

Pinellas County Schools

Azalea Middle School



2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

| | |
|---------------------------------------|-----------|
| School Demographics | 3 |
| Purpose and Outline of the SIP | 4 |
| School Information | 7 |
| Needs Assessment | 10 |
| Planning for Improvement | 16 |
| Title I Requirements | 0 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 32 |

Azalea Middle School

7855 22ND AVE N, St Petersburg, FL 33710

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

Demographics

Principal: Susan Alvaro

Start Date for this Principal: 6/1/2018

| | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 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) | 100% |
| 2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (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* |
| School Grades History | 2018-19: D (39%) 2017-18: C (42%) 2016-17: F (31%) 2015-16: D (35%) 2014-15: D (35%) |
| 2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information* | |
| SI Region | Central |
| Regional Executive Director | Lucinda Thompson |
| Turnaround Option/Cycle | N/A |
| Year | |
| Support Tier | |

| ESSA Status | CS&I |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------|
| * As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here . | |

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Pinellas County School Board on 9/10/2019.

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.

Table of Contents

| | |
|---------------------------------------|-----------|
| Purpose and Outline of the SIP | 4 |
| School Information | 7 |
| Needs Assessment | 10 |
| Planning for Improvement | 16 |
| Title I Requirements | 0 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 32 |

Azalea Middle School

7855 22ND AVE N, St Petersburg, FL 33710

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

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 | Yes | 100% |
| Primary Service Type (per MSID File) | Charter School | 2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2) |
| K-12 General Education | No | 68% |

School Grades History

| Year | 2018-19 | 2017-18 | 2016-17 | 2015-16 |
|-------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| Grade | D | C | F | D |

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Pinellas County School Board on 9/10/2019.

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.

Azalea Middle School creates a quality educational setting that prepares each learner for college, career, and life by promoting critical thinking skills, providing a relevant and rigorous curriculum, and building a positive climate and culture.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Azalea Middle School strives to be a school in harmony by creating an environment with an intense focus centered on the academic, social, and emotional well being of all of our learners.

School Motto: Azalea Middle School's got GAME!

Growth Mindset

Academic Achievement

Mindful Behavior

Equitable Attitude

Our Commitments

Azalea Middle School Staff will

Work as a community

Work with our community

Demonstrate integrity and respect for all

Maintain a united focus

Work to instill hope

Show students and parents we care

Be ambassadors for our school

Lead by example

Be consistent

Continue to develop our professional practice

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 |
|---------------------|------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Brittain, Thomas | Principal | The principal is the instructional leader overseeing the full academic operations of the school. The assistant principals are assigned subject areas and grade levels to supervise and oversee the instructional staff, planning, and implementation of those areas. They serve as instructional leaders for their content areas and staff. |
| | | The MTSS coach monitors data and provides support to instructional staff and improve overall student performance. Additionally, the MTSS coach oversees and facilitates the PBIS systems at AMS to monitor its effectiveness in behavioral changes and area of growth. The MTSS coach will coordinates and facilitates montly MTSS and CST meetings. |
| | | School counselors responsible for monitoring the academic, emotional, and behavioral progression of every learner for progression in their grade level. |
| | | Instructional Coaches will provide assistance and ongoing professional learning to instructional staff. They will regularly observe and provide feedback to teachers regarding instructional improvement, data analysis, and student achievement. |
| Short, Carrie | Assistant Principal | |
| MacNeal, Julie | School Counselor | |
| Lengner, Kristy | Instructional Coach | |
| Lovett, Danielle | Teacher, K-12 | |
| Carter, Brittany | Instructional Coach | |
| Conroy, Jackie | Instructional Coach | |
| Helbling, Brenda | Instructional Coach | |
| Penna, Allison | School Counselor | |
| Roberts, Terry | Instructional Coach | |

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 | 337 | 291 | 299 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 927 | |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 18 | 36 | 21 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 75 | |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 | |
| 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 | 143 | 145 | 122 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 410 | |
| | 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 | 202 | 206 | 166 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 574 | |

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 | 3 | 5 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 | |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | |

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

47

Date this data was collected or last updated

Friday 8/30/2019

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 | |
| 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 | |

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 | 2 | 8 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 24 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 27 | 54 | 54 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 135 |
| Course failure in ELA or Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 187 | 196 | 260 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 643 |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 146 | 125 | 90 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 361 |

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 | 207 | 211 | 209 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 627 |

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 | 26% | 52% | 54% | 27% | 51% | 52% |
| ELA Learning Gains | 38% | 55% | 54% | 36% | 51% | 54% |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | 35% | 47% | 47% | 26% | 40% | 44% |
| Math Achievement | 29% | 55% | 58% | 22% | 54% | 56% |
| Math Learning Gains | 39% | 52% | 57% | 26% | 52% | 57% |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 37% | 46% | 51% | 26% | 44% | 50% |
| Science Achievement | 27% | 51% | 51% | 28% | 51% | 50% |
| Social Studies Achievement | 57% | 68% | 72% | 34% | 65% | 70% |

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

| Indicator | Grade Level (prior year reported) | | | Total |
|---------------------------------|-----------------------------------|---------|---------|---------|
| | 6 | 7 | 8 | |
| Number of students enrolled | 337 (0) | 291 (0) | 299 (0) | 927 (0) |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 18 (0) | 36 (0) | 21 (0) | 75 (0) |
| One or more suspensions | 1 (0) | 5 (0) | 6 (0) | 12 (0) |
| Course failure in ELA or Math | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 143 (0) | 145 (0) | 122 (0) | 410 (0) |
| | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) |

