

Alachua County Public Schools

# Kanapaha Middle School



## 2019-20 Schoolwide 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>7</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>Title I Requirements</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>0</b>

# Kanapaha Middle School

5005 SW 75TH ST, Gainesville, FL 32608

<https://www.sbac.edu/kanapaha>

## Demographics

**Principal: Sherry Estes**

Start Date for this Principal: 7/16/2019

<b>2019-20 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 below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners Asian Students Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
<b>School Grades History</b>	2018-19: B (61%) 2017-18: B (59%) 2016-17: B (58%) 2015-16: B (57%) 2014-15: A (69%)
<b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>	
<b>SI Region</b>	Northeast
<b>Regional Executive Director</b>	<a href="#">Cassandra Brusca</a>
<b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>	N/A
<b>Year</b>	
<b>Support Tier</b>	

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 Alachua 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.

---

## Table of Contents

---

<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>Title I Requirements</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>0</b>

## Kanapaha Middle School

5005 SW 75TH ST, Gainesville, FL 32608

<https://www.sbac.edu/kanapaha>

### School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2018-19 Title I School	2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Middle School 6-8	No	65%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	59%

### School Grades History

Year	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17	2015-16
Grade	B	B	B	B

### School Board Approval

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

### SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a school improvement plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F.

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 (see page 4). For schools receiving a grade of A, B, or C, the district may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at <https://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.**

Our mission is to maximize achievement for middle school students through a rigorous and engaging curriculum emphasizing foundational knowledge, problem-solving skills, multi-literacies, and civic dispositions. Students will achieve their annual learning gains in reading, writing, math, and science. With a high-performing faculty, robust community partnerships, and an effective Positive Behavior Support (PBS) program, we will produce responsible citizens prepared for success in high school and beyond.

**Provide the school's vision statement.**

Our vision is to be the premier middle school in Alachua County. We will, through an inclusive environment, with a very diverse student population, produce gains in student achievement, utilize community resources and support, and maintain a safe learning environment for all members of the school family.

### School Leadership Team

**Membership**

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

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Stanford, Ginger	Assistant Principal	Curriculum
Estes, Sherry	Principal	Serve as instructional leader by using data to drive the instructional focus and professional development for the school year. Monitors lesson plans, conducts frequent classroom walkthroughs, and gives feedback through two formal observations per year. Evidence is collected and shared from all types of observations, and administrator gives substantive feedback in post-observation conferences. Additionally, protects time for teacher planning and instruction.
McNichols, Austin	Assistant Principal	Administration
Calabrese, Jane	Teacher, K-12	6th grade team leader
McDonald, Jeremy	Teacher, K-12	6th grade team leader Language Arts department chair
Renicks, Theresa	Teacher, K-12	7th grade team leader
Ambrose, Ashley	Teacher, K-12	7th grade team leader Social Studies department chair
Yarn, Aisha	Teacher, K-12	8th grade team leader
Hart, Sara	Instructional Media	team leader
Grater, Karen	Instructional Media	team leader

## 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	377	388	343	0	0	0	0	1108	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	14	17	0	0	0	0	45	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	19	23	40	0	0	0	0	82	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	25	63	33	0	0	0	0	121	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	106	121	100	0	0	0	0	327	

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	108	138	139	0	0	0	0	385	

**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	41	41	38	0	0	0	0	120	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	2	0	0	0	0	5	

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

59

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

Wednesday 9/25/2019

**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	56	44	27	0	0	0	0	127	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	24	25	0	0	0	0	63	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	22	39	21	0	0	0	0	82	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	105	90	89	0	0	0	0	284	

**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	10	23	25	0	0	0	0	58	

## 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	58%	59%	54%	58%	60%	52%
ELA Learning Gains	56%	56%	54%	55%	59%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	40%	41%	47%	36%	40%	44%
Math Achievement	65%	60%	58%	64%	60%	56%
Math Learning Gains	63%	56%	57%	63%	62%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	53%	46%	51%	44%	47%	50%
Science Achievement	53%	53%	51%	49%	57%	50%
Social Studies Achievement	76%	73%	72%	71%	72%	70%

### EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)			Total
	6	7	8	
Number of students enrolled	377 (0)	388 (0)	343 (0)	1108 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	14 ( )	14 ( )	17 ( )	45 (0)
One or more suspensions	19 (0)	23 (0)	40 (0)	82 (0)
Course failure in ELA or Math	25 (0)	63 (0)	33 (0)	121 (0)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	106 (0)	121 (0)	100 (0)	327 (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	54%	53%	1%	54%	0%
	2018	55%	55%	0%	52%	3%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	53%	54%	-1%	52%	1%
	2018	55%	55%	0%	51%	4%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison		-2%				
08	2019	62%	61%	1%	56%	6%
	2018	64%	61%	3%	58%	6%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison		7%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2019	54%	52%	2%	55%	-1%
	2018	63%	53%	10%	52%	11%
Same Grade Comparison		-9%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	66%	59%	7%	54%	12%
	2018	61%	58%	3%	54%	7%
Same Grade Comparison		5%				
Cohort Comparison		3%				
08	2019	42%	27%	15%	46%	-4%
	2018	42%	24%	18%	45%	-3%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		-19%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2019	53%	54%	-1%	48%	5%
	2018	55%	53%	2%	50%	5%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
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	72%	69%	3%	71%	1%
2018	70%	69%	1%	71%	-1%
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	88%	56%	32%	61%	27%
2018	85%	60%	25%	62%	23%
Compare		3%			
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	100%	48%	52%	57%	43%
2018	100%	63%	37%	56%	44%
Compare		0%			

## 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 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	15	44	38	18	42	41	17	23			
ELL	26	54	43	55	61	54	36	72			
ASN	76	77		90	75		62	90	100		
BLK	31	40	33	35	48	45	23	56	70		
HSP	47	54	53	62	63	61	44	78	79		
MUL	62	60	33	70	68	67	61	75	86		
WHT	77	63	45	82	70	56	70	87	89		
FRL	37	45	38	43	52	46	34	55	71		
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 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	17	30	22	23	50	47	20	27			
ELL	38	53	54	68	82	90	30	62			
ASN	79	71		83	80		74	91	84		
BLK	32	44	36	33	48	44	24	49	55		
HSP	53	52	48	67	67	56	48	58	77		
MUL	49	53	40	62	59	58	52	63	77		
WHT	77	60	44	84	72	46	78	88	85		
FRL	42	47	38	47	56	49	34	61	70		

2017 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	36	33	22	40	34	12	15			
ELL	34	58	69	48	59			36			
ASN	67	68		83	79		50	83	100		
BLK	31	41	30	33	48	40	22	45	61		
HSP	51	53	35	57	56	43	33	72	64		
MUL	54	53	54	72	73	38	65	76	90		
WHT	74	64	41	80	70	56	64	87	83		
FRL	36	44	31	43	51	39	24	53	65		

### 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	60
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	50
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	600
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	99%
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%	
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	50
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	
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%	

Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	81
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
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%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	59
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	65
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	
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%	
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	71
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	48
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

## 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.**

Students with disabilities showed the lowest performance. These students had less restrictive environment (LRE) time with non-disabled peers than students at schools of similar size. Students with disabilities are a high majority percentage of the lowest quartile group, that also did not meet or exceed the district and state averages to make gains in ELA. Supporting every student with what they need with rigorous standards and instruction, allowing for appropriate accommodations to support their ability, to be able to make gains and achievement in the LRE possible. Continuing to provide professional development in best practices for inclusive education (universal design for learning, differentiated instruction, classroom management, visual supports, PBS and collaborative planning) must be a priority to support all students. We also showed a drop in ELL students gains in ELA achievement, as well as African American students showed a drop in lowest quartile in ELA and Math from 2018. ELA achievement for African American students was down though math achievement was up. Students with limited language skills need additional support, as well as our lowest quartile readers and will benefit from increased professional development opportunities for teachers with implementation support to benefit students.

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

The ELL students achievement in ELA showed the largest drop of 12 points from the prior year. The number of ELL students has increased with limited resources - support, programs, family involvement activities and teacher awareness. These students also need many of the same strategies used to support our students with disabilities and lowest quartile students. Continuing to increase universal design for learning, differentiated instruction, classroom management, visual supports, PBS and collaborative planning. Working with the district we need to locate additional resources that may replace Read 180 to better support the needs of our ELL students. For the 19-20 school year 7th & 8th grade Reading students will be using Iready and IXL for 6th grade students. Teachers will get support and professional development in implementation strategies and using data to drive students.

