Clearwater Fundamental Middle School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Clearwater Fundamental Middle School

1660 PALMETTO ST, Clearwater, FL 33755

https://www.pcsb.org/clearwaterfund-ms

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes (F.S.), requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a new, amended, or continuation SIP for each school in the district which has a school grade of D or F; has a significant gap in achievement on statewide, standardized assessments administered pursuant to s. 1008.22 by one or more student subgroups, as defined in the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), 20 U.S.C. s. 6311(b)(2)(C)(v)(II); has not significantly increased the percentage of students passing statewide, standardized assessments; has not significantly increased the percentage of students demonstrating Learning Gains, as defined in s. 1008.34, and as calculated under s. 1008.34(3)(b), who passed statewide, standardized assessments; has been identified as requiring instructional supports under the Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE) program established in s. 1008.365; or has significantly lower graduation rates for a subgroup when compared to the state's graduation rate. Rule 6A-1.098813, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.), requires district school boards to approve a SIP for each Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) school in the district rated as Unsatisfactory.

Below are the criteria for identification of traditional public and public charter schools pursuant to the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) State plan:

Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)
A school not identified for CSI or TSI, but has one or more subgroups with a Federal Index below 41%.

Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)
A school not identified as CSI that has at least one consistently underperforming subgroup with a Federal Index below 32% for three consecutive years.

Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)
A school can be identified as CSI in any of the following four ways: 1. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%; 2. Have a graduation rate at or below 67%; 3. Have a school grade of D or F; or 4. Have a Federal Index below 41% in the same subgroup(s) for 6 consecutive years.

ESEA sections 1111(d) requires that each school identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI develop a support and improvement plan created in partnership with stakeholders (including principals and other school leaders, teachers and parent), is informed by all indicators in the State's accountability system, includes evidence-based interventions, is based on a school-level needs assessment, and identifies resource inequities to be addressed through implementation of the plan. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as TSI, ATSI and non-Title I CSI must be approved and monitored by the school district. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as Title I, CSI must be approved by the school district and

Department. The Department must monitor and periodically review implementation of each CSI plan after approval.

The Department's SIP template in the Florida Continuous Improvement Management System (CIMS), https://www.floridacims.org, meets all state and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all ESSA components for a support and improvement plan required for traditional public and public charter schools identified as CSI, TSI and ATSI, and eligible schools applying for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) funds.

Districts may allow schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions to develop a SIP using the template in CIMS.

The responses to the corresponding sections in the Department's SIP template may address the requirements for: 1) Title I schools operating a schoolwide program (SWD), pursuant to ESSA, as amended, Section 1114(b); and 2) charter schools that receive a school grade of D or F or three consecutive grades below C, pursuant to Rule 6A-1.099827, F.A.C. The chart below lists the applicable requirements.

SIP Sections	Title I Schoolwide Program	Charter Schools
I-A: School Mission/Vision		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(1)
I-B-C: School Leadership, Stakeholder Involvement & SIP Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(2-3)	
I-E: Early Warning System	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-A-C: Data Review		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-F: Progress Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(3)	
III-A: Data Analysis/Reflection	ESSA 1114(b)(6)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(4)
III-B: Area(s) of Focus	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(i-iii)	
III-C: Other SI Priorities		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(5-9)
VI: Title I Requirements	ESSA 1114(b)(2, 4-5), (7)(A)(iii)(I-V)-(B) ESSA 1116(b-g)	

Note: Charter schools that are also Title I must comply with the requirements in both columns.

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 Department 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.

I. School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

The mission of the Clearwater Fundamental community is to promote highest student achievement through cooperative efforts and a challenging curriculum for our students to be college and career ready.

Provide the school's vision statement.

100% Student success.

School Leadership Team, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring

School Leadership Team
For each member of the school leadership team, select the employee name and email address from the dropdown. Identify the position title and job duties/responsibilities as it relates to SIP implementation for each member of the school leadership team.**:**

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Barthel, Deanna	Teacher, K-12	ELA/Rdg Dept Head
Bohnet, Bridget	Teacher, K-12	Math Dept Head
Johnston, Kinnan	Teacher, K-12	SS Dept. Head
Joyner, Stephanie	Principal	Academic and Operations
Kurek, Paul	Assistant Principal	Academic and Operations
Lane, Erin	School Counselor	Helping students academically and emotionally.
Ritter, Kimberly	Teacher, K-12	ELA/Rdg Dept Head
Rubaii, Elaine	Teacher, K-12	Science Dept. Head

Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Development
Describe the process for involving stakeholders (including the school leadership team, teachers and school staff, parents, students (mandatory for secondary schools) and families, and business or community leaders) and how their input was used in the SIP development process. (ESSA 1114(b)(2))

Note: If a School Advisory Council is used to fulfill these requirements, it must include all required stakeholders.