Grade Level Data

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

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

| ELA | | | | | | |
|-----------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 06 | 2019 | 23% | 51% | -28% | 54% | -31% |
| | 2018 | 23% | 49% | -26% | 52% | -29% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 0% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 07 | 2019 | 26% | 51% | -25% | 52% | -26% |
| | 2018 | 21% | 48% | -27% | 51% | -30% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 5% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 3% | | | | |
| 08 | 2019 | 30% | 55% | -25% | 56% | -26% |
| | 2018 | 33% | 55% | -22% | 58% | -25% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -3% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 9% | | | | |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|-----------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 06 | 2019 | 19% | 44% | -25% | 55% | -36% |
| | 2018 | 16% | 45% | -29% | 52% | -36% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 3% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 07 | 2019 | 36% | 60% | -24% | 54% | -18% |
| | 2018 | 44% | 59% | -15% | 54% | -10% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -8% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 20% | | | | |
| 08 | 2019 | 11% | 31% | -20% | 46% | -35% |
| | 2018 | 21% | 31% | -10% | 45% | -24% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -10% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | -33% | | | | |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
|-----------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 08 | 2019 | 27% | 51% | -24% | 48% | -21% |
| | 2018 | 28% | 53% | -25% | 50% | -22% |
| 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 | 63% | 68% | -5% | 71% | -8% |
| 2018 | 54% | 66% | -12% | 71% | -17% |
| Compare | | 9% | | | |
| 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 | 69% | 55% | 14% | 61% | 8% |
| 2018 | 81% | 57% | 24% | 62% | 19% |
| Compare | | -12% | | | |
| GEOMETRY EOC | | | | | |
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2019 | 0% | 56% | -56% | 57% | -57% |
| 2018 | 0% | 56% | -56% | 56% | -56% |
| 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 | 7 | 26 | 31 | 8 | 36 | 41 | 14 | 24 | | | |
| ELL | 25 | 38 | 50 | 29 | 41 | | | | | | |
| ASN | 73 | 79 | | 73 | 57 | | | | | | |
| BLK | 10 | 29 | 33 | 13 | 31 | 33 | 6 | 39 | 32 | | |
| HSP | 32 | 38 | 41 | 39 | 43 | 47 | 30 | 60 | 65 | | |
| MUL | 39 | 48 | | 36 | 39 | | 60 | | 50 | | |
| WHT | 44 | 47 | 38 | 48 | 50 | 44 | 58 | 77 | 72 | | |
| FRL | 22 | 36 | 35 | 27 | 39 | 35 | 22 | 54 | 58 | | |

| 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 | 4 | 26 | 30 | 9 | 30 | 33 | | 23 | | | |
| ELL | 13 | 36 | 27 | 16 | 49 | | 13 | | | | |
| ASN | 47 | 42 | | 55 | 65 | | 45 | | | | |
| BLK | 11 | 35 | 41 | 13 | 38 | 39 | 10 | 36 | 53 | | |
| HSP | 28 | 51 | 48 | 37 | 56 | 73 | 28 | 58 | 70 | | |
| MUL | 36 | 50 | | 40 | 49 | 30 | 26 | | | | |
| WHT | 39 | 46 | 54 | 47 | 56 | 56 | 41 | 67 | 72 | | |
| FRL | 20 | 41 | 45 | 26 | 45 | 46 | 18 | 49 | 62 | | |
| 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 | 7 | 21 | 19 | 6 | 13 | 14 | 6 | 12 | | | |
| ELL | 13 | 30 | | 13 | 27 | | | 25 | | | |
| ASN | 55 | 64 | | 50 | 45 | | | | | | |
| BLK | 13 | 27 | 25 | 7 | 20 | 24 | 7 | 16 | 35 | | |
| HSP | 27 | 42 | 26 | 20 | 25 | 35 | 29 | 27 | 46 | | |
| MUL | 41 | 42 | | 32 | 42 | | 33 | 56 | | | |
| WHT | 42 | 42 | 30 | 39 | 31 | 27 | 55 | 53 | 56 | | |
| FRL | 22 | 32 | 26 | 16 | 23 | 25 | 20 | 28 | 44 | | |

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) | CS&I |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students | 40 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students | YES |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 4 |
| Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency | 48 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 399 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 10 |
| Percent Tested | 97% |
| Subgroup Data | |
| Students With Disabilities | |
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities | 23 |
| 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 | 39 |
| English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | YES |
| 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 | 71 |
| 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 | 25 |
| Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | YES |
| Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32% | |
| Hispanic Students | |
| Federal Index - Hispanic Students | 44 |
| 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 | 45 |
| 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 | 53 |
| 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 | 38 |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | YES |
| 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.

Our lowest performing component is our science data. Our results have been stagnate for three years never reaching 30% proficiency and falling significantly below state and district averages. Several factors contributed to last year's low performance including the loss of our science coach, several long term instructional vacancies, and a large number of students who struggle with reading and ELA.

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

The performance of our L25% in both ELA and Math had significant drops. That subgroup also affects our overall proficiency and gains. Providing earlier and consecutive supports to those student did not happen in the 2018 school year. Student's progress was monitored but accurate and leading data was analyzed incorrectly. The MAP assessment and its data was underutilized as measure to identify struggling students provide them with targeted supports for academic improvement.

