

2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

## **Table of Contents**

| School Demographics            | 3  |
|--------------------------------|----|
| Purpose and Outline of the SIP | 4  |
| School Information             | 7  |
| Needs Assessment               | 9  |
| Planning for Improvement       | 16 |
| Title I Requirements           | 20 |
| Budget to Support Goals        | 22 |

Palm Beach - 0121 - Howell L. Watkins Middle School - 2019-20 SIP

# Howell L. Watkins Middle School

9480 MACARTHUR BLVD, Palm Beach Gardens, FL 33403

https://hlwm.palmbeachschools.org

Demographics

## **Principal: Presley Charles**

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2019

| <b>2019-20 Status</b> (per MSID File)   | Active   |
|---|--|
| School Type and Grades Served<br>(per MSID File)  | Middle School<br>6-8   |
| Primary Service Type<br>(per MSID File)   | K-12 General Education   |
| 2018-19 Title I School  | Yes  |
| 2018-19 Economically<br>Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate<br>(as reported on Survey 3)   | 100%   |
| <b>2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b><br>(subgroups with 10 or more students)<br>(subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an<br>asterisk) | Students With Disabilities*<br>English Language Learners*<br>Asian Students<br>Black/African American Students*<br>Hispanic Students*<br>Multiracial Students<br>White Students<br>Economically Disadvantaged<br>Students* |
| School Grades History   | 2018-19: C (45%)<br>2017-18: C (49%)<br>2016-17: C (43%)<br>2015-16: C (46%)<br>2014-15: C (45%)   |
| 2019-20 School Improvement (SI) In  | formation*   |
| SI Region   | Southeast  |
| Regional Executive Director   | LaShawn Russ-Porterfield   |
| Turnaround Option/Cycle   | N/A  |
| Year  | N/A  |
|   |  |

| ESSA Status | TS&I |
|-------------|------|
|             |      |

\* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, <u>click here</u>.

#### School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Palm Beach 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 <u>www.floridacims.org.</u>

#### 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               | 9  |
| Planning for Improvement       | 16 |
| Title I Requirements           | 20 |
| Budget to Support Goals        | 22 |

Palm Beach - 0121 - Howell L. Watkins Middle School - 2019-20 SIP

## Howell L. Watkins Middle School

#### 9480 MACARTHUR BLVD, Palm Beach Gardens, FL 33403

#### https://hlwm.palmbeachschools.org

#### **School Demographics**

| School Type and Gr<br>(per MSID F    |                     | 2018-19 Title I School | Disadvant           | Economically<br>taged (FRL) Rate<br>ted on Survey 3) |
|--------------------------------------|---------------------|------------------------|---------------------|--|
| Middle Sch<br>6-8                    | ool                 | Yes                    |                     | 92%  |
| <b>Primary Servio</b><br>(per MSID F | ••                  | Charter School         | (Reporte            | Minority Rate<br>ed as Non-white<br>Survey 2)        |
| K-12 General Ed                      | ducation            | No                     |                     | 93%  |
| School Grades Histo                  | ry                  |                        |                     |  |
| Year<br>Grade                        | <b>2018-19</b><br>C | <b>2017-18</b><br>C    | <b>2016-17</b><br>C | <b>2015-16</b><br>C                                  |
| School Board Appro                   | val                 |                        |                     |  |

This plan is pending approval by the Palm Beach 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 <a href="https://www.floridaCIMS.org">https://www.floridaCIMS.org</a>.

#### 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.

Howell L Watkins is committed to providing a world-class educational experience for the students and staff we serve. Providing an atmosphere and culture of excellence and equity that empowers each student and staff to reach their highest potential. Implementing campus initiatives that foster expanding awareness, developing skills, and amplifying ethical behaviors that are attributed to being responsible, productive and contributing members of society.

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

Howell L. Watkins as an entity of the School District of Palm Beach County envisions a dynamic, collaborative multi-cultural community where education and lifelong learning are valued, supported, and all learners reach their highest potential and succeed in the global economy. H.L. Watkins Middle School strives daily to bring out the best in all students and staff academically and socially, as we prepare our learners to be productive contributors of the world.

#### 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   |
|------------------------------|------------------------|---|
| Tomas<br>Andres,<br>Awilda   | Principal              | Provide the leadership and management necessary to administer and supervise<br>all programs, policies and activities of the school to ensure high quality<br>educational experiences and services for the students in a safe and enriching<br>environment. Commitment to the vision, mission and values of the Palm Beach<br>County School District.  |
| Turner-<br>Wright,<br>Shauna | Assistant<br>Principal | Provide the leadership and management necessary to administer and supervise<br>assigned programs as advised by school principal according to policies and<br>activities of the school to ensure high quality educational experiences and<br>services for the students in a safe and enriching environment. Commitment to<br>the vision, mission and values of the Palm Beach County School District.  |
| Angione,<br>Catherine        | Other                  | Teacher on Special Assignment to provide the leadership and management<br>necessary to administer and supervise assigned programs as advised by school<br>principal according to policies and activities of the school to ensure high quality<br>educational experiences and services for the students in a safe and enriching<br>environment. Commitment to the vision, mission and values of the Palm Beach<br>County School District.  |
| Haspil,<br>Melanie           | Other                  | Single School Culture Coach assigned to develop a common school culture<br>using data to provide leadership and management necessary to administer and<br>supervise the school's climate as advised by school principal according to<br>policies and activities of the school to ensure high quality educational<br>experiences and services for the students in a safe and enriching environment.<br>Commitment to the vision, mission and values of the Palm Beach County School<br>District. |

