2018	19%	48%	-29%	52%	-33%
Same Grade Comparison		6%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	32%	62%	-30%	54%	-22%
	2018	27%	61%	-34%	54%	-27%
Same Grade Comparison		5%				
Cohort Comparison		13%				
08	2019	16%	31%	-15%	46%	-30%
	2018	6%	29%	-23%	45%	-39%
Same Grade Comparison		10%				
Cohort Comparison		-11%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2019	25%	47%	-22%	48%	-23%
	2018	24%	48%	-24%	50%	-26%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison						

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

CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	32%	67%	-35%	71%	-39%
2018	34%	65%	-31%	71%	-37%
Compare		-2%			

HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	82%	63%	19%	61%	21%
2018	61%	63%	-2%	62%	-1%
Compare		21%			

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

Subgroup Data

2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	18	36	37	14	46	53	14	21			
ELL	9	43	57	11	50	58	3	11			
BLK	26	41	51	26	40	35	20	31	62		

2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
HSP	31	48	37	33	53	54	31	35	91		
MUL	43	32		33	32						
WHT	44	41	43	47	54	67	45	45	70		
FRL	28	42	47	29	44	43	23	30	64		

2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2015-16	C & C Accel 2015-16
SWD	13	30	35	11	20	20	16	16			
ELL	11	42	49	11	41	38	25	8			
BLK	27	43	47	21	30	32	19	38	50		
HSP	28	43	50	32	43	33	38	30	63		
MUL	39	43		36	36						
WHT	49	49	45	44	48	37	50	48	79		
FRL	29	44	48	26	35	33	26	37	57		

ESSA Data

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

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	TS&I
OVERALL Federal Index - All Students	43
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	5
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	52
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	426
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	95%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	30
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	2
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	33
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES

English Language Learners	
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	37
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	46
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	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	51
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	40
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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

The data component showing the lowest performance is math and language arts proficiency for ESE students. 18% of ESE students were proficient in reading and 14% were proficient in math for the 2019 school year.

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

The science data shows the greatest decline from the prior year. ELL students level of proficiency decreased by 22 percent. During the 2018/19 school year students were misplaced in honors classes and were not provided with reading support.

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

The biggest gap for the state average is the Civics EOC. There was a vacancy for two thirds of the school year.

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

The data component showing the most improvement was overall learning gains and learning gains for the lowest 25 of students in math. Overall learning gains in math increased by 26 percent and 33 percent for the lowest 25 percent.

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

Potential areas of concern are SWD subgroup at 30% and Black students at 37%.

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

1. Black Students ELA
2. Black Students Math
3. ESE Students ELA
4. ESE Students Math
5. 8th Grade Science

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Equity & Diversity

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	The need to focus on equity and diversity is evident because Black students at Greco are 56% of the population but represent 78.9% of our school suspensions. Black students are 2.87 times more likely to receive OSS than any other subgroup. These students experience time out of class when they are opting out of learning and are missing essential instruction,
---	---

Measurable Outcome: Greco will decrease students suspension rates by 50%

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Andrew Olson (andrew.olson@sdhc.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy: Restorative Practice strategies will be utilized to build and strengthen positive relationships with staff and students. The goal is to reduce, prevent and improve adverse behaviors, repair and restore relationships and resolve conflict while holding individuals and groups accountable. We will work to build healthy relationships and a sense of community to prevent and address conflict. Through social emotional learning, students will better recognize and manage emotions, establish positive relationships and make responsible decisions and handle challenging situations responsibly.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: This strategy will give teachers tools to deescalate situations and guiding through examining how behavior impacts others and a positive frame for conflict resolution while guiding students through self-regulating emotions. Restorative practice will help keep the flow of instruction while tending to the emotional needs of students.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Present data to faculty (problematic behaviors)
2. Faculty PD on restorative practices
3. Team meetings follow up from faculty PD
4. Plan of implementation in classroom
5. Relationship building - to support restorative conversations

Person Responsible: Andrew Olson (andrew.olson@sdhc.k12.fl.us)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Instructional Coaching

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Instructional coaching is needed so teachers can participate in coaching cycles to improve instructional practice which will translate to higher student achievement. This was identified as a need through classroom observation data.