**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 lowest quartile for ELA was a 7 point gap from the state averages. These combines the needs and lack of gain made by ELL students, black students and students with disabilities. Lack of quality curriculum that helps identify students greatest individual area of concern to help support and improve those skills enabling them to make gains. Increase strategies parents and students can work on at home and increase their interest in reading and use of language.

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

Math lowest quartile made a 6 point increase over the previous year and over the district and state average. Increasing summer math activities, supporting students math strategies with IXL for 6th grade students, increasing number of students taking advanced math and being prepared and ready for Algebra in 8th grade. the math teachers worked collaborative with district staff to get a better understanding of AIMS and FSA data. The collaboration allowed for teachers to planning and implement standards with greatest of confidence. Students were able to value their efforts as they came to understand their personal data.

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

The EWS data shows that the at least one third of our students are a level 1 in ELA and math. These students also are experiencing course failures at a higher rate and lack of 100% attendance. Attendance has been affected by the number of suspensions of these students. Working as a faculty to address different strategies to support students who have higher referrals. Tough kids toolbox school wide training during three faculty meetings. Teachers are also are going to participate in coaching, modeling and learning walks with district coaches. The teachers will participate in four coaching sessions, as well being coached, observed and discussing feedback to change management as well as instructional practices that allow for restorative strategies. Increase faculty awareness of restorative practices with presentations from the River Phoenix organization. Teacher leaders will attend restorative justice and lead formal circles at KMS. Teachers are also participating in socio-emotional learning circles to help with communication with students to decrease behavior in class.

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

1. Students with disabilities - ELA and Math
2. ELA support of Lowest quartile students in ELL and African American students
3. ELA achievement for ELL and African American students
4. Science achievement
5. Decrease suspensions of African American students to increase time in school, restorative practices, and mentoring support

## Part III: Planning for Improvement

### Areas of Focus:



#1	
<b>Title</b>	Decrease Suspensions
<b>Rationale</b>	Students in lowest quartile have highest suspension rate and lose instructional time when they miss school, due to suspensions. Having quality instructional time with all students so they can get what they need to be able to make growth on their FSA and standards based instruction daily in the classroom. .
<b>State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve</b>	Decrease our suspensions of African American students by at least 15% annually for the 19-20 school year. Target is 70. Decrease overall suspensions by 10% to 116.
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome</b>	Austin McNichols (mcnicholsa@gm.sbac.edu)
<b>Evidence-based Strategy</b>	Teachers school wide will have instruction in Toolbox for Tough Kids in three faculty meetings. Nine teachers from various grade levels and subject areas will participate in a Learning Walks on four occasions to evaluate quality instruction in peer classrooms that diffuses difficult students and allows for restorative strategies. The teachers will be observed and coached by district coaches on several occasions. Restorative practices with entire faculty, followed up with Educator dialogue with eleven teachers and restorative circle practices with twelve students. Restorative justice trainers from KMS will learn strategies and then lead formal circles at school. PBIS will increase to allow for social emotional learning circles in academic circles.
<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy</b>	The rationale for this begins with the need to improve equitable practices that allow for every student to have the opportunity to make academic growth in ELA and math. There is a achievement gap found when analyzing the data for ELA and math between white students and African American students To best support all students and increase their ability to achieve students must be in school and teachers can learn motivation strategies that increase students desire to be in class and attempt task.
<b>Action Step</b>	
<b>Description</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Tough Kids Toolbox instruction for all faculty members in three faculty meeting, during the months of August, October, and December. Nine teachers will participate in further Learning Walks with district coaches as they will observe a number of classrooms on four different occasions and then debrief about restorative and instructional strategies that can improve management of behavior, as well as ways to diffuse tough students prior to behavior escalating with motivational techniques, procedures and contracts. Other faculty members will be volunteers to have their classrooms walked through . The experiences and strategies will be shared within their grade levels teams to increase all teachers awareness and interest in seeking further experience.</li> <li>2. Restorative Practices - Teachers school-wide will be instructed in professional development by the River Phoenix foundation in a faculty meeting. Then over two days eleven teachers will be able to train in-depth in dialogue that will encourage restorative practices, as well as strategies. The teachers will later meet with twelve students to have restorative educational dialogue - where there will be role reversals, open dialogue that will lead to better understanding of students insight and teachers. The experiences will be shared in grade level meetings.</li> <li>3. Restorative Justice - Two teacher trainers - a dean and counselor will attend district wide</li> </ol>

training in October to learning additional strategies in restorative practices for the most difficult situations. They will return to school and lead formal circles with families, teachers and students to support improvement in their social justices .