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 data component with the greatest gap was our math proficiency. The state average is 58% while Azalea seriously under performs at 29%. Several factors contributed to last year's low performance including the lack of a math coach. Teachers did not consistently ensure curriculum, instructions, and assessments are designed and delivered with a clear focus on continuous improvement of student engagement and academic achievement. While student progress was monitored but several data points were misinterpreted that did not allow for accurate implementation of student supports.

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

The data component that showed the most improvement was our social studies achievement. Our proficiency has experienced a two year growth, increasing another 6% points last year. Several initiatives were launched last year for social studies including increased data analysis of district unit and cycle assessments, student goal setting based on standards, remediation pullouts based on the results of unit and cycle assessments, increased use of literacy strategies, and Saturday review bootcamps to remediate and review content.

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

Our largest area of concern the number of students who have scored a level one of the 2018-2019 state assessment. 42% of our students scored a level 1 on the FSA ELA assessment and 38% of our students scored level 1 on the FSA Math assessment.

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

1. Increased monitoring of teacher practice and feedback to support teacher growth.
2. The use of curriculum specialists and academic coaches to provide academic supports for L25 and Level 1 students.
3. Increased parent and community engagement as an effort to increase student success.
4. Significant increase of early interventions for our at-risk students
5. Increased opportunities for on-line course work for students falling behind grade level.
6. Intense focus on academic data and supports for ESSA subgroups, in particular our ESE and Black students who have been below 32% for two years.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

| #1 | |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Title | English/ Language Arts |
| Rationale | Our current level of performance is 26% of our learners scored at the proficient level or above in ELA, as evidenced in Spring 2018 Reading FSA. We expect our performance level to be increase to 36% of our students scoring at the proficient level or above in ELA by Spring 2019. Additionally our learning gains in ELA fell from 42% to 38%. This significant downward trend in ELA has prompted a schoolwide focus on core instruction and support for our ESSA subgroups and L25 learners. |
| State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve | The percent of all students scoring at the proficient level or above in ELA will increase from 26% to 36%, as measured by the 2020 Reading FSA. |
| Person responsible for monitoring outcome | Brenda Helbling (helblingb@pcsb.org) |
| Evidence-based Strategy | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Enhance staff ability to engage students in rigorous complex tasks. 2. Us bi-weekly data to continually assess learners monitor profess towards proficiency. 3. Enhance staff capacity to identify critical content from the standards in alignment with district resources 4. Use of iReady diagnostics testing to provide real time data to personalize instruction for students that best allows for academic growth |
| Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Assessments are written at a higher depth of knowledge than our students usually encounter. We need to increase their exposure to more rigorous course content in an effort to prepare them to struggle with academically challenging material. 2. The use of real time data will allow all stakeholders to adequately plan for the needs of all learners in an effort to differentiate, scaffold, and modify and adjust instruction. 3. The increase use of evidence based strategies will be used in all classrooms in an effort to increase standards based instruction that are focused on reading strategies and creating a common language for learners to reference. 4. Develop a collaborative partnership with the Achievement Network to improve teaching and learning utilizing best practices, improved coaching, and focused professional learning. |
| Action Step | |
| Description | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Teachers increase the frequency of exposure to rigorous tasks daily by every classroom teacher. 2. Allow for the strategic practice of reading and writing strategies in every classroom. 3. Instructional coaches will ensure teachers have the proper support to administer bi-weekly assessments in a manner in which students have the opportunity to show their best efforts and accurate scores. 2. Instructional coaches and teachers will utilize data from bi-weekly assessments to create rigorous lesson plans that provide accommodations, differentiation, and scaffolded supports (PLCs). 3. The instructional leadership team will plan constructive walk throughs to provide feedback and support for teacher growth and to identify trends and makes plans to increase exposure to reading and writing. 4. Instructional coaches will plan to monitor ELA and reading classes to to provide feedback for teacher growth and model lessons and strategies. |

4. Small group pull outs will be instituted based on bi-weekly assessment results that identify students who are not demonstrating proficiency with an intense focus on our ESSA subgroups and L25%.
5. ELA and Reading teachers will utilize district resources and strategies to plan to ensure high engagement, rigor and progress monitoring.
6. All instructional staff will provide opportunities for explicit vocabulary instruction as well as opportunities for students to determine the meanings of words using the context of the text.
7. All instructional staff will utilize the school wide reading and writing TREES strategy and will integrate them across contents.
8. Encourage productive struggle for students as they work through vocabulary and comprehension using evidenced based strategies.

Person Responsible Brenda Helbling (helblingb@pcsb.org)