### Early Warning Systems

#### **Current Year**

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

| Indicator                       |   |   |   |   |   |   | Grad | de Lev | vel |   |    |    |    | Total |
|---------------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|------|--------|-----|---|----|----|----|-------|
| indicator                       | Κ | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6    | 7      | 8   | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total |
| Number of students enrolled     | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 318  | 339    | 331 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 988   |
| Attendance below 90 percent     | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 27   | 39     | 59  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 125   |
| One or more suspensions         | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 72   | 52     | 31  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 155   |
| Course failure in ELA or Math   | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 23   | 72     | 56  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 151   |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 102  | 123    | 147 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 372   |

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

| Indicator                            | Grade Level |   |   |   |   |   |    |    |    |   |    |    |    | Total |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|---|----|----|----|-------|
| indicator                            | κ           | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6  | 7  | 8  | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | TOLAI |
| Students with two or more indicators | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 65 | 83 | 79 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 227   |

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

| la dia star                         | Grade Level |   |   |   |   |   |    |    |    |   |    |    |    |       |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|---|----|----|----|-------|
| Indicator                           | κ           | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6  | 7  | 8  | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total |
| Retained Students: Current Year     | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 48 | 28 | 47 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 123   |
| Students retained two or more times | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2  | 2  | 0  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 4     |

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

60

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

Wednesday 8/28/2019

#### **Prior Year - As Reported**

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

| Indicator                       | Grade Level |   |   |   |   |   |     |     |     |    |       |   |   |     |
|---------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|-----|-----|-----|----|-------|---|---|-----|
| Indicator                       | K 1 2 3 4   | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9   | 10  | 11  | 12 | Total |   |   |     |
| Attendance below 90 percent     | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 55  | 46  | 58  | 0  | 0     | 0 | 0 | 159 |
| One or more suspensions         | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 72  | 88  | 52  | 0  | 0     | 0 | 0 | 212 |
| Course failure in ELA or Math   | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 58  | 42  | 79  | 0  | 0     | 0 | 0 | 179 |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 163 | 179 | 144 | 0  | 0     | 0 | 0 | 486 |

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

| Indicator                            | Grade Level |   |   |   |   |   |    |    |    |   |    |    |    | Total |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|---|----|----|----|-------|
| mulcator                             | Κ           | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6  | 7  | 8  | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | TOLAI |
| Students with two or more indicators | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 94 | 90 | 95 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 279   |

#### **Prior Year - Updated**

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

| Indicator                       | Grade Level |   |   |   |   |   |     |     |     |   |    |    |    |       |  |
|---------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|-----|-----|-----|---|----|----|----|-------|--|
| Indicator                       | κ           | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6   | 7   | 8   | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total |  |
| Attendance below 90 percent     | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 55  | 46  | 58  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 159   |  |
| One or more suspensions         | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 72  | 88  | 52  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 212   |  |
| Course failure in ELA or Math   | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 58  | 42  | 79  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 179   |  |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 163 | 179 | 144 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 486   |  |

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

| Indicator                            |   | Grade Level |   |   |   |   |    |    |    |   |    | Total |    |       |
|--------------------------------------|---|-------------|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|---|----|-------|----|-------|
| mulcator                             | κ | 1           | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6  | 7  | 8  | 9 | 10 | 11    | 12 | Total |
| Students with two or more indicators | 0 | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 94 | 90 | 95 | 0 | 0  | 0     | 0  | 279   |

### 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 Grade Component      | School | District | State | School | District | State |  |
| ELA Achievement             | 38%    | 58%      | 54%   | 33%    | 56%      | 52%   |  |
| ELA Learning Gains          | 48%    | 56%      | 54%   | 45%    | 57%      | 54%   |  |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile  | 40%    | 49%      | 47%   | 43%    | 48%      | 44%   |  |
| Math Achievement            | 38%    | 62%      | 58%   | 35%    | 61%      | 56%   |  |
| Math Learning Gains         | 39%    | 60%      | 57%   | 40%    | 61%      | 57%   |  |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 36%    | 53%      | 51%   | 35%    | 52%      | 50%   |  |
| Science Achievement         | 32%    | 52%      | 51%   | 35%    | 53%      | 50%   |  |
| Social Studies Achievement  | 52%    | 75%      | 72%   | 52%    | 76%      | 70%   |  |

### EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

| Indicator                       | Grade Le  | evel (prior year | reported) | Total     |
|---------------------------------|-----------|------------------|-----------|-----------|
| Indicator                       | 6         | 7                | 8         | - Total   |
| Number of students enrolled     | 318 (0)   | 339 (0)          | 331 (0)   | 988 (0)   |
| Attendance below 90 percent     | 27 (55)   | 39 (46)          | 59 (58)   | 125 (159) |
| One or more suspensions         | 72 (72)   | 52 (88)          | 31 (52)   | 155 (212) |
| Course failure in ELA or Math   | 23 (58)   | 72 (42)          | 56 (79)   | 151 (179) |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 102 (163) | 123 (179)        | 147 (144) | 372 (486) |