The plan is developed by the staff with input from our student counsel representative. Then it is presented to SAC for input and questions.

SIP Monitoring
Describe how the SIP will be regularly monitored for effective implementation and impact on increasing the achievement of students in meeting the State's academic standards, particularly for those students with the greatest achievement gap. Describe how the school will revise the plan, as necessary, to ensure continuous improvement. (ESSA 1114(b)(3))

The school uses formative and summative data to measure student growth. If growth is not occurring the problem solving cycle is started to decide how we have to change our actions. The data and any possible changes are presented to the families and SAC in the middle of the school year.

Demographic Data
Only ESSA identification and school grade history updated 3/11/2024

2023-24 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
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	34%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	34%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	ATSI
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD)* English Language Learners (ELL) Asian Students (ASN) Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: A 2019-20: A 2018-19: A 2017-18: A
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

Using 2022-23 data, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	13	16	36
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	5	10
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	2
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	29	10	21	60
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	1	2	21
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	6	8	21

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students identified retained:

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

Prior Year (2022-23) As Initially Reported (pre-populated)

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	23	22	14	59
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	3
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	0	0	6
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	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	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

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

The number of students identified retained:

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

Prior Year (2022-23) Updated (pre-populated)
Section 3 includes data tables that are pre-populated based off information submitted in prior year's SIP.

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	23	22	14	59
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	3
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	0	0	6
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	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	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

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

The number of students identified retained:

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

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review

ESSA School, District and State Comparison (pre-populated)
Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school or combination schools). Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school.

On April 9, 2021, FDOE Emergency Order No. 2021-EO-02 made 2020-21 school grades optional. They have been removed from this publication.

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	79	49	49	76	46	50	78		
ELA Learning Gains				60			62		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				49			53		
Math Achievement*	93	58	56	89	30	36	88		
Math Learning Gains				73			71		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				68			70		
Science Achievement*	78	48	49	72	52	53	76		
Social Studies Achievement*	95	69	68	94	52	58	92		
Middle School Acceleration	81	77	73	89	44	49	90		
Graduation Rate					45	49			
College and Career Acceleration					66	70			
ELP Progress	57	38	40	90	72	76	86		

In cases where a school does not test 95% of students in a subject, the achievement component will be different in the Federal Percent of Points Index (FPPI) than in school grades calculation.

See Florida School Grades, School Improvement Ratings and DJJ Accountability Ratings.

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	81
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	483
Total Components for the Federal Index	6

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	76
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	760
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	53			
ELL	64			
AMI				
ASN	97			
BLK	73			
HSP	75			
MUL	89			
PAC				
WHT	88			
FRL	78			

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	37	Yes	1	
ELL	62			
AMI				
ASN	89			
BLK	70			
HSP	69			
MUL	80			
PAC				
WHT	76			
FRL	73			

Accountability Components by Subgroup

Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school. (pre-populated)

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY 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 2021-22	C & C Accel 2021-22	ELP Progress
All Students	79			93			78	95	81			57
SWD	37			73			38		62		4	
ELL	45			85			38	81	76		6	57
AMI												
ASN	100			100					92		3	
BLK	63			83							2	
HSP	64			90			65	94	79		6	55
MUL	78			94				92	92		4	
PAC												
WHT	85			95			83	95	81		5	
FRL	69			90			73	94	83		6	61

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21	ELP Progress
All Students	76	60	49	89	73	68	72	94	89			90
SWD	17	34	28	52	52	48	0	65				
ELL	44	39	36	78	67	67	35	68	96			90
AMI												
ASN	100	89		94	72				92			
BLK	65	69	60	82	75							
HSP	64	49	35	84	71	63	61	85	86			90
MUL	86	64	60	93	79				100			
PAC												
WHT	79	62	54	90	74	69	72	96	89			
FRL	69	58	49	86	73	70	61	89	91			88

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20	ELP Progress
All Students	78	62	53	88	71	70	76	92	90			86
SWD	27	42	40	60	58	50	31	62				
ELL	60	56	43	81	67	68	42	77	86			86
AMI												
ASN	100	83		100	94							
BLK	61	72		80	80	82						
HSP	71	62	47	85	72	78	58	89	84			89
MUL	82	50		86	64		100		82			
PAC												
WHT	80	62	56	89	70	66	81	92	93			
FRL	74	61	53	83	68	72	69	89	83			82

Grade Level Data Review– State Assessments (pre-populated)
The data are raw data and include ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data. The percentages shown here represent ALL students who received a score of 3 or higher on the statewide assessments.