| #2 | |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Title | Mathematics |
| Rationale | Our current level of performance is 29% proficiency, as evidenced in the spring 2019 FSA. We expect our performance level to be 40% proficiency by May 2020. Additionally, our learning gains decreased from 48% to 39%. The decrease in both proficiency and learning gains illustrate a significant deficiency in mathematics. |
| State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve | The percentage of all students achieving math proficiency will increase from 29% to 40%, as measured by the 2020 Math FSA. |
| Person responsible for monitoring outcome | Jackie Conroy (conroyj@pcsb.org) |
| Evidence-based Strategy | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Strengthen staff ability to engage students in complex tasks. 2. Enhance staff capacity to identify critical content from the Standards in alignment with district resources. 3. Support staff to utilize data to organize students to interact with content in manners which differentiates/scaffolds instruction to meet the needs of each student. 4. Use of iReady diagnostics testing to provide real time data to personalize instruction for students that best allows for academic growth |
| Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Assessments are written at a higher depth of knowledge than our students usually encounter. We need to increase their exposure to more rigorous course content to prepare them to struggle with academically challenging material. 2. The increase use of evidence-based strategies will be used in all classrooms in an effort to increase standards based instruction that are focused on reading strategies and creating a common language for learners to reference 3. The use of real time data will allow all stakeholders to adequately plan for the needs of all learners to differentiate, scaffold, and modify and adjust instruction. 4. Develop a collaborative partnership with the Achievement Network to improve teaching and learning utilizing best practices, improved coaching, and focused professional learning. |
| Action Step | |
| Description | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Math teachers will provide students with opportunities to struggle with informational texts, write about mathematical processes, and utilize longer more challenging mathematics based performance tasks to progressively increase the depth of knowledge within classroom lesson plans. 2. Teachers will utilize district resources to effectively plan units and performance based tasks that incorporate standards for mathematical practice. 3. Teachers will participate in regular, monthly professional learning communities to allow for common planning, data analyzation, rigor reviews, and task analysis. 4. Learners will participate in bi-weekly assessment are aligned to standards. Using the data from these assessments, teachers and other instructional staff will combine ideas to provide high quality interventions for all student needs. 5. Instructional Coaches will pull data from bi-weekly assessments and analyze the data for areas of growth, trends, and possible interventions. Together they will have data chats to discuss data and make a plan for standards based interventions. 6. The instructional leadership team will plan constructive walk throughs to provide feedback and support for teacher growth and to identify trends and makes plans to |

increase exposure to complex curriculum.

7. Small group pull outs will be instituted based on bi-weekly assessment results that identify students who are not demonstrating proficiency with an intense focus on our ESSA subgroups and L25%.

**Person
Responsible**

Jackie Conroy (conroyj@pcsb.org)

| #3 | |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Title | Science |
| Rationale | Our current level of performance is 27% students achieving proficiency, as evidenced in NGSSS grade 8 Science assessment. This was a 1% decrease from the previous academic year. We expect our performance level to be 40% by May 2020. Our science scores have become stagnant and have not grown significantly over the past three years. Our results remain notably below that of district and state results. As a result we will focus on creating a more rigorous standards based instruction that continually monitors student progress and proficiency. |
| State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve | The percent of 8th grade students demonstrating proficiency will increase from 28% to 40%, as measured by the 8th Grade NGSSS Science Assessment. |
| Person responsible for monitoring outcome | Carrie Short (shortca@pcsb.org) |
| Evidence-based Strategy | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Enhance staff capacity to identify critical content from the standards in alignment with district resources. 2. Strengthen staff ability to engage students in complex tasks using scientific thinking skills. 3. Support staff to utilize data to organize students to interact with content in manners which differentiates and scaffolds instruction to meet the needs of each student. 4. Develop a collaborative partnership with the Achievement Network to improve teaching and learning utilizing best practices, improved coaching, and focused professional learning. |
| Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The increase use of evidence-based strategies will be used in all classrooms in an effort to increase standards based instruction that are focused on reading strategies and creating a common language for learners to reference 2. Assessments are written at a higher depth of knowledge than our students usually encounter. We need to increase their exposure to more rigorous course content to prepare them to struggle with academically challenging material. Specifically using performance based tasks and complex scientific thought processes. 3. The use of real time data will allow all stakeholders to adequately plan for the needs of all learners to differentiate, scaffold, and modify and adjust instruction. |
| Action Step | |
| Description | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Teachers and coaches will collaboratively plan and implement rigorous and engaging, standards-based lessons including higher order questions. performance based tasks, and complex scientific analysis. 2. Participate in regular, monthly professional learning communities to allow for common planning, data analyzation, rigor reviews, and task analysis. 3. Instructional staff will utilize district resources to effectively plan for units that incorporate rigorous performance tasks aligned to the standards. 4. Implementation of school wide literacy strategies in content areas. Specifically including writing in response to text, focused note taking, TREES, and the utilization of grade appropriate texts. 5. Learners will participate in bi-weekly assessment are aligned to standards. Using the data from these assessments, teachers and other instructional staff will combine ideas to |

provide high quality interventions for all student needs.

5. The instructional leadership team will pull data from bi-weekly and formative assessments to analyze for areas of growth, trends, and possible interventions. Teachers will adjust instruction, enrich and reteach, and provide evidence based interventions. .

6. The instructional leadership team will plan constructive walk throughs to provide feedback and support for teacher growth and to identify trends and makes plans to increase exposure to complex curriculum.

7. Small group pull outs will be instituted based on bi-weekly assessment results that identify students who are not demonstrating proficiency with an intense focus on our ESSA subgroups and L25%.

Person Responsible Carrie Short (shortca@pcsb.org)