#### 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-<br>District<br>Comparison | State    | School-<br>State<br>Comparison |
| 06           | 2019      | 40%    | 58%      | -18%                              | 54%      | -14%                           |
|              | 2018      | 31%    | 53%      | -22%                              | 52%      | -21%                           |
| Same Grade C | omparison | 9%     |          |                                   |          |                                |
| Cohort Com   | parison   |        |          |                                   |          |                                |
| 07           | 2019      | 33%    | 53%      | -20%                              | 52%      | -19%                           |
|              | 2018      | 34%    | 54%      | -20%                              | 51%      | -17%                           |
| Same Grade C | omparison | -1%    |          |                                   |          |                                |
| Cohort Com   | parison   | 2%     |          |                                   |          |                                |
| 08           | 2019      | 37%    | 58%      | -21%                              | 56%      | -19%                           |
|              | 2018      | 40%    | 60%      | -20%                              | 58%      | -18%                           |
| Same Grade C | omparison | -3%    |          |                                   | <u> </u> |                                |
| Cohort Com   | parison   | 3%     |          |                                   |          |                                |

|              |           |        | MATH     |                                   |       |                                |
|--------------|-----------|--------|----------|-----------------------------------|-------|--------------------------------|
| Grade        | Year      | School | District | School-<br>District<br>Comparison | State | School-<br>State<br>Comparison |
| 06           | 2019      | 40%    | 60%      | -20%                              | 55%   | -15%                           |
|              | 2018      | 34%    | 56%      | -22%                              | 52%   | -18%                           |
| Same Grade C | omparison | 6%     |          |                                   |       |                                |
| Cohort Com   | parison   |        |          |                                   |       |                                |
| 07           | 2019      | 14%    | 35%      | -21%                              | 54%   | -40%                           |
|              | 2018      | 24%    | 39%      | -15%                              | 54%   | -30%                           |
| Same Grade C | omparison | -10%   |          |                                   |       |                                |
| Cohort Com   | parison   | -20%   |          |                                   |       |                                |
| 08           | 2019      | 31%    | 64%      | -33%                              | 46%   | -15%                           |
|              | 2018      | 32%    | 65%      | -33%                              | 45%   | -13%                           |
| Same Grade C | omparison | -1%    |          |                                   | •     |                                |
| Cohort Com   | parison   | 7%     |          |                                   |       |                                |

|              |                       |        | SCIENCE  |                                   |       |                                |
|--------------|-----------------------|--------|----------|-----------------------------------|-------|--------------------------------|
| Grade        | Year                  | School | District | School-<br>District<br>Comparison | State | School-<br>State<br>Comparison |
| 08           | 2019                  | 31%    | 51%      | -20%                              | 48%   | -17%                           |
|              | 2018                  | 36%    | 54%      | -18%                              | 50%   | -14%                           |
| Same Grade C | Same Grade Comparison |        |          |                                   |       |                                |
| Cohort Com   | parison               |        |          |                                   |       |                                |

|      |        | BIOLO    | GY EOC                      |       |                          |
|------|--------|----------|-----------------------------|-------|--------------------------|
| Year | School | District | School<br>Minus<br>District | State | School<br>Minus<br>State |
| 2019 |        |          |                             |       |                          |
| 2018 |        |          |                             |       |                          |
|      |        | CIVIC    | SEOC                        |       |                          |
| Year | School | District | School<br>Minus<br>District | State | School<br>Minus<br>State |
| 2019 | 49%    | 72%      | -23%                        | 71%   | -22%                     |
| 2018 | 51%    | 72%      | -21%                        | 71%   | -20%                     |
| Co   | ompare | -2%      |                             |       |                          |
|      |        | HISTO    | RY EOC                      |       |                          |
| Year | School | District | School<br>Minus<br>District | State | School<br>Minus<br>State |
| 2019 |        |          |                             |       |                          |
| 2018 |        |          |                             |       |                          |
|      |        | ALGEE    | RA EOC                      |       |                          |
| Year | School | District | School<br>Minus<br>District | State | School<br>Minus<br>State |
| 2019 | 78%    | 64%      | 14%                         | 61%   | 17%                      |

|      |        | ALGEE    | BRA EOC                     |       |                          |
|------|--------|----------|-----------------------------|-------|--------------------------|
| Year | School | District | School<br>Minus<br>District | State | School<br>Minus<br>State |
| 2018 | 77%    | 62%      | 15%                         | 62%   | 15%                      |
| Co   | ompare | 1%       |                             |       |                          |
|      |        | GEOME    | TRY EOC                     |       |                          |
| Year | School | District | School<br>Minus<br>District | State | School<br>Minus<br>State |
| 2019 | 95%    | 60%      | 35%                         | 57%   | 38%                      |
| 2018 | 93%    | 57%      | 36%                         | 56%   | 37%                      |
| Co   | ompare | 2%       |                             | · · · |                          |

