



---

## Table of Contents

---

|   |           |
|---|-----------|
| <b>School Demographics</b>                | <b>3</b>  |
| <b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>     | <b>4</b>  |
| <b>School Information</b>                 | <b>7</b>  |
| <b>Needs Assessment</b>                   | <b>12</b> |
| <b>Planning for Improvement</b>           | <b>18</b> |
| <b>Positive Culture &amp; Environment</b> | <b>35</b> |
| <b>Budget to Support Goals</b>            | <b>35</b> |

## Madeira Beach Fundamental K 8

591 TOM STUART CAUSEWAY, Made IR A Beach, FL 33708

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

### Demographics

**Principal: Ateek Christopher**

Start Date for this Principal: 7/7/2009

|  |   |
|--|---|
| <b>2019-20 Status</b><br>(per MSID File)   | Active  |
| <b>School Type and Grades Served</b><br>(per MSID File)  | Combination School<br>KG-8  |
| <b>Primary Service Type</b><br>(per MSID File)   | K-12 General Education  |
| <b>2019-20 Title I School</b>  | No  |
| <b>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b><br>(as reported on Survey 3)  | 27%   |
| <b>2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b><br>(subgroups with 10 or more students)<br>(subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Students With Disabilities<br>Asian Students<br>Black/African American Students<br>Hispanic Students<br>Multiracial Students<br>White Students<br>Economically Disadvantaged Students |
| <b>School Grades History</b>   | 2018-19: A (74%)<br>2017-18: A (75%)<br>2016-17: A (76%)<br>2015-16: A (73%)  |
| <b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>  |   |
| <b>SI Region</b>   | Central   |
| <b>Regional Executive Director</b>   | <a href="#">Lucinda Thompson</a>  |
| <b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>   | N/A   |
| <b>Year</b>  |   |
| <b>Support Tier</b>  |   |
| <b>ESSA Status</b>   | N/A   |

\* 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 Pinellas County School Board.

## SIP Authority

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

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

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

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

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

## Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

---

## Table of Contents

---

|                                       |           |
|---------------------------------------|-----------|
| <b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b> | <b>4</b>  |
| <b>School Information</b>             | <b>7</b>  |
| <b>Needs Assessment</b>               | <b>12</b> |
| <b>Planning for Improvement</b>       | <b>18</b> |
| <b>Title I Requirements</b>           | <b>0</b>  |
| <b>Budget to Support Goals</b>        | <b>35</b> |

## Madeira Beach Fundamental K 8

591 TOM STUART CAUSEWAY, Made IR A Beach, FL 33708

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

### School Demographics

|   |                               |   |
|---|-------------------------------|---|
| <b>School Type and Grades Served</b><br>(per MSID File) | <b>2019-20 Title I School</b> | <b>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b><br>(as reported on Survey 3) |
| Combination School<br>KG-8                              | No                            | 22%   |
| <b>Primary Service Type</b><br>(per MSID File)          | <b>Charter School</b>         | <b>2018-19 Minority Rate</b><br>(Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)               |
| K-12 General Education                                  | No                            | 22%   |

### School Grades History

| Year  | 2019-20 | 2018-19 | 2017-18 | 2016-17 |
|-------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| Grade | A       | A       | A       | A       |

### School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Pinellas 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.**

Madeira Beach Fundamental will provide a rigorous student-centered learning environment to ensure 100% student success and promote college readiness by working collaboratively with all faculty, staff, and community stakeholders.