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
07	2023 - Spring	76%	48%	28%	47%	29%
08	2023 - Spring	77%	47%	30%	47%	30%
06	2023 - Spring	81%	47%	34%	47%	34%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	96%	58%	38%	54%	42%
07	2023 - Spring	59%	36%	23%	48%	11%
08	2023 - Spring	95%	61%	34%	55%	40%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	78%	47%	31%	44%	34%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	97%	53%	44%	50%	47%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	100%	46%	54%	48%	52%

CIVICS						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	95%	68%	27%	66%	29%

III. Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis/Reflection
Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources.

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

Math is higher than reading scores across the grade levels. The lowest cell for CFMS is ELA showing a level 3 or higher.

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

CFMS did not decline in any area.

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.

CFMS was above the State average in all areas.

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

SSA Science for 8th grade showed the most improvement. CFMS focused on Nature of Science.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I, identify one or two potential areas of concern.

Having an increase in the number of ELL and SWD students, we need to make sure scaffolding and differentiation is occurring on a more regular basis.

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

Maintain or increase in Math, Science, Civics and ELA.

Area of Focus
(Identified key Area of Focus that addresses the school's highest priority based on any/all relevant data sources)

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed.
One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Our 2023 8th grade level of performance was 78% proficiency as measured by a level 3 or higher on the Science State-wide Science Assessment. In 2022, 8th grade Science SSA performance was 72%. In 2021, 8th grade performance was 76%.

Although our scores improved from last year, there is still more progress that is possible. Teachers need to continue to practice intentionally planning lessons that include the use of Nature of Science (NOS) standards, Inquiry, and Complex Scientific Thinking and Process Skills. Our scores on N.O.S. standards on cycle tests (all grade levels) are typically lower than scores on life, earth, and physical science standards. If we engage students in more rigorous tasks with a deliberate focus on N.O.S. standards, our overall scores should improve 4% as measured by 8th grade students performing at, or above, grade level on the Science SSA.

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

The percent of all 8th grade students performing at or above grade level will increase from 78% to 82% as measured by the Science SSA.

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

Teacher checklists of grade-level N.O.S. standards. Classroom observations and feedback. Performance Matters formative data (GAP assessments), summative data (cycle assessments), and feedback. Teachers will monitor and collaborate in PLCs monthly. Teachers will discuss data and remediation strategies with
students throughout the year.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

[no one identified]

Evidence-based Intervention:
Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Strengthen staff ability to engage students in complex tasks using Scientific Thinking Skills, Processes and Procedures of Science (Hypothesizing, Experimenting, Data Gathering/Recording, and Analysis), Inquiry Activities, and Project-Based Learning.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Student performance on Nature of Science (N.O.S.) Standards across all grade levels (as seen on cycle/semester test data) has historically trended lower than performance on life science, earth science, or physical science standards. N.O.S. standards can be woven into the teaching of other standards. If we focus on improving these N.O.S. standards, overall scores will improve. Last year, our school focused on this intervention, and our scores improved. With continued focus and effort, our growth should continue its upward trend.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention
(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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

Teachers intentionally plan lessons that will include the use of Nature of Science standards, Scientific Inquiry, Scientific Thinking, and Scientific Process Skills.

Person Responsible: Elaine Rubaii (rubaiie@pcsb.org)

By When: Weekly

Teachers will participate in conferences and/or trainings to support Scientific Inquiry, Project Based (Problem-Based) Learning, and/or STEM strategies in the classroom.

Person Responsible: Elaine Rubaii (rubaiie@pcsb.org)

By When: Ongoing

Grade-level teachers collaborate as much as possible for more school-wide consistency in delivering rigorous, standards-based, N.O.S.-infused lessons.