## Subgroup Data

|           |             | 2019      | SCHOO             | OL GRAD      | E COMF     | ONENT              | S BY SI     | JBGRO      | UPS          |                         |                           |
|-----------|-------------|-----------|-------------------|--------------|------------|--------------------|-------------|------------|--------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|
| Subgroups | ELA<br>Ach. | ELA<br>LG | ELA<br>LG<br>L25% | Math<br>Ach. | Math<br>LG | Math<br>LG<br>L25% | Sci<br>Ach. | SS<br>Ach. | MS<br>Accel. | Grad<br>Rate<br>2017-18 | C & C<br>Accel<br>2017-18 |
| SWD       | 20          | 44        | 39                | 21           | 33         | 33                 | 17          | 34         | 62           |                         |                           |
| ELL       | 32          | 51        | 42                | 33           | 33         | 27                 | 31          | 36         | 79           |                         |                           |
| ASN       | 75          | 64        |                   | 83           | 71         |                    |             |            |              |                         |                           |
| BLK       | 33          | 45        | 40                | 33           | 35         | 36                 | 23          | 47         | 73           |                         |                           |
| HSP       | 43          | 52        | 32                | 46           | 46         | 27                 | 53          | 53         | 89           |                         |                           |
| MUL       | 39          | 36        |                   | 48           | 50         |                    | 45          |            |              |                         |                           |
| WHT       | 58          | 64        |                   | 57           | 55         |                    | 61          | 78         | 89           |                         |                           |
| FRL       | 35          | 46        | 40                | 36           | 38         | 37                 | 30          | 48         | 76           |                         |                           |
|           |             | 2018      | SCHOO             | OL GRAD      | E COMF     | PONENT             | S BY SI     | JBGRO      | UPS          |                         |                           |
| Subgroups | ELA<br>Ach. | ELA<br>LG | ELA<br>LG<br>L25% | Math<br>Ach. | Math<br>LG | Math<br>LG<br>L25% | Sci<br>Ach. | SS<br>Ach. | MS<br>Accel. | Grad<br>Rate<br>2016-17 | C & C<br>Accel<br>2016-17 |
| SWD       | 21          | 46        | 54                | 25           | 46         | 48                 | 21          | 38         | 77           |                         |                           |
| ELL       | 23          | 50        | 54                | 28           | 45         | 51                 | 23          | 51         |              |                         |                           |
| ASN       | 83          | 80        |                   | 78           | 65         |                    |             |            | 90           |                         |                           |
| BLK       | 30          | 45        | 47                | 34           | 44         | 43                 | 31          | 48         | 72           |                         |                           |
| HSP       | 48          | 58        | 50                | 51           | 53         | 59                 | 64          | 64         | 85           |                         |                           |
| MUL       | 48          | 52        |                   | 61           | 52         |                    | 50          | 80         |              |                         |                           |
| WHT       | 76          | 63        |                   | 68           | 63         | 64                 | 69          | 79         | 95           |                         |                           |
| FRL       | 36          | 47        | 48                | 39           | 46         | 46                 | 37          | 52         | 77           |                         |                           |
|           |             | 2017      | SCHOO             | OL GRAD      | E COMF     | PONENT             | S BY SI     | JBGRO      | UPS          |                         |                           |
| Subgroups | ELA<br>Ach. | ELA<br>LG | ELA<br>LG<br>L25% | Math<br>Ach. | Math<br>LG | Math<br>LG<br>L25% | Sci<br>Ach. | SS<br>Ach. | MS<br>Accel. | Grad<br>Rate<br>2015-16 | C & C<br>Accel<br>2015-16 |
| SWD       | 10          | 34        | 36                | 18           | 33         | 31                 | 14          | 29         | 53           |                         |                           |
| ELL       | 19          | 42        | 43                | 25           | 44         | 25                 | 11          | 38         |              |                         |                           |
| ASN       | 68          | 76        |                   | 65           | 74         |                    |             |            |              |                         |                           |
| BLK       | 26          | 41        | 42                | 28           | 36         | 33                 | 29          | 46         | 65           |                         |                           |
| HSP       | 47          | 49        | 40                | 49           | 46         | 36                 | 42          | 58         | 83           |                         |                           |
| MUL       | 59          | 65        |                   | 48           | 46         |                    | 58          | 75         | 73           |                         |                           |
| WHT       | 63          | 61        |                   | 72           | 61         |                    | 75          | 87         | 83           |                         |                           |

|           | 2017 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS |           |                   |              |            |                    |             |            |              |                         |                           |
|-----------|---|-----------|-------------------|--------------|------------|--------------------|-------------|------------|--------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|
| Subgroups | ELA<br>Ach.                               | ELA<br>LG | ELA<br>LG<br>L25% | Math<br>Ach. | Math<br>LG | Math<br>LG<br>L25% | Sci<br>Ach. | SS<br>Ach. | MS<br>Accel. | Grad<br>Rate<br>2015-16 | C & C<br>Accel<br>2015-16 |
| FRL       | 32  | 45        | 44                | 33           | 40         | 34                 | 32          | 50         | 67           |                         |                           |

### 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  | 44   |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students                                    | NO   |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target                                    | 3    |
| Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency | 39   |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index                                       | 441  |
| Total Components for the Federal Index  | 10   |
| Percent Tested  | 99%  |

## Subgroup Data

| Students With Disabilities   |     |
|--|-----|
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities   | 31  |
| 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  | 40  |
| 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   |     |
|  | 70  |
| Federal Index - Asian Students   | 73  |
| Federal Index - Asian Students<br>Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO  |

Palm Beach - 0121 - Howell L. Watkins Middle School - 2019-20 SIP

| Black/African American Students  |          |  |  |  |  |
|--|----------|--|--|--|--|
| Federal Index - Black/African American Students                                |          |  |  |  |  |
| Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?        |          |  |  |  |  |
| Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32% |          |  |  |  |  |
| Hispanic Students  |          |  |  |  |  |
| Federal Index - Hispanic Students  |          |  |  |  |  |
| Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?                      |          |  |  |  |  |
| Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%               |          |  |  |  |  |
| Multiracial Students   | <u> </u> |  |  |  |  |
| Federal Index - Multiracial Students   |          |  |  |  |  |
| Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?                   |          |  |  |  |  |
| 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?              |          |  |  |  |  |
| Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%       |          |  |  |  |  |
| White Students   |          |  |  |  |  |
| Federal Index - White Students   | 66       |  |  |  |  |
| White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?                         |          |  |  |  |  |
| Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%                  |          |  |  |  |  |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students  |          |  |  |  |  |
| Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students                            |          |  |  |  |  |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?    |          |  |  |  |  |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Delow 4170 in the Current Teal?   |          |  |  |  |  |