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

100% Student Success

### School Leadership Team

#### **Membership**

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

| <b>Name</b>         | <b>Title</b>        | <b>Job Duties and Responsibilities</b>                   |
|---------------------|---------------------|--|
| Ateek, Christopher  | Principal           |  |
| Crandall, Brooke    | Assistant Principal |  |
| Altenore, Carolyn   | Assistant Principal |  |
| Vermillion, Kristin | School Counselor    | Middle School Students with last names A - K             |
| Santos, Valerie     | School Counselor    | Middle School Students with Last Names L - Z             |
| Johansen, Shannon   | Psychologist        |  |
| Simon, Jill         | Teacher, K-12       | Kindergarten Team Leader                                 |
| Deson, Michelle     | Teacher, K-12       | 1st Grade Team Leader                                    |
| Bostick, David      | Teacher, K-12       | 2nd Grade Team Leader                                    |
| Rutkis, Krista      | Teacher, K-12       | 4th Grade Team Leader                                    |
| Mosall, Laura       | Teacher, K-12       | 5th Grade Team Leader                                    |
| Woestmann, Molly    | Teacher, K-12       | Elementary Electives Team Leader                         |
| Courtney, Sara      | Teacher, K-12       | Equity Champion / Restorative Practices Trainer          |
| Gilberg, Allan      | Teacher, K-12       | Middle School Social Studies Department Chair            |
| Hall, Stephanie     | Teacher, ESE        | VE Resource and ESE Liaison                              |
| Knox, Jonathan      | Teacher, K-12       | Middle School Reading and Language Arts Department Chair |
| Moser, Melissa      | Teacher, K-12       | Middle School Mathematics Department Chair               |
| Motte, Malinda      | School Counselor    | Elementary Students                                      |
| Wolfenden, Angela   | Teacher, K-12       | Middle Grades Elective Department Chair                  |
| Butler, Heather     | Teacher, K-12       | Middle Grades Science Department Chair                   |
| Graus, Kim          | Teacher, K-12       |  |
| Spencer, Ajori      | Teacher, K-12       | Equity Champion  |



## Demographic Information

### Principal start date

Tuesday 7/7/2009, Ateek Christopher

**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.*

8

**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.*

13

### Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

77

### Demographic Data

|  |   |
|--|---|
| <b>2020-21 Status</b><br>(per MSID File)   | Active  |
| <b>School Type and Grades Served</b><br>(per MSID File)  | Combination School<br>KG-8  |
| <b>Primary Service Type</b><br>(per MSID File)   | K-12 General Education  |
| <b>2019-20 Title I School</b>  | No  |
| <b>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b><br>(as reported on Survey 3)  | 27%   |
| <b>2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b><br>(subgroups with 10 or more students)<br>(subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Students With Disabilities<br>Asian Students<br>Black/African American Students<br>Hispanic Students<br>Multiracial Students<br>White Students<br>Economically Disadvantaged Students |
| <b>School Grades History</b>   | 2018-19: A (74%)<br>2017-18: A (75%)<br>2016-17: A (76%)<br>2015-16: A (73%)  |
| <b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>  |   |
| <b>SI Region</b>   | Central   |

|  |                                  |
|--|----------------------------------|
| <b>Regional Executive Director</b>   | <a href="#">Lucinda Thompson</a> |
| <b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>   | N/A                              |
| <b>Year</b>  |                                  |
| <b>Support Tier</b>  |                                  |
| <b>ESSA Status</b>   | N/A                              |
| * As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, <a href="#">click here</a> . |                                  |

**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               | 70          | 72 | 72 | 74 | 87 | 88 | 303 | 303 | 305 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 1374  |
| Attendance below 90 percent               | 0           | 2  | 1  | 0  | 5  | 5  | 4   | 10  | 4   | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 31    |
| One or more suspensions                   | 0           | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 2  | 2   | 0   | 0   | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 4     |
| Course failure in ELA                     | 0           | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |       |
| Course failure in Math                    | 0           | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0   | 5   | 3   | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 8     |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment  | 0           | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 6  | 22  | 25  | 18  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 71    |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment | 0           | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 7  | 16  | 14  | 19  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 56    |

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 | 2 | 1 | 6 | 4 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 13    |

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 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 2     |
| Students retained two or more times | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |       |

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 6/29/2020

**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     | 72          | 72 | 71 | 73 | 86 | 88 | 304 | 311 | 305 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 1382  |
| Attendance below 90 percent     | 1           | 2  | 4  | 8  | 7  | 6  | 17  | 18  | 31  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 94    |
| One or more suspensions         | 0           | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 4   | 2   | 0   | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 6     |
| Course failure in ELA or Math   | 0           | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 2   | 0   | 6   | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 8     |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0           | 0  | 0  | 2  | 7  | 8  | 30  | 31  | 23  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 101   |

**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 | 1 | 0 | 5 | 5 | 4 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 15    |

**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 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0     |
| Students retained two or more times | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0     |

**Prior Year - Updated**

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

| Indicator                       | Grade Level |    |    |    |    |    |     |     |     |   |    |    |    | Total |
|---------------------------------|-------------|----|----|----|----|----|-----|-----|-----|---|----|----|----|-------|
|                                 | K           | 1  | 2  | 3  | 4  | 5  | 6   | 7   | 8   | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |       |
| Number of students enrolled     | 72          | 72 | 71 | 73 | 86 | 88 | 304 | 311 | 305 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 1382  |
| Attendance below 90 percent     | 1           | 2  | 4  | 8  | 7  | 6  | 17  | 18  | 31  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 94    |
| One or more suspensions         | 0           | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 4   | 2   | 0   | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 6     |
| Course failure in ELA or Math   | 0           | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 2   | 0   | 6   | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 8     |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0           | 0  | 0  | 2  | 7  | 8  | 30  | 31  | 23  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 101   |

