Beulah Middle School

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Beulah Middle School

6001 W NINE MILE RD, Pensacola, FL 32526

www.escambiaschools.org

Demographics

Principal: Frank Murphy J

Start Date for this Principal: 5/29/2020

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
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	89%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (50%) 2017-18: No Grade 2016-17: No Grade 2015-16: No Grade
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northwest
Regional Executive Director	Rachel Heide
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TS&I

* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here.

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F. This plan is also a requirement for Targeted Support and Improvement (TS&I) and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CS&I) schools pursuant to 1008.33 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

To be designated as TS&I, a school must have one or more ESSA subgroup(s) with a Federal Index below 41%. This plan shall be approved by the district. There are three ways a school can be designated as CS&I:

1. have a school grade of D or F
2. have a graduation rate of 67% or lower
3. have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

For these schools, the SIP shall be approved by the district as well as the Bureau of School Improvement.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F, or a graduation rate 67% or less. Districts may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing for schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at www.floridacims.org.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

Table of Contents

Beulah Middle School

6001 W NINE MILE RD, Pensacola, FL 32526

www.escambiaschools.org

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	**2019-20 Title I School**	**2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
Middle School 6-8	Yes	74%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	52%

School Grades History

Year	**2019-20**	**2018-19**
Grade	C	C

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F (see page 4). For schools receiving a grade of A, B, or C, the district may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at https://www.floridaCIMS.org.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

Our mission is to develop an inclusive community of self-confident, innovative, critical and creative thinkers who practice resiliency, show empathy, and take initiative for learning while embracing technology.
Beulah Middle School believes that all students have the ability to learn and be successful. We believe that we have the responsibility to our students to accept them as individuals, to assess their needs and interests, and to provide a varied, well-organized curriculum which will promote positive academic, social, physical, and emotional growth. Students, staff and the community will work together to help every child realize their potential to become responsible citizens and life-long learners.

Provide the school's vision statement.

We strive to...
Be a safe, caring, nurturing environment in which all students can feel supported emotionally, intellectually, and physically.
Encourage critical thinking, integrity, self-confidence, and a desire for excellence.
Achieve academic excellence by embracing technology and encouraging students to try new things in order for them to reach their highest potential.
Recognize that each student is unique. Build positive personal characteristics such as tolerance, cooperation, honesty, and encourage respect for the individual differences that make each of us unique.
Support creativity, individuality, and innovative thinking; in order to prepare students to become leaders who can meet the challenges facing our world both today and tomorrow.

School Leadership Team

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

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Reynolds, Sandi	Teacher, K-12	
Britt McCaskill, Marietta	Assistant Principal	
Taylor, Wilson	Principal	
Seigle, James	Teacher, K-12	
Wilcox, Krysta	Teacher, K-12	
Hyder, Cheri	Teacher, K-12	
Eldridge, Jessica	Teacher, K-12	

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Friday 5/29/2020, Frank Murphy J

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

0

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

16

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

75

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Middle School 6-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	89%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (50%) 2017-18: No Grade 2016-17: No Grade 2015-16: No Grade
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northwest
Regional Executive Director	[Rachel Heide](#)
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	

Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TS&I
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, [click here](#).	

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	291	378	379	0	0	0	0	1048
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	64	59	72	0	0	0	0	195
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	53	64	0	0	0	0	133
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	16	2	0	0	0	0	23
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	2	26	0	0	0	0	33
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	62	76	76	0	0	0	0	214
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	65	95	86	0	0	0	0	246

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	12	25	31	0	0	0	0	68

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	1	2	3	0	0	0	0	6
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	6	5	0	0	0	0	16

Date this data was collected or last updated
Friday 7/24/2020

Prior Year - As Reported

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	65	80	52	0	0	0	0	197
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	27	84	52	0	0	0	0	163
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	10	13	0	0	0	0	38
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	118	113	98	0	0	0	0	329

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	53	74	53	0	0	0	0	180

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	2	4	2	0	0	0	0	8
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	4	4	0	0	0	0	12

Prior Year - Updated

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	65	80	52	0	0	0	0	197
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	27	84	52	0	0	0	0	163
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	10	13	0	0	0	0	38
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	118	113	98	0	0	0	0	329

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	53	74	53	0	0	0	0	180

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	2	4	2	0	0	0	0	8
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	4	4	0	0	0	0	12

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	47%	48%	54%	0%	46%	52%
ELA Learning Gains	58%	52%	54%	0%	51%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	56%	45%	47%	0%	42%	44%
Math Achievement	43%	46%	58%	0%	43%	56%
Math Learning Gains	47%	47%	57%	0%	43%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	46%	43%	51%	0%	40%	50%
Science Achievement	40%	43%	51%	0%	44%	50%
Social Studies Achievement	51%	58%	72%	0%	56%	70%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