4. PBIS - Social Emotional Learning Circles - School wide teachers are working to increase positive behaviors that can support students learning of behaviors that acceptable. Grade level teams, as well as, teachers are working on Kcash speeding options for students in their classrooms. Administration also offers special opportunities for students to spend the reward and to decrease cost of at sporting events - encourage school spirit and appropriate sportsmanship behaviors. A group of nine teachers will participate in social emotional circles within their academic departments to improve instructional practices that support students ability to engage in learning, as well as, provide teachers with insight into practices that improve instruction for every students to provide them with what they need.

**Person Responsible** Sherry Estes (estessl@gm.sbac.edu)

---

#2	
<b>Title</b>	Lowest Quartile of ELA and Math
<b>Rationale</b>	To continue to give every student the opportunity to achieve at grade level standards and to improve the gaps in achievement that occurs between African American and white students.
<b>State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve</b>	By increasing the ELA lowest quartile gain to 43% and math lowest quartile to 66%, Science achievement to 59% we will increase the overall achievement gains that will meet or exceed the district's goals.
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome</b>	Austin McNichols (mcnicholsa@gm.sbac.edu)
<b>Evidence-based Strategy</b>	Focused learning walks with Coaches, Data collection and focused feedback based on coaching model. To improve instructional techniques and instructional practices that benefit every students ability to be successful and master standards.
<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy</b>	Using a collaborative approach based out of the University of Washington - Focused walk through or learning walks will increase teachers collaborative discussions about practices and strategies that increase their ability to reach all students. The approach allows for a distributed power that actively engages all stake holders in the processes of generating, analyzing, reflecting and acting on walk through data, The power of collaboration when there is a clear purpose and shared leadership has a drastic impact on achievement.
<b>Action Step</b>	
<b>Description</b>	<p>1. Crate Walks with Bessie Criscione and Ginger Stanford - The eight teachers will be grouped by subject areas - focused on Language Arts, Social Studies and Science. They will work to gain additional knowledge of Webb's depth of knowledge and Florida Standards based instruction. The will participate in classroom walk through where they will analyze the teacher created lessons and work that is assigned to students comparing it to the level of difficulty laid out in the standards. They will collaboratively plan lessons are engaging students in the appropriate Webb's level and evaluate students ability to master the standard being instructed.</p> <p>2. Universal design for learning Professional development with Learning Walks - Lead by teacher leader on campus - Kristina Matrone- Teachers meet for a full day of professional development to learn about strategies, break down barriers, practice strategies and learn about UDL. The ten teachers will have three additional days to do school wide learning walks to observe UDL, thinking about additional ways to implement and be able to coach peer teachers with strategies. The focus will be content and process to support every student with what they need in a diverse and versatile learning environment.</p> <p>3. Collaborative planning for every teacher by subject area. They will meet three times a year to work with district teacher on special assignment in their subject area as well as KMS administration. The teachers will work to analyze data from FSA, AIMS, IReady for ELA and IXL for sixth grade. They will evaluate progress of students based on previous instruction and look deeper into standards to develop a common language among grade levels and departments. The teachers will use CPALMS to develop units and lessons that are more appropriately matched to the standards they are instructing.</p> <p>4. Book Study - Better than Carrots or Sticks lead by a teacher leader on campus ( Ashley Ambrose) with eight teachers involved with the book study. They will meet four times and</p>

follow up the professional development with using two strategies from the book - they will share their insight and discoveries as well as their implementation of strategies with their grade level teams