**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 | 1 | 0 | 5 | 5 | 4 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 15    |

**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 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0     |
| Students retained two or more times | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0     |

## 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             | 76%    | 70%      | 61%   | 79%    | 65%      | 57%   |
| ELA Learning Gains          | 63%    | 63%      | 59%   | 68%    | 57%      | 57%   |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile  | 58%    | 56%      | 54%   | 62%    | 52%      | 51%   |
| Math Achievement            | 83%    | 72%      | 62%   | 85%    | 64%      | 58%   |
| Math Learning Gains         | 71%    | 63%      | 59%   | 73%    | 56%      | 56%   |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 63%    | 54%      | 52%   | 68%    | 52%      | 50%   |
| Science Achievement         | 76%    | 64%      | 56%   | 79%    | 55%      | 53%   |
| Social Studies Achievement  | 93%    | 81%      | 78%   | 95%    | 81%      | 75%   |

### EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

| Indicator | Grade Level (prior year reported) |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     | Total |
|-----------|-----------------------------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-------|
|           | K                                 | 1   | 2   | 3   | 4   | 5   | 6   | 7   | 8   |       |
|           | (0)                               | (0) | (0) | (0) | (0) | (0) | (0) | (0) | (0) | 0 (0) |

### Grade Level Data

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

| ELA                   |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|-----------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade                 | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 03                    | 2019 | 82%    | 56%      | 26%                        | 58%   | 24%                     |
|                       | 2018 | 71%    | 53%      | 18%                        | 57%   | 14%                     |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | 11%    |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| 04                    | 2019 | 72%    | 56%      | 16%                        | 58%   | 14%                     |
|                       | 2018 | 65%    | 51%      | 14%                        | 56%   | 9%                      |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | 7%     |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      | 1%     |          |                            |       |                         |
| 05                    | 2019 | 70%    | 54%      | 16%                        | 56%   | 14%                     |
|                       | 2018 | 72%    | 50%      | 22%                        | 55%   | 17%                     |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | -2%    |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      | 5%     |          |                            |       |                         |
| 06                    | 2019 | 76%    | 51%      | 25%                        | 54%   | 22%                     |
|                       | 2018 | 77%    | 49%      | 28%                        | 52%   | 25%                     |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | -1%    |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      | 4%     |          |                            |       |                         |
| 07                    | 2019 | 72%    | 51%      | 21%                        | 52%   | 20%                     |

| ELA                   |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|-----------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade                 | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
|                       | 2018 | 76%    | 48%      | 28%                        | 51%   | 25%                     |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | -4%    |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      | -5%    |          |                            |       |                         |
| 08                    | 2019 | 81%    | 55%      | 26%                        | 56%   | 25%                     |
|                       | 2018 | 81%    | 55%      | 26%                        | 58%   | 23%                     |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | 0%     |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      | 5%     |          |                            |       |                         |

| MATH                  |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|-----------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade                 | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 03                    | 2019 | 83%    | 62%      | 21%                        | 62%   | 21%                     |
|                       | 2018 | 81%    | 62%      | 19%                        | 62%   | 19%                     |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | 2%     |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| 04                    | 2019 | 84%    | 64%      | 20%                        | 64%   | 20%                     |
|                       | 2018 | 84%    | 62%      | 22%                        | 62%   | 22%                     |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | 0%     |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      | 3%     |          |                            |       |                         |
| 05                    | 2019 | 83%    | 60%      | 23%                        | 60%   | 23%                     |
|                       | 2018 | 95%    | 61%      | 34%                        | 61%   | 34%                     |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | -12%   |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      | -1%    |          |                            |       |                         |
| 06                    | 2019 | 70%    | 44%      | 26%                        | 55%   | 15%                     |
|                       | 2018 | 79%    | 45%      | 34%                        | 52%   | 27%                     |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | -9%    |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      | -25%   |          |                            |       |                         |
| 07                    | 2019 | 90%    | 60%      | 30%                        | 54%   | 36%                     |
|                       | 2018 | 83%    | 59%      | 24%                        | 54%   | 29%                     |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | 7%     |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      | 11%    |          |                            |       |                         |
| 08                    | 2019 | 63%    | 31%      | 32%                        | 46%   | 17%                     |
|                       | 2018 | 82%    | 31%      | 51%                        | 45%   | 37%                     |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | -19%   |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      | -20%   |          |                            |       |                         |