| #4 | |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Title | Social Studies (Civics) |
| Rationale | Our current level of performance is 57% of our students achieving proficiency, as evidenced in Civics EOC. We expect our performance level to be 70% by May 2020. |
| State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve | The percent of all students achieving proficiency will increase from 57% to 70%, as measured by the 2020 Civics EOC. |
| Person responsible for monitoring outcome | Carrie Short (shortca@pcsb.org) |
| Evidence-based Strategy | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Strengthen staff ability to engage students in complex tasks. 2. Enhance staff capacity to identify critical content from the Standards in alignment with district resources. 3. Support staff to utilize data to organize students to interact with content in manners which differentiates/scaffolds instruction to meet the needs of each student. 4. Develop a collaborative partnership with the Achievement Network to improve teaching and learning utilizing best practices, improved coaching, and focused professional learning. |
| Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The increase use of evidence-based strategies will be used in all classrooms in an effort to increase standards based instruction that are focused on reading strategies and creating a common language for learners to reference 2. Assessments are written at a higher depth of knowledge than our students usually encounter. We need to increase their exposure to more rigorous course content to prepare them to struggle with academically challenging material. Specifically using performance based tasks and complex scientific thought processes. 3. The use of real time data will allow all stakeholders to adequately plan for the needs of all learners to differentiate, scaffold, and modify and adjust instruction. 4. All unit and cycle assessments have been aligned to the standards and EOC test. Using data from these assessments, teachers and other instructional staff can combine ideas to provide high quality interventions for all students. |
| Action Step | |
| Description | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Utilize district resources that include shorter, challenging and technical passages that elicit close and critical reading. 2. Teachers and staff developers will collaboratively plan and implement rigorous and engaging, standards-based lessons including higher order questions. performance based tasks, and complex text analysis. 2. Instructional staff will participate in regular, monthly professional learning communities to allow for common planning, data analysis, rigor reviews, and student work analysis. 3. Implementation of school wide literacy strategies in content areas. Specifically including writing in response to text, focused note taking, TREES, and the utilization of grade appropriate texts. 4. The instructional leadership team will plan constructive walk throughs to provide feedback and support for teacher growth and to identify trends and makes plans to increase exposure to complex curriculum. 5. Learners will participate in unit and cycle assessments that are aligned to standards. Using the data from these assessments, teachers and other instructional staff will |

combine ideas to provide high quality interventions for all student needs.

5. The instructional leadership team will pull data from unit and cycle assessments to analyze for areas of growth, academic trends, and possible student interventions. Teachers will adjust their instruction, enrich and reteach standards as needed, and provide evidence based interventions. .

7. Small group pull outs will be instituted based on unit and cycle assessment results that identify students who are not demonstrating proficiency with an intense focus on our ESSA subgroups and L25%.

**Person
Responsible**

Carrie Short (shortca@pcsb.org)

| #5 | |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Title | College Career Readiness |
| Rationale | Our current level of performance is 63% of students showing proficiency in accelerated courses, as evidenced in the Algebra I EOC, Geometry EOC, and industry certifications. We expect our performance level to be 75% by May 2020 |
| State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve | The percent of all students enrolled in highly rigorous courses will increase by 10% in the 2019-2020 school year. As a result the percentage of learners achieving proficiency in accelerated courses will increase from 63% to 75%, as measured by the Algebra EOC, Geometry EOC, and industry certification exams. |
| Person responsible for monitoring outcome | Julie MacNeal (macnealj@pcsb.org) |
| Evidence-based Strategy | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Strengthen teacher implementation of rigorous instructional practices. 2. Strengthen stakeholders' understanding of advanced course pathways. 3. Strengthen staff practice to communicate and engage students and families in planning when students are not on-track to be promoted with their cohort. 4. Utilize school wide AVID strategies that support governance, curriculum and instruction, data collection and analysis, professional learning, and student and parent outreach to ensure college readiness and improved academic performance for all students. |
| Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy | Increasing the opportunities for student access to rigorous courses will increase the success of students in all academic areas. Our team must develop a laser like focus to move students into accelerated courses to destroy the opportunity myth that they cannot advance comparable to others. |
| Action Step | |
| Description | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Facilitate professional learning to ensure WICOR strategies school wide. 2. Infuse career and college readiness into all core curriculum classes. 3. Integrate career and college readiness into literacy strategies across contents. 4. Identify and assist students with incorporating an appropriate level of rigor in their schedules. 5. The instructional leadership team will implement, monitor, and adjust school wide systems for academic support for students in rigorous courses. 6. The instructional leadership team will plan constructive walk throughs to provide feedback and support for teacher growth and to identify trends and makes plans to increase exposure to complex curriculum. |
| Person Responsible | Carrie Short (shortca@pcsb.org) |

| #6 | |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Title | Bridging the Gap Plan |
| Rationale | Our current level of performance shows a consistent gap between Black and non-Black students. There is a 28% gap in ELA, a 22% gap in Math, a 31.8% gap in HS readiness, a 31.6% gap in accelerated courses and a 14.1% gap in advanced courses. |
| State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve | The percent gap between of black students and non black students will decrease by 8% in areas as measured by the 2020 state assessments and behavioral data. |
| Person responsible for monitoring outcome | Kristy Lengner (lengnerk@pcsb.org) |
| Evidence-based Strategy | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Identify and support meeting the academic, social-emotional, and behavioral needs of each and every student. 2. Engage in equity problem solving processes to ensure the academic, social-emotional, and behavioral needs of each student. 3. Increase of school based experts that are trained as equity champions, culturally responsive instruction, restorative practices, and PBIS. 4. Create a school wide culture where all students feel they belong. 5. Develop a collaborative partnership with the Achievement Network to improve teaching and learning utilizing best practices, improved coaching, and focused professional learning. |
| Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. An overall improvement in the engagement and achievement will for black students to content with them to create a place of belonging that will prepare students and close all areas of the achievement gap. 2. Create a student centered environment the will provide all learners with what they need to be successful. |
| Action Step | |
| Description | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Provide targeted professional development and coaching to teachers and leaders on culturally relevant strategies to increase engagement and improve pass rates and grade point averages for black students. 2. Set up parent conferences with all black students who are not-on-track to graduate to review personalized learning plans. 3. Identify and provide additional culturally relevant books, resources and technology to supplement core instruction representing diverse perspectives as a way to increase student engagement. 4. Ensure black students are participating in extended learning opportunities before and after school and in extended school year programs through recruitment and targeted resources. 5. Provide training for teachers of accelerated and advanced courses that is specific to culturally relevant instruction to ensure engagement of black learners 6. Provide training for culturally relevant disciplinary practices and ensure strong implementation. 7. Implement Restorative Practices throughout the school. |
| Person Responsible | Kristy Lengner (lengnerk@pcsb.org) |