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

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

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2019	51%	42%	9%	54%	-3%
	2018					
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	42%	43%	-1%	52%	-10%
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		42%				
08	2019	42%	50%	-8%	56%	-14%
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		42%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2019	27%	36%	-9%	55%	-28%
	2018					
Cohort Comparison						

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
07	2019	57%	50%	7%	54%	3%
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		57%				
08	2019	30%	21%	9%	46%	-16%
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		30%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2019	38%	42%	-4%	48%	-10%
	2018					
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	48%	54%	-6%	71%	-23%
2018					
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	68%	52%	16%	61%	7%
2018					
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					

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	21	56	49	17	35	35	9	29			
ELL	31	58		25	46						
ASN	67	92		60	62						
BLK	29	50	54	24	38	40	24	31	50		
HSP	63	64	64	54	58		38	75			
MUL	51	60		54	63		62	44			
WHT	57	62	52	52	50	51	49	64	67		
FRL	39	53	55	34	42	45	28	39	55		
	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
	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

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	50
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	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	450
Total Components for the Federal Index	9
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%	1

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%	0
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	70
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	38
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	59
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	56
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	56
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	43
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Analysis

Data Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources (see guide for examples for relevant data sources).

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

Our lowest performing area was students with disabilities. Due to the fact that this data is from our first year being open, we do not have trending data to show or support deficits for us to correct.

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

We do not have trending data to show us an area with the greatest decline, however we have progress monitoring tests through STAR 360 and SchoolNet that show our students with disabilities are still our lowest-performing subgroup.

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 greatest gap between our school data and state data is with the Civics EOC. This is an issue across our district. This year we made a few changes to our Civics teacher team, due to the growth of the school. They planned together and worked with finding the best methods of teaching different students. We saw an increase in our Civics proficiency using SchoolNet data and we feel we would have closed the gap between the school and state data on Civics EOC.

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

Our school made the most improvement in the lowest quartile and in learning gains in ELA. We believe this is due to the fact that we have implemented Achieve 3000 across the board and have added a new vocabulary program to our school.

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

Our major areas of concern are our 7th and 8th graders with low FSA scores in ELA and Math. We feel this is directly tied to our ESE students not making appropriate gains. With remote learning, fewer in the classroom and more support on campus, we are planning on more small group time with an ESE support teacher or staff member to help these students understand and retain the information learned.

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

1. Improving learning for Students With Disabilities
2. Professional Development for teachers on accommodations and how to use them.

3. Professional Development on CKH, PBIS, Schoolwide discipline procedures to help foster relationships so that students stay in class and can increase their opportunities to learn.
4. Professional Development on Thinking Maps for teachers to use in all classes.
5. Professional Development on technology and remote learning.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	2019 ELA FSA data shows deficiencies across grade levels and within the subgroups English Language Learners (ELL), Students with Disabilities, and African Americans. This highlights the importance of focusing on instruction for ELA strategies across content areas.

Measurable Outcome:	For ELL students, this will be an increase of at least 1% from 40% to at least 41%. For Students with Disabilities, this will be an increase of at least 4% from 31% to at least 35%. For our Black students it will be an increase of at least 3% from 38% to at least 41%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Marietta Britt McCaskill (mbrittmccaskill@ecsdfl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Implement multiple strategies to increase comprehension, including cross-curricular activities and implementation. This includes graphic organizers, summaries, ask & answer, modeling, scaffolding, and providing feedback. Strategies for implementation/training: Kagan Structures including, but not limited to: Jot Thoughts, Mix Pair Share, Timed Pair Share Think Alouds Whole Brain Thinking Maps
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Based on 2019 FSA data, lack of instruction in multiple comprehension strategies across the contents seems to create a hindrance in comprehending texts. According to "Improving Adolescent Literacy: Effective Classroom Intervention Practices" found on What Works Clearinghouse, implementing multiple strategies for comprehension improves learning over implementation of a single strategy for comprehension.

Action Steps to Implement

Dedicate a portion of the regular classroom lesson to explicit vocabulary instruction.
Using Flocabulary
Root word vocabulary instruction across the school
Graphic organizer used school-wide
2. Use repeated exposure to new words in multiple oral and written contexts and allow sufficient practice sessions.
Post Roots and associated content words in classrooms and around the school building
3. Give sufficient opportunities to use new vocabulary in a variety of contexts through activities such as discussion, and extended reading
4. Provide students with strategies to make them independent vocabulary learners (help promote students to independently acquire vocabulary skills - using context clues to derive meaning)
Root word vocabulary instruction across the school

Person Responsible	Marietta Britt McCaskill (mbrittmccaskill@ecsdfl.us)