| SCIENCE               |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|-----------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade                 | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 05                    | 2019 | 73%    | 54%      | 19%                        | 53%   | 20%                     |
|                       | 2018 | 91%    | 57%      | 34%                        | 55%   | 36%                     |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | -18%   |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| 08                    | 2019 | 77%    | 51%      | 26%                        | 48%   | 29%                     |
|                       | 2018 | 85%    | 53%      | 32%                        | 50%   | 35%                     |

| SCIENCE               |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|-----------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade                 | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| Same Grade Comparison |      |        |          | -8%                        |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      |        |          | -14%                       |       |                         |

| 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       | 93%    | 68%      | 25%                   | 71%   | 22%                |  |
| 2018       | 89%    | 66%      | 23%                   | 71%   | 18%                |  |
| Compare    |        |          |                       | 4%    |                    |  |

| 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        | 93%    | 55%      | 38%                   | 61%   | 32%                |  |
| 2018        | 98%    | 57%      | 41%                   | 62%   | 36%                |  |
| Compare     |        |          |                       | -5%   |                    |  |

| GEOMETRY EOC |        |          |                       |       |                    |  |
|--------------|--------|----------|-----------------------|-------|--------------------|--|
| Year         | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |  |
| 2019         | 100%   | 56%      | 44%                   | 57%   | 43%                |  |
| 2018         | 100%   | 56%      | 44%                   | 56%   | 44%                |  |
| Compare      |        |          |                       | 0%    |                    |  |

**Subgroup Data**

| 2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
|---|----------|--------|-------------|-----------|---------|--------------|----------|---------|-----------|-------------------|---------------------|
| Subgroups                                 | ELA Ach. | ELA LG | ELA LG L25% | Math Ach. | Math LG | Math LG L25% | Sci Ach. | SS Ach. | MS Accel. | Grad Rate 2017-18 | C & C Accel 2017-18 |
| SWD                                       | 49       | 60     | 54          | 58        | 62      | 47           | 30       | 76      |           |                   |                     |
| ELL                                       | 33       | 60     | 54          | 53        | 67      | 64           |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| ASN                                       | 86       | 69     | 67          | 93        | 73      |              | 85       | 100     | 95        |                   |                     |

| 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 |
| BLK                                       | 52       | 47     | 35          | 61        | 60      | 59           | 54       |         |           |                   |                     |
| HSP                                       | 72       | 58     | 48          | 78        | 73      | 57           | 72       | 88      | 82        |                   |                     |
| MUL                                       | 73       | 77     | 70          | 76        | 74      |              |          | 88      |           |                   |                     |
| WHT                                       | 77       | 63     | 59          | 84        | 71      | 64           | 77       | 93      | 82        |                   |                     |
| FRL                                       | 64       | 57     | 50          | 74        | 66      | 58           | 64       | 85      | 85        |                   |                     |
| 2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| Subgroups                                 | ELA Ach. | ELA LG | ELA LG L25% | Math Ach. | Math LG | Math LG L25% | Sci Ach. | SS Ach. | MS Accel. | Grad Rate 2016-17 | C & C Accel 2016-17 |
| SWD                                       | 39       | 36     | 33          | 55        | 53      | 48           | 57       | 55      |           |                   |                     |
| ASN                                       | 76       | 55     |             | 93        | 83      |              | 100      | 91      | 92        |                   |                     |
| BLK                                       | 60       | 67     | 50          | 66        | 58      | 33           | 70       | 92      |           |                   |                     |
| HSP                                       | 76       | 65     | 62          | 82        | 63      | 68           | 81       | 83      | 79        |                   |                     |
| MUL                                       | 78       | 67     |             | 89        | 79      |              | 100      |         | 70        |                   |                     |
| WHT                                       | 77       | 61     | 54          | 87        | 71      | 68           | 86       | 90      | 81        |                   |                     |
| FRL                                       | 67       | 60     | 52          | 80        | 65      | 63           | 81       | 86      | 71        |                   |                     |
| 2017 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| Subgroups                                 | ELA Ach. | ELA LG | ELA LG L25% | Math Ach. | Math LG | Math LG L25% | Sci Ach. | SS Ach. | MS Accel. | Grad Rate 2015-16 | C & C Accel 2015-16 |
| SWD                                       | 48       | 47     | 37          | 55        | 56      | 53           | 52       |         |           |                   |                     |
| ASN                                       | 88       | 84     | 86          | 94        | 80      |              | 87       |         | 80        |                   |                     |
| BLK                                       | 59       | 45     | 54          | 69        | 69      | 69           |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| HSP                                       | 77       | 65     | 60          | 79        | 68      | 63           | 86       | 93      | 79        |                   |                     |
| MUL                                       | 79       | 74     |             | 90        | 67      |              | 100      |         | 55        |                   |                     |
| WHT                                       | 79       | 68     | 61          | 85        | 73      | 67           | 79       | 94      | 74        |                   |                     |
| FRL                                       | 74       | 65     | 62          | 76        | 70      | 69           | 70       | 91      | 53        |                   |                     |