Person Responsible: Elaine Rubaii (rubaiie@pcsb.org)

By When: Biweekly

Teachers regularly assess (formally and informally) and utilize data to modify and adjust instruction.

Person Responsible: Elaine Rubaii (rubaiie@pcsb.org)

By When: Weekly

Conduct regular, monthly, Professional Learning Communities (PLCs) to review student data and plan for instructional lessons that include N.O.S. standards, as well as close and critical reading and skill/strategy-based groups to implement during core instruction to support success with complex texts.

Person Responsible: Elaine Rubaii (rubaiie@pcsb.org)

By When: Monthly

Administrators monitor teacher practice and provide feedback to support teacher growth. Administrators regularly observe science lessons to monitor strategy implementation and provide feedback to teachers to support next steps.

Person Responsible: Stephanie Joyner (joyners@pcsb.org)

By When: On going

Participation of teachers, students and administration in CFES Brilliant Pathways conferences, activities and field trips to support college and career knowledge and readiness.

Person Responsible: Stephanie Joyner (joyners@pcsb.org)

By When: On going

Participation in STEM Leadership Alliance conference by teachers and administration to support STEM in the classrooms while excelling students.

Person Responsible: Stephanie Joyner (joyners@pcsb.org)

By When: Summer

Continue to use higher order thinking questions.

Person Responsible: Elaine Rubaii (rubaiie@pcsb.org)

By When: On going

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed.
One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

CFMS is not identified for ATSI or TSI

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

The percent of all students achieving math proficiency will increase by two percentage points from current levels, as measured by end-of-year FAST assessment or Algebra/Geometry EOC exam.

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

Student data from cycle and unit assessments will be analyzed by teacher, department and administration. Teachers will engage in data chats with students throughout the year.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Bridget Bohnet (bohnetb@pcsb.org)

Evidence-based Intervention:
Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

CFMS is not identified for ATSI or TSI

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Differentiation and equity for all students should be a focus across all grade levels within the math department. A variety of instruction strategies including but not limited to AVID structures will be evident in all mathematics classrooms to ensure highest student achievement.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention
(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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

Mathematics teachers participate in professional learning opportunities around the B.E.S.T. Standards, the Mathematical Thinking & Reasoning Standards, and Differentiation in the Math Classroom

Person Responsible: Bridget Bohnet (bohnetb@pcsb.org)

By When: On going.

Teachers utilize systemic documents (adopted curriculum, pacing guides, etc.) to effectively plan for mathematics units that incorporate the Mathematical Thinking and Reasoning Standards and rigorous performance tasks aligned to the B.E.S.T. Benchmarks for Mathematics.

Person Responsible: Bridget Bohnet (bohnetb@pcsb.org)

By When: On going

Teachers provide students with a minimum of 1 differentiated learning opportunity within each unit of instruction that addresses mathematical readiness, student interest or student choice in learning.

Person Responsible: Bridget Bohnet (bohnetb@pcsb.org)

By When: On going

Teachers utilize IXL's Diagnostic Arena to address student mathematical skills gaps from their individualized Action Plans with an emphasis on utilizing the program outside of the school day to extend learning beyond the classroom.

Person Responsible: Bridget Bohnet (bohnetb@pcsb.org)

By When: On going.

Administrators and teachers engage in mathematics-focused learning walks/discussions with a focus on target/task alignment and differentiated learning opportunities for students.

Person Responsible: Bridget Bohnet (bohnetb@pcsb.org)

By When: On going

Conduct regular, monthly, Professional Learning Communities (PLCs) inclusive of 'data chats' to review student data to identify and plan for differentiation opportunities based on the students' readiness, interest, and/or learning profile. Data can come from the FAST assessments, IXL, Instructional Materials assessments, and/or teacher and district formal and informal assessments.

Person Responsible: Bridget Bohnet (bohnetb@pcsb.org)

By When: On going

Teachers collaboratively plan learning targets and learning tasks to align to the B.E.S.T. Benchmarks for Mathematics

Person Responsible: Bridget Bohnet (bohnetb@pcsb.org)

By When: Monthly

Teachers participate in ongoing professional development focused on Differentiation in Mathematics

Person Responsible: Bridget Bohnet (bohnetb@pcsb.org)

By When: Monthly

Within PLC and/or common planning, teachers utilize student data to collaboratively plan differentiated learning opportunities that address student readiness, interest, and/or learning profile

Person Responsible: Bridget Bohnet (bohnetb@pcsb.org)

By When: Monthly

Continue higher order thinking questions.