#### 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.

ELA and Math learning gains with our lowest 25% population is the data component showing the greatest declines in performance when comparing 2018 to 2019 percentages. ELA declining from 50 to 40 and math declining from 47 to 36. Science is actually the lowest performing data component at

32% proficient which is also a decline from 39% in 2018. ELA achievement was actually the lowest performing data component in 2018 at 37% which actually increased by 1% in 2019. Common trends in the data indicate low performance in Science at the district and state level. Contributing factors identified by our team include; lack of instructional rigor and lack of effective differentiated instruction with our lowest 25%. The need to strengthen our inclusion model of instruction for our lowest 25% is another barrier. Additionally with Science achievement the barriers are also lack of building on necessary skills and standards in grades 6 and 7, this again indicates a need to strengthen instructional rigor. The necessity for deliberate coaching and building instructional capacity are apparent local trends based upon reflection, observation and analysis. Lack of professional development for teachers, lack of professional collaboration among teachers and lack of teachers using data to drive instruction are also major contributing factor to last year's low performance.

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

Math learning gains of the lowest 25% showed the greatest decline at 36 percent from 47 in 2018, 11 percent drop, with ELA learning gains of the lowest 25% coming in a very close second with a 10 percent decline, 40 percent from 50 in 2018. The need to strengthen our inclusion model of instruction for our lowest 25% is a major factor contributing to this decline. Also lack of planning together for effective instruction including intensive interventions and reteaching strategies. Minimal collaboration to analyze the data to drive instruction is also another major factor contributing to this decline. The need for coaching support and professional development opportunities specific to student needs and closing the gap are also contributing factors to this decline. Students performing at severely low levels of basic math computation and reading comprehension and Instruction not planned or implemented to meet the needs of the lowest 25% population are other contributing factors to this decline.

# 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.

Math achievement and Social Studies both with a 20% gap have the greatest gap when compared to the state average. Math at 38% proficient compared to the state's 58% and Social Studies at 52% compared to the state's 72%. Factors contributing to this gap with math content include however are not limited to; lack of in depth exposure to the math strands aligned to the item specifications, using the data to drive instruction and tutorial decisions. Also in Social studies below grade level readers struggle with the comprehension and fluency of the social studies text. Other contributing factors are; a change in teacher for one of the Social studies classroom and a year 1 teacher in the other classroom. The higher level readers were grouped with the 1 veteran teacher. Not evenly distributing the ESE and ELL students in the classrooms may have also been a contributing factor creating a great gap in performance compared to the state average.

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

ELA achievement and Middle school acceleration are the only 2 components that did not show a decline in performance out of the nine cells. Their performance did not necessarily show a lot of improvement, they both increased by 1. This year the ELA team was a strong team instructionally with effective classroom management. The Middle School Acceleration courses are our higher-performing students. These teachers also provide additional tutorial for these students deliberate to the item specifications and data analysis. When taking a closer look at the sub-groups, there were other areas showing improvement; Middle school acceleration with Hispanics increased from 85 in 2018 to 89 in 2019. ELL students showed an increase in ELA, Math and Science. In ELA 23 to 32, Math 28 to 33 and in Science 23 to 31. Black subgroup showed an increase in ELA; 30 to 33 and Asian subgroup showed improvement in Math; from 65 to 71. Tutorial sessions for these subgroups in

these content areas is one contributing factor to the improvement. Strong Instructional leaders in the ELA department contributed to ELA achievement not declining. Consistent team planning and collaboration among the ELA Team was also a productive action that supported ELA achievement. Teachers committed to intentional instruction and tutoring in ELA and Middle school acceleration areas contributed to these 2 areas maintaining and not declining as well as to the increase in the subgroups. The identified subgroups participated in tutoring and small group instruction.

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

Potential areas of concern identified based on EWS reflection are; as a school this year we need to focus on (1.) increasing attendance,(2.) decreasing suspensions and (3.) decreasing the number of student failures in ELA and Math subject areas and (4.) decreasing the number of level 1 achievement levels on the state assessment. Additionally a specific focus on increasing attendance for 8th grade students and decreasing attendance below 90% at 59 in 2019 to 55 or less in 2020. Also a specific focus on decreasing the number of students with one or more suspensions; at 72 in 2019 in grade 6 to 68 or less in 2020. We will naturally work on increasing attendance and decreasing suspensions for all grade levels, however have definite targeted goals where needed based on the data.

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

1. Increase learning gains for students in the lowest 25% in ELA by 10% by FSA 2020.

- 2. Increase learning gains for students in the lowest 25% in Math by 14% by FSA 2020.
- 3. Increase Science achievement by 10% by FSA 2020.
- 4. Increase attendance by 2% or more in each grade level according to end of year attendance reports.