| #7 | |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Title | School Climate/ Conditions for Learning |
| Rationale | At Azalea Middle School, we use climate, culture, and conditions for learning as the basis of how we engage students in content and ultimately achieve and progress academically. |
| State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve | Decrease discipline referrals by 25% school-wide. |
| Person responsible for monitoring outcome | Kristy Lengner (lengnerk@pcsb.org) |
| Evidence-based Strategy | Positive Behavior Interventions and Supports, Multi-Tiered Systems of Support, Classroom Management and Crisis Prevention and Intervention, and Professional Development to teachers and staff. Develop a collaborative partnership with the Achievement Network to improve teaching and learning utilizing best practices, improved coaching, and focused professional learning. |
| Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy | PBIS aims to support to build effective environments in which positive behavior is more effective than problem behavior. PBIS emphasizes the use of preventative teaching and reinforcement based strategies to provide meaning and durable behavior and lifestyle outcomes. MTSS will use data to provide specific and individual supports to students in need. CPI and classroom management PD will provide teachers with strategies and support to maintain and increase positive classroom culture. |
| Action Step | |
| Description | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. PBIS, MTSS, CPI, and classroom management training will be provided during pre-school. 2. Teachers and staff will teach and explain PBIS to students and events will be calendared out for students during the first week of school. 3. MTSS will pull data and meet bi-weekly to plan and implement tiered interventions for specific students. 4. PBIS committee will meet bi-weekly to evaluate current rewards and events and problem-solve areas for improvement. 5. Instructional coaches will intervene on teachers most in need of classroom management support and assist teachers in working toward a more positive classroom culture. |
| Person Responsible | Carrie Short (shortca@pcsb.org) |

| #8 | |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Title | Attendance |
| Rationale | The daily attendance rate at Azalea Middle School increased by 3% to 92.1% for the 2018-2019 school year. However, 10% (81 students) of our population missed 10% or more of school days for the 2018-2019 school year. |
| State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve | Azalea Middle School intends to continue to increase our daily attendance rate, as well as decrease the amount of students missing more than 10% of school days to 5% of our student population. |
| Person responsible for monitoring outcome | Carrie Short (shortca@pcsb.org) |
| Evidence-based Strategy | Our Child Study Team will meet bi-weekly to combat student attendance issues. |
| Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy | In order to efficiently and systemically help students who are chronically absent, forming a Child Study Team by grade-level is imperative. Each meeting will be structured in a way where we discuss data and implement interventions for every child that is missing 10% or more days of school. |
| Action Step | |
| Description | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Phone calls home will be made and logged into FOCUS. 2. 3 and 5 attendance letters will be sent home and logged into FOCUS and SSWIMS. 3. Conferences will be held with students and their parents/guardians. 4. Home visits will be conducted for our students that do not make attendance improvements. 5. CST will petition the Truancy Court for our most severe cases. |
| Person Responsible | Carrie Short (shortca@pcsb.org) |

| #9 | |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Title | Family and Community Engagement |
| Rationale | Family and community engagement fosters partnerships among schools, family and community groups, and individuals. These partnerships result in sharing and maximizing resources in order to improve student academic achievement. |
| State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve | Increase parent and community engagement events. Increase two-way communication using Class Dojo. Improve school-related behaviors and reduce discipline. Improve student academic outcomes. |
| Person responsible for monitoring outcome | Terry Roberts (robertste@pcsb.org) |
| Evidence-based Strategy | School will host family engagement events throughout the school year providing parent educational activities to help parents support their children's learning. |
| Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy | Research says that the most effective forms of parental engagement are those that directly relate to student learning. This includes programs promoting shared reading, interactive homework, and learning support workshops. |
| Action Step | |
| Description | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Effectively communicate with families their students' progress and school processes/practices. 2. Provide academic tools in regard to their students' achievement at home. 3. Purposefully involve families with opportunities for them to advocate for their students. 4. intentionally build positive relationships with families and community partners. 5. Provide opportunities for parents and community members to volunteer for events on campus. |
| Person Responsible | Carrie Short (shortca@pcsb.org) |

| | |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| #10 | |
| Title | Healthy Schools |
| Rationale | Our current level of performance is 5 out of 6 modules in bronze, as evidenced in Alliance for a Healthier Generations Healthy School Program Assessment Modules. We expect our performance level to be 6 out of 6 modules by May 2019. The problem/gap is occurring because a, lack of physical activity beyond recommended # of minutes and the food sold in the BKC store does not adhere to smart snack guidelines. If our healthy school team can monitor the implementation of administrative guidelines for wellness our school, then the problem would be reduced and all modules would be completed. |
| State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve | Our school will be eligible in 6 out of 6 modules for /gold recognition by April 2019 as evidenced by the Alliance for a Healthier Generation's Healthy Schools Program Framework |
| Person responsible for monitoring outcome | Thomas Brittain (brittain@pcsb.org) |
| Evidence-based Strategy | Create more opportunities for physical activity at school. Create professional development and learning opportunities to increase school wellness for all stakeholders. |
| Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy | Healthy schools adopt policies and practices that empower students to eat better, move more, and feel their best. They offer nutritious meals and snacks, get students and staff moving with physical activity, and engage the entire school community in promoting healthy habits. As a result, healthier schools experience higher attendance rates, greater academic success, increased family engagement, and reduced staff turnover. |
| Action Step | |
| Description | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Assemble a Healthy School Team made up of a minimum of four (4) individuals including, but not limited to: PE Teacher/Health Teacher, Classroom Teacher, Wellness Champion, Administrator, Cafeteria Manager, Parent, and Student. 2. Attend district-supported professional development. 3. Complete Healthy Schools Program Assessment 4. Complete the SMART Snacks in School Documentation 5. Implement Healthy School Program Action Plan 6. Update Healthy Schools Program Assessment and Apply for Recognition |
| Person Responsible | Thomas Brittain (brittain@pcsb.org) |