Person Responsible: Bridget Bohnet (bohnetb@pcsb.org)

By When: On going

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed.
One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

In 6th grade, 81% of students scored Level 3 or above. In 7th grade, 75% of students scored Level 3 or above. In 8th grade, 78% of students scored Level 3 or above. Overall, 78% of students at CFMS scored Level 3 or above. Our area of focus for 2023-'24 is to increase student FAST ELA scores by 2% overall. To accomplish this, the ELA and Reading department will build culture and community as we utilize opportunities for professional collaboration through shared planning, department specific ELPs, personalized on-site professional development aligned to the B.E.S.T benchmarks. The department will provide additional opportunities to encourage and celebrate student literacy and writing success through school-wide literacy events and competitions. The ELA department will provide targeted student intervention based on the iReady diagnostic assessments and PM1 and PM2 data.

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

The percent of students performing at or above grade level in Reading/Writing will increase by 2% as measured by the 2023-2024 FAST Reading/Writing Assessment.

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

This will be monitored through the use of formative assessments, state and district cycle data, and department-focused data chats.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Deanna Barthel (bartheld@pcsb.org)

Evidence-based Intervention:
Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

ELA/Reading teachers will focus on co-planning and consistency in our department and work on implementing standards-based lessons aligned to district resources. Teachers will utilize data to evaluate students' progress towards standards mastery and use this information to differentiate and scaffold instruction.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Through focusing on department consistency and collective data analyses, ELA and Reading teachers will be able to meet the needs of each student in a more strategic manner.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention
(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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

Conduct department PLCs evaluating student data and areas of instructional focus.

Person Responsible: Kimberly Ritter (ritterk@pcsb.org)

By When: Monthly

Administer quarterly department-wide formative assessments specific to grade level and aligned to the focus standards on the district curriculum map.

Person Responsible: Kimberly Ritter (ritterk@pcsb.org)

By When: Every 9 weeks.

Consistently conduct data chats with students and support setting learning goals based on data and formative assessments.

Person Responsible: Deanna Barthel (bartheld@pcsb.org)

By When: Monthly

Based on the need identified through data analysis and data chats, ELA and Reading teachers will use strategies and resources as recommended and created by the district ELA/Reading staff.

Person Responsible: Deanna Barthel (bartheld@pcsb.org)

By When: Quarterly

Communicate the learning focus and share data with students' caregivers - update caregivers on upcoming department assessments and additional opportunities for student learning.

Person Responsible: Deanna Barthel (bartheld@pcsb.org)

By When: Bimonthly

As a department, ELA/Reading teachers will collaborate to foster school-wide enthusiasm for literacy and learning and will collaborate with school administration to celebrate students' successes.

Person Responsible: Deanna Barthel (bartheld@pcsb.org)

By When: Monthly

Continue a school-wide protocol for use during daily Literacy block. The ELA/Reading department will monitor students' output.

Person Responsible: Kimberly Ritter (ritterk@pcsb.org)

By When: Monthly

Students will participate in higher order thinking activities to better support their knowledge and application of the skills learned in the B.E.S.T benchmarks.

Person Responsible: Kimberly Ritter (ritterk@pcsb.org)

By When: Weekly

Daily literacy time will continue school wide. Students will complete performance assessments aligned to B.E.S.T benchmarks.

Person Responsible: Deanna Barthel (bartheld@pcsb.org)

By When: Daily

Direct and whole group instruction will be based on achieving specific learning targets and will be systemic in nature. As stated in Hattie's "Visible Learning for Literacy, "direct instruction can be an effective method for teaching [...] constrained skills (47).

Person Responsible: Deanna Barthel (bartheld@pcsb.org)

By When: Ongoing

Use texts to increase students' background knowledge and literacy skills in social studies and science.

Person Responsible: Kimberly Ritter (ritterk@pcsb.org)

By When: Ongoing

Provide small group differentiated instruction in order to meet individual student needs.

Person Responsible: Deanna Barthel (bartheld@pcsb.org)

By When: Ongoing

All students who scored a level 1 or 2 on FAST testing PM3 will be placed in intensive reading for the '23-'24 school year. If needed, students scoring a level 1 or 2 on PM2 will be moved midyear into intensive reading.