5. Decrease the number of failure percentages and discipline referrals by 5% or more in each grade level.

## Part III: Planning for Improvement

#### Areas of Focus:

| #1  |  |  |  |  |  |
|---|--|--|--|--|--|
| Title   | By delivering effective, rigorous and relevant instruction to meet the needs of all students, we will increase in learning gains for students scoring in the lowest 25% on ELA FSA and Math FSA  |  |  |  |  |
| Rationale   | As of 2019-19 our Learning gains for students scoring in the lowest 25% decreased from 2018 to 2019 on the ELA FSA and the Math FSA. Trends in the data identify the need to improve the instructional model used with the lowest 25% population. The lowest 25% population consists largely of ESE and ELL students, however not limited to.  |  |  |  |  |
| State the<br>measurable<br>outcome the<br>school<br>plans to<br>achieve | The intended outcome is to increase learning gains of the lowest 25% in ELA by 10% as measured by ELA FSA 2020. Our goal for Math FSA is to increase learning gains for the lowest 25% by 14% by Math FSA 2020.  |  |  |  |  |
| Person<br>responsible<br>for<br>monitoring<br>outcome                   | Awilda Tomas Andres (awilda.tomasandres@palmbeachschools.org)  |  |  |  |  |
| Evidence-<br>based<br>Strategy  | As part of our improvement plan we have begun implementation of Reading programs,<br>Instructional interventions, Tutorial strategies, and adding additional support staff. The<br>reading programs we are implementing this year are; Reading Plus, Just Words, Wilson,<br>Achieve 3000 and Imagine Learning. The instructional interventions we are implementing<br>include adding small group rotations, professional collaborations and data-driven<br>instruction to the instructional model. Tutorial strategies include, standards based activities<br>aligned to the item specifications. Additional support staff that we have this year are; a<br>single school culture coordinator, a math and science coach, a language facilitator, ELL<br>support person, and a curriculum TOSA.   |  |  |  |  |
| Rationale<br>for<br>Evidence-<br>based<br>Strategy                      | Research supports an increase in student reading performance based on the contributed amount of time on task in the Reading Plus program when compared to students not using Reading Plus programs. Students who used the Reading Plus program rigorously and as prescribed showed a moderate increase in stamina and fluency, reading words accurately, specifically reading on a computer screen. Struggling readers exposed to Just Words and Wilson strategies and techniques show an increase in language acquisition and intermediate fluency when compared to struggling readers using other intervention strategies. Achieve 3000 and Imagine Learning are district supported programs researched and proven to provide literacy learning and differentiated instructional support to increase reading performance for individual student needs of struggling readers, english language learners and students with other disabilities. |  |  |  |  |
| Action Step   |  |  |  |  |  |
| Description   | <ol> <li>Hire instructional coaches and support staff to provide professional development to<br/>teachers, in classroom support, modeling, Team collaboration and planning support, assist<br/>to monitor instructional delivery and data as well as provide teachers with timely<br/>instructional feedback.</li> <li>Through the Collaborative team meetings teachers will plan for rigorous infusion of the<br/>content required by Statute 1003.42(2) and S.B. Policy 2.09: History of Holocaust, Africans<br/>and African Americans, Hispanic Contributions, Women's Contributions, Sacrifices of<br/>Veterans, History of the U.S., Conservation of Resources and Health Education. This will</li> </ol>   |  |  |  |  |
|   | be done through community service projects and research projects, literature groups, direct  |  |  |  |  |

instruction, small group instruction, parent and community events highlighting literature and art contributions, multicultural parent engagements and events to promote cultural sensitivity. We have all introduced a new art curriculum this year where students will be exposed to the arts contribution and exploration.

3. Differentiated Team collaboration will be supported by the Single School Culture Coordinator, Instructional coaches and IB coordinator. Topics will be aligned by need and will include balanced literacy, small group instruction, higher order questioning, creation of assessment, items aligned to items specifications, item specification training, and using data to inform instruction.

4. Administrators will conduct weekly walk-throughs and observations in order to provide teachers with timely, individual feedback to teachers on how to improve their instruction.

5. Administrators will conduct data chats with teachers and groups of teachers. Teachers will have student data chats and parent data chats to better inform their instruction.

6. Instructional materials and resources will be aligned to the standards monitored by the reading coach and SSCC.

7. New teachers will be assigned mentors and provided support to build their teaching capacity.

8. Science teachers will attend Science professional development and will design and deliver hands-on instruction on labs for students to apply scientific concepts.

9. The school will follow the standards-based math instructional plan as designed by the district and supported by the area office. This plan is devised to review-teach-assess-review-reteach. Administrators will monitor the assessment data and provide feedback and support.

10. Students will participate in science instruction and practice activities including Science Fair, labs and journals.

11. Teachers will use Google Classroom to enhance instruction in ELA, Math, Science and Social Studies. Teachers are being trained to use Google classroom and Smart Interactive Flat Panels in the classroom effectively to increase rigor, relevance and student engagement..

To monitor effectiveness Coaches will complete a log of support services provided. Other evidence will include Team Collaboration agendas and notes, PDD agendas and notes, meeting discussions with administrators, learning walk-through evidence and teacher feedback through meetings and iObservation.

Person

Awilda Tomas Andres (awilda.tomasandres@palmbeachschools.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).

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

- 1. Improvement in Instructional rigor and student engagement in the classrooms.
- 2. Improve Single School Culture and Climate.
- 3. Infused content as required by Florida Statute

Additional schoolwide improvement goals will be addressed through alignment with Pillars of Effective Instruction: Students are immersed in rigorous task encompassing the full intent of the Florida State Standards and content required by Florida State Statute 1003.42 continuing to develop a single school culture and appreciation of multicultural diversity in alignment to S.B. 2.09 with a focus on reading and writing across all content areas. Our students focus on content and curriculum related to:

The History of the Holocaust

The History of Black and African Americans

The Contributions of Latino and Hispanics

The Contributions of Women

The Sacrifices of Veterans and Medal of Honor recipients within US History.