### 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)  | N/A  |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students  | 74   |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students                                    | NO   |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target                                    | 0    |
| Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency |      |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index                                       | 666  |
| Total Components for the Federal Index  | 9    |
| Percent Tested  | 100% |
| Subgroup Data   |      |

| <b>Students With Disabilities</b>  |     |
|--|-----|
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities                                     | 55  |
| Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?             | NO  |
| Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%      | 0   |
| <b>English Language Learners</b>   |     |
| Federal Index - English Language Learners                                      | 55  |
| English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?              | NO  |
| Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%       | 0   |
| <b>Native American Students</b>  |     |
| 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   |
| <b>Asian Students</b>  |     |
| Federal Index - Asian Students   | 84  |
| Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?                         | NO  |
| Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%                  | 0   |
| <b>Black/African American Students</b>   |     |
| Federal Index - Black/African American Students                                | 53  |
| Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?        | NO  |
| Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0   |
| <b>Hispanic Students</b>   |     |
| Federal Index - Hispanic Students  | 70  |
| Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?                      | NO  |
| Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%               | 0   |
| <b>Multiracial Students</b>  |     |
| Federal Index - Multiracial Students   | 76  |
| Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?                   | NO  |
| Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%            | 0   |
| <b>Pacific Islander Students</b>   |     |
| 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   | 74 |
| 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                                | 67 |
| 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.

The school-wide data components that showed the lowest performance were the ELA Lowest 25th Percentile at 58% proficiency and the Mathematics Lowest 25th Percentile at 63% proficiency. In addition, English Language Arts (ELA) proficiency was low at 76% overall proficiency, and Science at 76% overall proficiency. In ELA, the grade-level data component with the lowest performance was 5th grade, at 70% proficiency. In Math, the data component with the lowest performance was 8th grade, at 63% proficiency. In Science, the data component with the lowest performance was 5th grade, at 73% proficiency. Low performance in ELA and Science can be contributed to turn-over in staff, lack of data usage in designing targeted lessons, and lack of rigorous, standards-based instruction. In addition, a new textbook adoption that moved to a digital/online platform in Science may have contributed to lower performance as teachers learned and implemented best practices for student success in a new way.

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

The data component that showed the greatest decline from the prior year was Science Achievement that dropped from 86% proficiency in 2017-2018 to 76% proficiency in 2018-2019. 5th grade Science declined from 91% of students achieving proficiency in 2017-2018, to 73% achieving proficiency in 2018-2019, an 18% decrease in proficiency. 8th grade Science declined from 85% of students achieving proficiency in 2017-2018, to 77% achieving proficiency in 2018-2019, an 8% decrease in proficiency. Another data component with significant decline from the prior year was 8th grade Mathematics, which declined from 82% of students achieving proficiency in 2017-2018, to 63% of students achieving proficiency in 2018-2019, a 19% decrease in proficiency. Decline in performance from the prior year can be contributed to a new course offering, a double-block of Algebra, with a larger cohort of students who would have scored at the proficient level or above, now taking the Algebra EOC rather than the 8th grade FSA Mathematics assessment. In addition, a new textbook adoption in science which required teachers to learn and implement best practices for student success in a new way, and lack of data usage in designing targeted lessons that are rigorous and standards-based.

**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.**

All data components were above the state average. The ELA data component closest to the state average is 4th and 5th grade, which were both 14% above the state average. 4th grade showed 72% proficiency, compared to the state average of 58% proficient, and 5th grade showed 70% proficiency, compared to the state average of 56% proficient.

The Mathematics data component closest to the state average is 6th grade, which was 15% above the state average. 6th grade showed 70% proficiency, compared to the state average of 55%.