Person Responsible: Erin Lane (laneer@pcsb.org)

By When: January and June

#4. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Social Studies

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed.
One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

The gap is occurring because teachers are not consistently scaffolding learning and encouraging higher order thinking.

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

The percent of students on the 2024 Spring Civics EOC Assessment will
increase by 2% of the students earning a level 3 or higher.
The percent of students scoring at grade level in US History will increase by 7% on as measured by the PM tests.

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

The area of focus will be monitored for the desired outcome by using the Civics cycle data, and by engaging in monthly PLCs in which teachers will discuss data, remediation strategies, how to increase reading/writing in the classrooms and collaborate.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Kinnan Johnston (johnstonki@pcsb.org)

Evidence-based Intervention:
Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Strengthen staff ability to engage students in complex tasks and reading/writing skills in the classrooms.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The Civics EOC requires students to analyze items such as historical quotes,
charts, and political cartoons to answer questions, 80% of which are level 2
or 3 in complexity. If we increase student engagement in complex tasks, their
Civics EOC scores will improve. If we also increase reading/writing in the
classrooms, our Civics EOC scores will improve.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention
(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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

Teachers will increase the utilization primary source documents at varying complexity levels with appropriate reading/AVID strategies.

Person Responsible: Kinnan Johnston (johnstonki@pcsb.org)

By When: Monthly

Conduct regular, monthly Professional Learning Communities to review student data and to plan for instructional lessons that meet the remediation and enrichment needs of students.

Person Responsible: Kinnan Johnston (johnstonki@pcsb.org)

By When: Monthly

Teachers monitor and provide feedback to students to support learning.

Person Responsible: Kinnan Johnston (johnstonki@pcsb.org)

By When: Ongoing

Teachers increase the utilization of supplemental resources (such as Writing in Response to Text resources created by the district), primary sources, and include short challenging passages that elicit close and critical reading and re-reading.

Person Responsible: Kinnan Johnston (johnstonki@pcsb.org)

By When: Ongoing

#5. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Other

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed.
One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

During the 2023/24 school year all students will receive rigorous
instruction for high level courses. All students will be monitored
and supported throughout the year to ensure success of the
rigorous course.

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

The percent of students participating in Advanced, Accelerated, Honors or
Pre-AP courses with a C or better will be 90%.

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

Progress reports at the mid point of a grading period and report
cards at end of the marking period.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

[no one identified]

Evidence-based Intervention:
Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Focused note taking.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

AVID site team will continue to support rigor in the classroom
through AVID strategies during department meetings.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention
(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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

Ensure counselor department head is an active member of the the AVID site team.

Person Responsible: Erin Lane (laneer@pcsb.org)

By When: Monthly

Plan to confront barriers and address equity in school policies and written documents to ensure that student enrollment in rigorous college preparatory courses reflects school demographics.

Person Responsible: Erin Lane (laneer@pcsb.org)

By When: Monthly

Plan, implement, and monitor a high school/college awareness articulation plan for all grade levels.

Person Responsible: Erin Lane (laneer@pcsb.org)

By When: October, January, April

Engaging strategies, to include focused note taking, that reach a diverse group of learners.

Person Responsible: Erin Lane (laneer@pcsb.org)

By When: Monthly

Gifted teachers will work for a total of 6 hours in after school hours to make sure the articulation plan for EP students are in place.

Person Responsible: Stephanie Joyner (joyners@pcsb.org)

By When: August and April/May

Participation of teachers, students and administration in CFES Brilliant Pathways conferences, activities and fieldtrips to support college and career knowledge and readiness.

Person Responsible: Stephanie Joyner (joyners@pcsb.org)

By When: Monthly

Participation in STEM Leadership Alliance conference by teachers and administration to support STEM in the classrooms while excelling students.

Person Responsible: Stephanie Joyner (joyners@pcsb.org)

By When: Monthly

#6. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Differentiation

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed.
One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Increase engagement of the diverse learner. Our current level of performance in proficiency of the black students couldn't be measured due to the group size, as evidenced by the ELA FAST proficiency scores in 2023.

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

The percent of Black students performing at or above grade level in Reading/Writing will increase by 4% as measured by the 2023-2024 FAST Reading/Writing test.