| #11 | |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Title | ESSA Sub-groups |
| Rationale | Our current level of performance shows four subgroups (ELL, ESE, Black, Economically Disadvantaged) below 41% and two subgroups (ESE and Black) falling below 32% for two consecutive years. We expect our performance level to be increase to 41% proficiency in all subgroups by May 2020. |
| State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve | The percent of all students in ESSA subgroups achieving proficiency will increase to 41%, as measured by 2020 state assessments. |
| Person responsible for monitoring outcome | Thomas Brittain (brittain@pcsb.org) |
| Evidence-based Strategy | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. ESE students will have meaningful IEP goals that supplement foundational skills needed to engage in rigorous, grade level content in the least restrictive environment. 2. Ensure ESE students receive instruction designed to teach students to advocate for their academic, social, and emotional needs. 3. Ensure black students are provided with quality behavioral and academic strategies that are designed to increase academic exposure and reduce disproportionate discipline and placement issues. 4. Improved use of data to organize students to interact with content in ways which increase differentiation, scaffolds instructions, and meets the needs of each student. 5. Strengthen school processes for engaging all subgroups and families through meaningful communication and outreach. 6. Develop a collaborative partnership with the Achievement Network to improve teaching and learning utilizing best practices, improved coaching, and focused professional learning. |
| Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy | These strategies advocate for our lowest performing students who need the greatest supports. Individualized efforts to differentiate for every student will drive academic and behavior plans. |
| Action Step | |
| Description | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. ESE students placed within the master schedule to optimize support and effective instruction. 2. Increased opportunities for ESE and general education teachers to co-plan for differentiated instruction and support delivery. 3. Use evidence based practices for students with disabilities to improve foundational literacy and math skills to ensure grade level work. 4. Teach executive functioning and self determination skills to enhance organization and self advocacy. 5. Use extensive positive behavior supports to reinforce appropriate behavior and develop relationships. 6. Use de-escalation strategies to intervene safely and appropriately. 7. Plan for meaningful communication with community partners and families via class dojo, social media, the school website, and parent letters. 8. The instructional leadership team will plan constructive walk throughs to provide feedback and support for teacher growth and to identify trends and makes plans to increase exposure to complex curriculum. |

Person Responsible Thomas Brittain (brittain@pcsb.org)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities (optional)

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

Recruitment, development, and retainment of highly effective teachers.

Improvement of communication with community partners and families.

Increased data analysis of all core subjects with all stakeholders to attain areas of growth and need.

Improved processes including school safety, readiness to learn, and PBIS

Part V: Budget

The approved budget does not reflect any amendments submitted for this project.

| | | | | | | |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------|-----------------------------------------------|-----------------------------|----------------|-----|---------------------|
| 1 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: English/ Language Arts | | | | \$124,336.16 |
| | Function | Object | Budget Focus | Funding Source | FTE | 2019-20 |
| | 6400 | 130-Other Certified Instructional Personnel | 0121 - Azalea Middle School | UniSIG | 1.0 | \$45,011.53 |
| <i>Notes: Salary for the ELA Coach</i> | | | | | | |
| | 5100 | 120-Classroom Teachers | 0121 - Azalea Middle School | UniSIG | 1.0 | \$46,907.30 |
| <i>Notes: Salary for the Intervention Teacher</i> | | | | | | |
| | 5100 | 210-Retirement | 0121 - Azalea Middle School | UniSIG | 0.0 | \$3,973.05 |
| <i>Notes: Retirement Benefits for the Intervention Teacher</i> | | | | | | |
| | 5100 | 220-Social Security | 0121 - Azalea Middle School | UniSIG | 0.0 | \$2,908.26 |
| <i>Notes: Social Security Benefits for the Intervention Teacher</i> | | | | | | |
| | 5100 | 220-Social Security | 0121 - Azalea Middle School | UniSIG | 0.0 | \$680.14 |
| <i>Notes: Medicare Benefits for the Intervention Teacher</i> | | | | | | |
| | 5100 | 230-Group Insurance | 0121 - Azalea Middle School | UniSIG | 0.0 | \$8,800.00 |
| <i>Notes: Health Benefits for the Intervention Teacher</i> | | | | | | |
| | 6400 | 210-Retirement | 0121 - Azalea Middle School | UniSIG | 0.0 | \$3,812.48 |
| <i>Notes: Retirement Benefits for the ELA Coach</i> | | | | | | |
| | 6400 | 220-Social Security | 0121 - Azalea Middle School | UniSIG | 0.0 | \$2,790.72 |
| <i>Notes: Social Security Benefits for the ELA Coach</i> | | | | | | |
| | 6400 | 220-Social Security | 0121 - Azalea Middle School | UniSIG | 0.0 | \$652.68 |
| <i>Notes: Medicare Benefits for the ELA Coach</i> | | | | | | |
| | 6400 | 230-Group Insurance | 0121 - Azalea Middle School | UniSIG | 0.0 | \$8,800.00 |
| <i>Notes: Health Benefits for the ELA Coach</i> | | | | | | |
| 2 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Mathematics | | | | \$61,067.41 |