**Person Responsible** Ginger Stanford (stanfogb@gm.sbac.edu)

---

#3	
<b>Title</b>	Increase performance of Students with Disability (SWD)
<b>Rationale</b>	Students with disabilities scored lower on state assessments than their non-disabled peers. In order to provide equity, we must provide our students with disabilities the resources and instruction that will assist them in meeting performance levels on state assessments.
<b>State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve</b>	Increase the achievement levels of Students with Disabilities in ELA, Math, and Science by 5 percentage points in each category.
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome</b>	Sherry Estes (estessl@gm.sbac.edu)
<b>Evidence-based Strategy</b>	Strategies used to meet this goal will include the use of research-based interventions of iReady for ELA instruction, IXL for Math instruction, and Universal Design for Learning in all subject areas.
<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy</b>	The focus of Universal Design for Learning will be content and process to support every student with what they need in a diverse and versatile learning environment. The additional supports of iReady and IXL in the classroom provide intervention, support, and enrichment for our students to increase their achievement in ELA, Math, and Science. The ESE department and district ESE meet in the Spring of 2019 and analyzed Best Practices in Inclusive Education for KMS and we have addressed these concerns through these goals.
<b>Action Step</b>	
<b>Description</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Universal design for learning Professional development with Learning Walks - Lead by teacher leader on campus - Kristina Matrone- Teachers meet for a full day of professional development to learn about strategies, break down barriers, practice strategies and learn about UDL. The ten teachers will have three additional days to do school wide learning walks to observe UDL, thinking about additional ways to implement and be able to coach peer teachers with strategies. The focus will be content and process to support every student with what they need in a diverse and versatile learning environment.</li> <li>2. iReady has been provided to Kanapaha by the District office and is being implemented in all ESE Language Arts classes as well as all 6th grade and 7th grade ELA/Reading classes. The students will take diagnostic assessments and throughout the year will work on the program to increase their knowledge and skills in reading and language arts concepts.</li> <li>3. IXL Math - for 6th grade - has been provided to Kanapaha by the District office and is being implemented in many Kanapaha classes. The students will take diagnostic assessments and throughout the year will work on the program to increase their knowledge and skills in reading and language arts concepts.</li> <li>4. We have also increased our LRE for our students exposing them more to the standard curriculum and increasing their time with non-disabled peers.</li> <li>5. We are monitoring SWD discipline referrals and suspensions to be more proactive in keeping them in class and in school. This connects to our discipline goal of decreasing our suspension numbers this year.</li> </ol>
<b>Person Responsible</b>	Sherry Estes (estessl@gm.sbac.edu)

**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).**

Providing Mentoring and support for all students is a priority- Kanapaha has partnered with the Greenhouse Church. They provide both volunteers and mentors during the school day. They mentor and tutor students during lunch time. Additionally, they will support teachers in the classroom and serve as Take-Stock Mentors. Teachers work to build relationships with students that support a student's desire to challenge themselves in academics and to be able to trust an adult if they are stressed or facing a problem or challenge they need support to handle As a Trauma Sensitive School - teachers have an awareness that there is more to the student than that which is visible to us. Teachers also serve as mentors to our high-risk students identified and monitored by our Student service team. As a PAL's school - students also take on rolls to support each other. The peer mentors are trained and picked by counselors with recommendations by teachers.

New teachers to our school have also have mentors - teachers that volunteer to support them in their transition to the culture of KMS. Mentors support them in discipline strategies, academic data driven instruction and creating a family involved learning community. This opens lines of communication in case there is something they need and they have additional support beside administrators and helps encourage use of strategies previously learned in professional development in last few years..

Supporting students to learn from their disciplinary consequences and focus them to have greater understanding on their ability to control their choices and actions. Students who are suspended have the opportunity for "Restart Day." The student meets with faculty/staff upon their return to discuss why they were suspended and how their reactions might be different in the future. Using the BASE curriculum in ISD students move to Tier 2 interventions which includes videos and lessons that students complete.

We also have very supportive Business Partners who help with fund-raising and giving incentives to utilize with our PBIS program. We implement a school-wide Discipline plan which includes school- rules, a discipline matrix to ensure consistent consequences. Our priority school wide is on PBIS and teachers have created K-Cash systems in their classrooms, opportunities to spend in the lunch room and lunch time and to allow all students to have access to school sponsored events.

Our PTSA is active and supports our school with volunteers and financially through teacher mini-grants. Our SAC, which is composed of school personnel, parents, and community members, also supports instruction and school activities financially.

We encourage parental involvement by showing parents how to utilize the Skyward Family access to view upcoming events, grades, assignments, absences, and behavior. We send home school newsletters quarterly, and update the school website regularly. Parent conferences receive priority during teacher planning time four mornings a week. Phone homes are used to notify parents of important information. We have multiple parent nights throughout the year to discuss relevant educational events and topics. We also update the school marquee frequently with important information regarding school events and activities.

Parents in eighth grade will have presentation this year in regards to high school options which include vocational as well as.