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

Through walkthroughs and PLC minute we will be able to see engagement occurring.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Deanna Barthel (bartheld@pcsb.org)

Evidence-based Intervention:
Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Utilize collaborative study groups and focused notetaking.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The gap is occurring due to the lack of engagement in the classrooms.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention
(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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

Continue use of literacy time schoolwide.

Person Responsible: Kimberly Ritter (ritterk@pcsb.org)

By When: Weekly

Implement reading and writing strategies in all classrooms.

Person Responsible: Kimberly Ritter (ritterk@pcsb.org)

By When: Monthly

Continued use of higher order thinking in all classrooms.

Person Responsible: Kimberly Ritter (ritterk@pcsb.org)

By When: Monthly

Provide culturally relevant strategies/equity strategies to increase engagement and improve grades in the ELA/Rdg classrooms.

Person Responsible: Kimberly Ritter (ritterk@pcsb.org)

By When: On going

ELA/Rdg teachers will implement culturally relevant instructional practices in the classrooms such as cooperative and small group settings, movement, explicit vocabulary instruction, monitoring with feedback and deliberate use of cultural references in lesson plans.

Person Responsible: Kimberly Ritter (ritterk@pcsb.org)

By When: Weekly

ELA/Reading teachers will provide an opportunity for black students to participate in weekly ELP opportunities by recruiting and targeting resources.

Person Responsible: Kimberly Ritter (ritterk@pcsb.org)

By When: Weekly

Provide culturally relevant strategies/equity strategies to increase engagement and improve grades in the ELA/Rdg classrooms.

Person Responsible: Kimberly Ritter (ritterk@pcsb.org)

By When: Weekly

Teachers analyze data in monthly PLC to discuss how they can differentiate to get engagement in the classrooms.

Person Responsible: Kimberly Ritter (ritterk@pcsb.org)

By When: Monthly

ELA/Rdg teachers will have access to real time data specific to the black students in order to have effective data chats and targeted support for improved learning.

Person Responsible: Kimberly Ritter (ritterk@pcsb.org)

By When: August, December, April, May

#7. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed.
One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Overall, 46% of the students with disabilities scored a level 3 or above on the FAST Reading assessment. Our area of focus for 2023-24 is to increase engagement of the students with disabilities. By increasing engagement with SWD achievement levels will increase. To accomplish this, the ELA and Reading department will build culture and community as we utilize opportunities for professional collaboration through shared planning, department specific ELPs, personalized on-site professional development aligned to the B.E.S.T benchmarks. The department will provide additional opportunities to encourage students with disabilities and celebrate student with disabilities literacy and writing success through school-wide literacy events and competitions. The ELA department will provide targeted student intervention based on the iReady diagnostic assessments and PM1 and PM2 data.

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

The percent of students with disabilities performing at or above grade level in Reading will increase by 10% as measured by the 2023-2024 FAST Reading Assessment.

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

This will be monitored through the use of formative assessments, state and district cycle data, and department-focused data chats.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

[no one identified]

Evidence-based Intervention:
Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

ELA/Reading teachers will focus on co-planning and consistency in our department and work on implementing standards-based lessons aligned to district resources. Teachers will utilize data to evaluate students' progress towards standards mastery and use this information to differentiate and scaffold instruction.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Through focusing on department consistency and collective data analyses, ELA and Reading teachers will be able to meet the needs of each student in a more strategic manner.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention
(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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

Conduct department PLCs evaluating student data and areas of instructional focus.

Person Responsible: Kimberly Ritter (ritterk@pcsb.org)

By When: monthly

SWD students will participate in higher order thinking activities to better support their knowledge and application of the skills learned in the B.E.S.T benchmarks.

Person Responsible: Kimberly Ritter (ritterk@pcsb.org)

By When: weekly

Based on the need of SWD students identified through data analysis and data chats, ELA and Reading teachers will use strategies and resources as recommended and created by the district ELA/Reading staff.

Person Responsible: Kimberly Ritter (ritterk@pcsb.org)

By When: On going

CSI, TSI and ATSI Resource Review

Describe the process to review school improvement funding allocations and ensure resources are allocated based on needs. This section must be completed if the school is identified as ATSI, TSI or CSI in addition to completing an Area(s) of Focus identifying interventions and activities within the SIP (ESSA 1111(d)(1)(B)(4) and (d)(2)(C).

The district issues SIP funding as they deem appropriate. Any SIP funds we spend are approved by the SAC.