Our school also integrates Single School Culture by sharing our Universal Guidelines for Success and communicating these expectations to parents via student protocols, and monitoring SwPBS through data. In alignment, to school board 2.09 and Florida State statue 1003.42 our school highlights multicultural diversity within the curriculum and the arts. Our students participate in activities and studies including, but not limited to, art expos of different cultures and in music our students study music of different eras and countries and in media our library selection is filled with books related to the variety of cultures.

Lauren Aldridge, guidance counselor serves as our school ambassador in implementing our school-wide positive behavior system which teaches, enforces and rewards our single school culture of SEMINOLES R.E.A.D.Y. The core design is to facilitate an expectation of students and staff to model; respect, effort, active listening, dependability, and being year-long learners throughout our entire campus culture. We infuse these attributes with our IB learner profile attributes; developing the whole learner.

Wendy Venoff is steering our School Ambassador program where we are teaching our students to be campus leaders/ambassadors embracing and promoting a culture of social and emotional well being for all of our students. Peers as Partners has also been implemented this school year; providing lessons, student engagement and student collaboration, teaching inclusion of every learner.

Also as a school our leadership team, teachers and staff are receiving training to assist with infusing strategies and skills that focus on Social Emotional Learning. We are infusing SEL through content areas as well as using strategies and techniques from the Kognito training when working with students. The Kognito simulation is a virtual program that walks the trainee through models of student situations that could occur in a school setting and the program guides the trainee through best solutions to help safely and effectively assist students through social and emotional learning processes to a healthy resolution.

All of our School leaders and staff are participating in Mental Health Awareness Professional Development provided through the School District's Professional Development Department. We are also working with Dr. Celena Johnson, School District Behavior Coach Specialist; assisting our staff and school leaders with Positive School-wide Behavior support including strategies to increase appropriate, positive behavior and social-emotional skill exposure to staff and students. We are also in the planning year to implement AVID for next school year, a program that helps students to develop the skills they need to be successful in college. This is one other component that we are adding to ensure that we are promoting and fostering high school readiness and post-graduate success.

### Part IV: Title I Requirements

#### Additional Title I Requirements

This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A schoolwide program and opts to use the Schoolwide Improvement Plan to satisfy the requirements of the schoolwide program plan, as outlined in the Every Student Succeeds Act, Public Law No. 114-95, § 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

# Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families, and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission and support the needs of students.

As a school we recognize the importance of building positive relationships with parents, families and other community stakeholders to fulfill our school's mission and support the needs of our students. We recognize the importance of forming strong partnerships with our parents and community members to positively impact the students in our school. As part of our plan to build positive relationships we welcome input from our parents, community partners and stakeholders through annual input meetings as well as monthly SAC meetings. Additionally Our SAC chair, Family facilitators and school leaders work with our parents as equal partners by organizing and facilitating Parent involvement opportunities such as; Curriculum Night, Open House, Breakfast with Dads, and Parent Conference Days. This year we also have our business partner- Ron Katz with Midas Automotive that participates at staff and parent functions providing incentives for our staff and promotional offerings for our parents as a joint partnership where we in turn support business at Midas. We are also hosting a Dinner with the Principal Night at Lime Fresh this year as a new partnership that will support our students, our school and Lime Fresh as new business partner and contributing stakeholder to the supporting our school's mission and the needs of our students. Additionally we have new this year, a Social Service Facilitator, Latoya Ransom that will work with our community and business partners and our students and families support services to provide parent and family engagement opportunities that promote effective parent involvement and positively impacts the students in our school. We also work with our school district's Multicultural Department to provide family engagement and parent training for our ELL families, as well as Our McKinney-Vento liaison, Kristina Rolle works with our guidance team in providing services and support for our migrant and homeless families.

#### PFEP Link

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

# Describe how the school ensures the social-emotional needs of all students are being met, which may include providing counseling, mentoring and other pupil services.

This year our school has 1 guidance counselor per grade level for a total of 3 guidance counselors; Grade 6-Lauren Aldridge, Grade 7- Jackie Batista, and Grade 8- Kate Tona. We also have a behavior coach on campus from the district's support service department-Mario Wright. Additionally we have new this year; Behavior and Mental Health support personnel; Lawrence Nixon and Wendy Venoff. We also have the District's CAPE Team housed on our campus to assist with Crisis Situations. We have a School-Based Team that includes our ESE Coordinator; Jerri Jump and school pyschologist; Katherine Ribakoff. These school staff provide counseling and mentoring and also make referrals to outside agencies as needed. All of our School leaders and staff are participating in Mental Health Awareness Professional Development provided through the School District's Professional Development Department. We are also working with Dr. Celena Johnson, School District Behavior Coach Specialist; assisting our staff and school leaders with Positive School-wide Behavior support including strategies to increase appropriate, positive behavior and social-emotional skill exposure to staff and students. Lauren Aldridge, guidance counselor serves as our school ambassador in implementing our school-wide positive behavior system which teaches, enforces and rewards our single school culture of SEMINOLES R.E.A.D.Y. The core design is to facilitate an expectation of students and staff to model; respect, effort, active listening, dependability, and being year-long learners throughout our entire campus culture. We infuse these attributes with our IB learner profile attributes; developing the whole learner. Wendy Venoff is steering our School Ambassador program where we are teaching our students to be campus leaders/ ambassadors embracing and promoting a culture of social and emotional well being for all of our students. Peers as Partners has also been implemented this school year; providing lessons, student engagement and student collaboration, teaching inclusion of every learner.

# Describe the strategies the school employs to support incoming and outgoing cohorts of students in transition from one school level to another.