| | Function | Object | Budget Focus | Funding Source | FTE | 2019-20 |
|----------|---------------|----------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------|----------------|-----|---------------------|
| | 6400 | 130-Other Certified Instructional Personnel | 0121 - Azalea Middle School | UniSIG | 1.0 | \$45,011.53 |
| | | | <i>Notes: Salary for the Math Coach</i> | | | |
| | 6400 | 210-Retirement | 0121 - Azalea Middle School | UniSIG | 0.0 | \$3,812.48 |
| | | | <i>Notes: Retirement Benefits for the Math Coach</i> | | | |
| | 6400 | 220-Social Security | 0121 - Azalea Middle School | UniSIG | 0.0 | \$2,790.72 |
| | | | <i>Notes: Social Security Benefits for the Math Coach</i> | | | |
| | 6400 | 220-Social Security | 0121 - Azalea Middle School | UniSIG | 0.0 | \$652.68 |
| | | | <i>Notes: Medicare Benefits for the Math Coach</i> | | | |
| | 6400 | 230-Group Insurance | 0121 - Azalea Middle School | UniSIG | 0.0 | \$8,800.00 |
| | | | <i>Notes: Health Benefits for the Math Coach</i> | | | |
| 3 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Science | | | | \$61,067.41 |
| | Function | Object | Budget Focus | Funding Source | FTE | 2019-20 |
| | 6400 | 130-Other Certified Instructional Personnel | 0121 - Azalea Middle School | UniSIG | 1.0 | \$45,011.53 |
| | | | <i>Notes: Salary for the Science Coach</i> | | | |
| | 6400 | 210-Retirement | 0121 - Azalea Middle School | UniSIG | 0.0 | \$3,812.48 |
| | | | <i>Notes: Retirement Benefits for the Science Coach</i> | | | |
| | 6400 | 220-Social Security | 0121 - Azalea Middle School | UniSIG | 0.0 | \$2,790.72 |
| | | | <i>Notes: Social Security Benefits for the Science Coach</i> | | | |
| | 6400 | 220-Social Security | 0121 - Azalea Middle School | UniSIG | 0.0 | \$652.68 |
| | | | <i>Notes: Medicare Benefits for the Science Coach</i> | | | |
| | 6400 | 230-Group Insurance | 0121 - Azalea Middle School | UniSIG | 0.0 | \$8,800.00 |
| | | | <i>Notes: Health Benefits for the Science Coach</i> | | | |
| 4 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Social Studies (Civics) | | | | \$0.00 |
| 5 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: College Career Readiness | | | | \$0.00 |
| 6 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Bridging the Gap Plan | | | | \$0.00 |
| 7 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: School Climate/ Conditions for Learning | | | | \$154,099.00 |
| | Function | Object | Budget Focus | Funding Source | FTE | 2019-20 |
| | 6400 | 310-Professional and Technical Services | 0121 - Azalea Middle School | UniSIG | | \$28,000.00 |
| | | | <i>Notes: ANet Consultant (Professional Development)</i> | | | |
| | 6400 | 310-Professional and Technical Services | 0121 - Azalea Middle School | UniSIG | | \$17,600.00 |
| | | | <i>Notes: ANet Standards Boot Camp</i> | | | |
| | 6400 | 330-Travel | 0121 - Azalea Middle School | UniSIG | | \$4,400.00 |
| | | | <i>Notes: ANet Boot Camp Teacher Registrations</i> | | | |

| | | | | | | |
|----|--------|-------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------|--------|--------------|
| | 5100 | 369-Technology-Related Rentals | 0121 - Azalea Middle School | UniSIG | | \$6,000.00 |
| | | | Notes: MyANet platform site licenses | | | |
| | 6400 | 310-Professional and Technical Services | 0121 - Azalea Middle School | UniSIG | | \$13,500.00 |
| | | | Notes: Cambio Group Professional Development | | | |
| | 6400 | 310-Professional and Technical Services | 0121 - Azalea Middle School | UniSIG | | \$25,000.00 |
| | | | Notes: Center for Transformational Teacher Training (CT3) | | | |
| | 6400 | 310-Professional and Technical Services | 0121 - Azalea Middle School | UniSIG | | \$15,000.00 |
| | | | Notes: UnBound's Standards Institute Professional Development | | | |
| | 6400 | 310-Professional and Technical Services | 0121 - Azalea Middle School | UniSIG | | \$15,000.00 |
| | | | Notes: New Leaders (Inspiring Transformational Instructional Leaders) Program | | | |
| | 6400 | 310-Professional and Technical Services | 0121 - Azalea Middle School | UniSIG | | \$9,599.00 |
| | | | Notes: Harvard School of Education Data Wise | | | |
| | 6400 | 310-Professional and Technical Services | 0121 - Azalea Middle School | UniSIG | 1.0 | \$20,000.00 |
| | | | Notes: External Evaluator / Research Advisor | | | |
| 8 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Attendance | | | | \$0.00 |
| 9 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Family and Community Engagement | | | | \$0.00 |
| 10 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Healthy Schools | | | | \$0.00 |
| 11 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: ESSA Sub-groups | | | | \$0.00 |
| | | | | | Total: | \$417,947.81 |