No description entered

Person Responsible	[no one identified]

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Instructional math practice. Based on the 2019 data students can benefit from visual representation. We plan to utilize the interactive math notebook to support instructional practice across all grade and learning levels. https://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/Docs/PracticeGuide/MPS_PG_043012.pdf#page=29 In analyzing the 2019 FSA data and the current 2020 progress monitoring data, vocabulary acquisition appears to be a hindrance to math comprehension. Effective Classroom Intervention Practices found on What Works Clearinghouse, explicit vocabulary instruction proved to have a strong positive effect size on student performance. Teach students how to use visual representation A major task for any student engaged in problem-solving is to translate the quantitative information in a problem into a symbolic equation—an arithmetic/algebraic statement—necessary for solving the problem. Visual representations help students solve problems by linking the relationships between quantities in the problem with the mathematical operations needed to solve the problem. Students who learn to visually represent the mathematical information in problems prior to writing an equation are more effective at problem-solving. Visual representations include tables, graphs, number lines, and diagrams such as strip diagrams, percent bars, and schematic diagrams.
Measurable Outcome:	Raising the standardized level 1 by two levels. Example: from 1L to 1H or 1M to 2L and 1H to 2H utilizing remediation for select students. Raising the standardized level 2s and 3s by 5% through the research-based evidence and strategies described in the worksheet above (43% to 48%). Raise the standardized level of all students with disabilities by one level by 3% (24% - 27%). Example: 1L to 1M using the strategies outlined including interactive math notebook, remedial math classes, and vocabulary.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	[no one identified]
Evidence-based Strategy:	Instructional Math Practice The strategies are strong and found in Practice Guide 16 https://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/PracticeGuide/16 https://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/Docs/PracticeGuide/MPS_PG_043012.pdf#page=29 Teach students how to use visual representation A major task for any student engaged in problem-solving is to translate the quantitative information in a problem into a symbolic equation—an arithmetic/algebraic statement—necessary for solving the problem. Visual representations help students solve problems by linking the relationships between quantities in the problem with the mathematical operations needed to solve the problem. Students who learn to visually represent the mathematical information in problems prior to writing an equation are more effective at problem-solving. Visual representations include tables, graphs, number lines, and diagrams such as strip diagrams, percent bars, and schematic diagrams.

Interactive Math Notebook

https://theeducatorsroom.com/interactive-student-notebooks-my-mathematical-lifesaver

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

An interactive notebook is based on brain research that helps students to visualize and learn through an active process. The right side of the notebook is for teacher-created notes. These notes can include a graphic organizer, pictures and tables, fill in the blank, and more. The right side can contain interactive parts, such as foldables. For example, when discussing the three methods for solving a system of equations, we will fold a piece of paper in half and cut one side three times.

Once the notes have been completed, the left side is utilized for practicing. The left side is used because it allows for the students to actively interact with their notes. This encourages students to try by themselves, then refer to the notes they cannot complete with a resource.

Action Steps to Implement

Four components
Vocabulary
Technology
Interactive Math Notebook
Remedial Math for select students

All grade levels will deploy the interactive math notebook for all students; Flocabulary, technology practice, and quizzes to allow for mastery of online related test-taking skills. Online calculator for use with all practice and standardized testing.
Utilizing the interactive math notebook will allow for practice and review.
The Interactive math notebook will teach students to note-taking strategies while allowing practice accompanying the notes. The left side of the book is teacher-directed student interactive notes. The right side of the notebook is proactive using the notes.
Students will use the notebook throughout the year with practice, quizzes, and other assessments.
The interactiveness will allow students to be engaged at all times.

Remedial math for select students who need to master previously learned math skills.

Person Responsible
Marietta Britt McCaskill (mbrittmccaskill@ecsdfl.us)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

The school will be focusing on safety of students through the COVID pandemic. The school will work with teachers, students, and families to practice social distancing, provide added hand washing times, limit contact for students in spaces they cannot social distance from one another and throughly clean all areas where people are present throughout the day. This will help mitigate students and staff having to be out due to the pandemic.

Part IV: Positive Culture & Environment

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

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

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

We have an active SAC Committee which meets more than 4 times a year. All data is included in the meetings including discipline data. Besides being a CKH and PBIS school we are developing a CAH (Capturing Adult Hearts) which keeps all staff members feeling connected to each other. This helps with problem-solving instead of problem creating. As administrators, we meet with students to discuss their data, both academically and behaviorally. We have developed a CICO system for students using a preferred adult and rewards are given based on points earned. We will be adding virtual parent-teacher conferences to increase participation, giving parents and teachers the opportunity for clearer communication and working together in helping their child achieve success.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link
The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups	$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups	$0.00
		Total:	$0.00