To support incoming and outgoing cohorts of students in transition from one school level to another all members of the school instructional staff participate in collaborative Team Meetings. Teachers are encouraged to meet informally and formally during their common planning time. Collaboration also occurs across grade levels, and across content areas, whenever possible. Collaborative Team Meetings provide our Instructional staff time to plan standards-based lessons and activities that support student transition from one school level to another according to grade level expectations. This year we have additional support staff to assist with this implementation, instructional coaching and development. We have a curriculum TOSA, a Single School Culture Facilitator, and a Math and Science Coach. These support persons also work closely with district specialist to provide professional development where staff members participate in collaborative discussions about student learning and state requirements across grade levels. Our Guidance counselors and Program Coordinators also work with our feeder schools on assisting us with incoming and outgoing expectations, requirements and transition. Additionally our team presents at our elementary feeder schools and invite our high school feeder schools in to present to our students. This year our 8th grade guidance counselor is also working with out 8th graders on high school readiness support and strategies, in efforts to work aligned with our district's strategic goals and long term outcomes. One part of this implementation is the "My Career Shines" program that has been imbedded in our US History classes, providing our 8th graders with a curriculum on forming a career plan. This is a required component for 8th grade promotion to 9th grade. We have also included lessons covering; History of the Holocaust, History of Africans and African Americans, Hispanic Contributions, Women's Contributions and Sacrifices of Veterans and the value of Medal of Honor recipients.

Describe the process through which school leadership identifies and aligns all available resources (e.g., personnel, instructional, curricular) in order to meet the needs of all students and maximize desired student outcomes. Include the methodology for coordinating and supplementing federal, state and local funds, services and programs. Provide the person(s) responsible, frequency of meetings, how an inventory of resources is maintained and any problem-solving activities used to determine how to apply resources for the highest impact.

The MTSS/Rtl process develops, leads, and evaluates school core content standards and programs. It also identifies and analyzes existing literature on scientifically based curriculum and behavior assessment, as well as intervention approaches. The MTSS/Rtl identifies systematic patterns of student needs while working with district personnel to identify appropriate, evidence-based intervention strategies that assist with whole school implementation for progress monitoring, data collection and data analysis. Our School leadership team utilizes this process to identify our school Instructional and support needs, as well as identify individual student needs. Our leadership team also conducts a Comprehensive Needs Assessment based upon all of our school data. As a result of our CNA; we determine the curricular resources and instructional and support personnel we will need in order to maximize desired student outcomes and reach our School Improvement goals. We are then also able to plan for allocation of Title I federal funding to assist in securing programs, materials, resources and personnel that will

provide the highest impact toward our school needs and goals. Title I funds are being utilized to fund select Instructional and support staff. Part of local, state and Title I funding support enable us to provide teachers as tutors for additional remediation and enrichment opportunities for our students, through morning care programs, after-school programs and summer school programs. Additionally providing Instructional coaches to model, support and develop teachers and also funding supplies and technology to supplement instruction. Our Instructional support staff; Catherine Angione, Clara Visconti, and Melanie Haspil are the persons responsible for frequency of meetings for teacher collaboration. Kate Tona is the person responsible for the frequency of our RTI support meetings. Awilda Tomas is the person responsible for the frequency of meetings for leadership and admin team. Richard Brown, Miguel Mateu and Kathleen Mattox assist with resource inventory.

# Describe the strategies the school uses to advance college and career awareness, which may include establishing partnerships with business, industry or community organizations.

Ensuring High school readiness and Fostering post-graduate success are active goals in our District Strategic Plan. In alignment with these goals, as a school we are implementing grade level specific initiatives and programs to support and encourage; developing high school readiness skills and success strategies and explorating post-graduate opportunities, with our students and staff. Our 8th grade guidance counselor and 8th grade assistant principal have planned visits from our feeder high schools to present their programs to our 8th grade students. We have also invited High school students to share best practices and strategies for High school readiness and success. Another program being implemented with 8th grade students is the "My career shines" program; stimulating students to begin thinking about post-graduate opportunities. Additionally one of our business partners, Ron Katz with Midas Automotive of Palm Beach has volunteered to come in and host a mechanic workshop for students that may be interested in other job trades that support post-graduate success. We are also in the planning year to implement AVID for next school year, a program that helps students to develop the skills they need to be successful in college. Our students also take part in a career fair at the school which provides the opportunity for stakeholders and business partners to come in and share their profession and/or career paths with our students, affording our students the opportunity to begin career planning. Professional Dress days and College T-shirt Fridays are other school-wide initiatives in place to expose our students to a variety of college and career options. We work diligently to keep our school Choice programs rigorous and effective in producing high school ready students and globally competitive college and career candidates. Our Guidance Department also informs and supports students and parents with promotion, graduation and college readiness requirements.

## Part V: Budget

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

| 1      | III.A.   | Areas of Focus: By deliverin<br>the needs of all students, we<br>in the lowest 25% on ELA FS | \$5,094.00                                |                                |        |            |  |
|--------|--|--|---|--------------------------------|--------|------------|--|
|        | Function   | Object   | Budget Focus                              | Funding Source                 | FTE    | 2019-20    |  |
|        |  |  | 0121 - Howell L. Watkins<br>Middle School | School<br>Improvement<br>Funds | 1366.0 | \$5,094.00 |  |
|        | Notes: School improvement funds will be utilized for a program or process towards student achievement. |  |   |                                |        |            |  |
| Total: |  |  |   |                                |        | \$5,094.00 |  |