Measureable Outcome: We will increase the percent proficient in the following subject areas by the designated percent
 Language Arts 5%
 Math 5%
 Science 10%
 Social Studies 24%
 We will increase learning gains in all areas by 10 %

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Andrew Olson (andrew.olson@sdhc.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy: Redline coaching includes the following continuum of coaching stances: Cognitive-the coach provides no scaffolding beyond the open-ended question(s) posed. Collaborative-The coach works alongside the coachee to encourage a collaborative discussion. Consultant -allows for coaches to tap into their knowledge, expertise, and experiences to support and deepen the coaching conversation. Calibrate- the coach uses data to help identify and clarify the issue being discussed

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Redline Coaching provides enough coaching support to move teacher's practice forward, but not so much that they are overwhelmed and shut down. Effective coaching is all about finding the right level of coaching to maximize the coaching impact. Redline coaching will meet the varied needs of teachers.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Train coaches on Redline Coaching
2. Conduct classroom observations
3. Work with teachers to develop instructional goals
4. Teachers will participate in coaching cycles
5. Class data analysis to determine next steps

Person Responsible Jennifer Butler (jennifer.butler@sdhc.k12.fl.us)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Collaborative Planning

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: The instructional focus of collaborative planning is a critical need so teachers and students can see the connections between subject areas and real world applications using the IB Unit Planner.

Measureable Outcome: We will increase the percent proficient in the following subject areas by the designated percent
 Language Arts 5%
 Math 5%
 Science 10%
 Social Studies 24%
 We will increase learning gains in all areas by 10 %

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: [no one identified]

Evidence-based Strategy: IB Unit planning to create units of inquiry with one being created each semester by subject area. They will be created in collaboration with subject area teachers and the Middle Years Program (MYP) coordinator. The units include the central idea, formative and summative assessment, teacher questions/provocations, resources needed, learning activities, standards covered and teacher reflection. Year 1 will have an emphasis on formative assessments.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: The IB Unit Planning and statements of inquiry hold students and teachers accountable for using best practices. Students can see connections between subject areas along with real world connections. Students will use the statement of inquiry to focus their learning while solving problems creatively and collaboratively.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Train staff on IB Unit Planning
2. Work with the MYP coordinator and subject area leaders to identify one unit to focus on each semester in each subject area
3. Create the IB Unit Plan
4. Teach the Unit in the classroom
5. Use data to reflect on the outcome
6. Revise unit if needed

Person Responsible [no one identified]

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

Part IV: Positive Culture & Environment

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

Stakeholders play a key role in school performance and addressing equity. Consulting various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment ensuring all stakeholders are involved.

Greco builds a positive school culture ensuring all stakeholders are involved through Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports (PBIS) is an evidence-based three-tiered framework to improve and integrate all of the data, systems, and practices affecting student outcomes every day. Through the three tiered levels of support, the staff works to establish a foundation of regular, proactive support while preventing unwanted behaviors, supports students who are at risk from developing more serious problem behaviors before those behaviors start. Students in need receive more intensive, individualized support to improve their behavioral and academic outcomes. Greco also uses a token economy system where students can earn Cub Bucks when they exhibit positive behaviors. These bucks can be redeemed for items from the school store, food items or access to special student events and celebrations. Each grade level team has created a calendar of special events for students through out the school year to celebrate their success.

Greco engages with the community through partnerships with local churches and businesses in Temple Terrace to provide resources for teachers and students. Greco has a community garden and compost area. This year Greco is partnering with the University of South Florida to install rain gardens on the campus. Greco's PTA and SAC committee work in conjunction to give input into school plans and structures, plan and volunteer for events for students and staff and provide grant opportunities for staff members to purchase supplies for the classroom and fund projects.

Parent Teacher Home Visits (PTHV) are conducted to make a meaningful connection with Greco families, starting with a voluntary home visit. PTHV engages students, families and educators, builds their leadership, networking and collaboration skills, and links those skills to student learning and outcomes.

Students will also be recognized and celebrated for positive behaviors and actions associated with the IB learner profile. IB learners are

Inquirers

Knowledgeable

Thinkers

Communicators

Principled

Open-minded

Caring

Courageous

Balanced

Reflective

Students will be celebrated in classrooms and school wide when the put these traits into action.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.

Part V: Budget			
1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Equity & Diversity	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Instructional Coaching	\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Collaborative Planning	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00