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

In looking at school-wide data, the data component that showed the most improvement was the ELA Lowest 25th Percentile performance, which improved from 54% proficiency in 2017-2018 to 58% proficiency in 2018-2019.

In looking at grade-level data, the data component that showed the most improvement in ELA is 3rd grade, which improved from 71% to 82% proficiency, an increase of 11%. In Math, 7th grade showed the most improvement, by improving from 83% to 90% proficiency, an increase of 7%. New actions taken were a change in personnel in 3rd grade and 7th grade courses, and increased use of rigorous, standards-based instruction.

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

Our largest number of students in the EWS data focuses on the number of students earning a Level 1 on the 2019 ELA or Mathematics FSA. We currently have 71 students scoring a Level 1 on the ELA FSA and 56 students scoring a Level 1 on the Mathematics FSA. In addition, we have 31 students whose attendance was below 90%.

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

1. Standards-based planning and instruction in all content areas
2. Number of students achieving proficiency in ELA, Math, Science, and Social Studies
3. Lesson target and task alignment
4. Equity and Social Justice through Restorative Practices
5. Connecting with students who disappeared during our transition to virtual learning

## Part III: Planning for Improvement

### Areas of Focus:

**#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA**

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** By focusing on instruction and differentiation of practice in English/Language Arts, we will improve the proficiency level of all students. Teachers will focus on instructional practices that identify critical content and engage students in complex tasks in order to improve student learning and increase the overall level of proficiency in ELA across all grade levels.

**Measurable Outcome:** The percent of all students achieving ELA proficiency will increase from 76% to 80%, as measured by the ELA FSA.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** Christopher Ateek (ateekc@pcsb.org)

**Evidence-based Strategy:** Enhance staff capacity to identify critical content from the Standards in alignment with district resources.  
Strengthen staff ability to engage students in complex tasks.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** Overall, ELA proficiency remained at 76% proficient from 2018 to 2019. The percentage of students making learning gains in ELA increased from 62% in 2018 to 63% in 2019. Learning gains among our L25 students also increased from 54% in 2018 to 58% in 2019. These strategies were beginning to be implemented in 2019-2020 and we will continue with implementation in 2019-2020 to continue to increase learning gains, but also to show increased overall proficiency by May 2021.

**Action Steps to Implement**

1. Conduct regular Professional Learning Communities (PLCs) inclusive of 'data chats' to review student responses to tasks and plan for instruction based on data.

**Person Responsible** Brooke Crandall (crandallb@pcsb.org)

2. Regularly assess (formally and informally) and utilize data to modify and adjust instruction, including utilizing the Assessment platform for collecting and assessing writing, reviewing student data and guiding instruction.

**Person Responsible** Brooke Crandall (crandallb@pcsb.org)

3. Teachers monitor and provide timely and specific feedback to students based on mastery of standards to support learning.

**Person Responsible** Brooke Crandall (crandallb@pcsb.org)

4. Use strengthen core instruction by increasing the amount of time students are engaged in reading by closely and critically re-reading complex text, writing, speaking, and listening.

**Person Responsible** Brooke Crandall (crandallb@pcsb.org)

AVID site-based training which includes the WICOR strategy of focused note taking, allowing for more differentiation and scaffolding to occur in the classroom.

**Person Responsible** Brooke Crandall (crandallb@pcsb.org)

ELA and reading teachers utilize a planning roadmap to choose strategies and resources for use as they plan, to ensure high engagement, rigor and progress monitoring. Planning PLC is aligned to equity protocol.

**Person Responsible** Brooke Crandall (crandallb@pcsb.org)

Include ESE teachers in ELA PLCs to facilitate collaborative planning.

**Person Responsible** Brooke Crandall (crandallb@pcsb.org)

Specify ESE teachers using data from formal and informal assessments to plan SDI targeted to student IEP goals to build skills to aid in mastery of grade level standards in ELA.

**Person Responsible** Brooke Crandall (crandallb@pcsb.org)

**#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math**

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** By focusing on instruction and differentiation of practice in Mathematics, we will improve the proficiency level of all students. Teachers will focus on instructional practices that identify critical content and will organize students to interact with content in manners which differentiates/scaffolds instruction to meet the needs of each student. In order to improve student learning and increase the overall level of proficiency in Mathematics across all grade levels.

**Measurable Outcome:** The percent of all students achieving Mathematics proficiency will increase from 83% to 87%, as measured by the Mathematics FSA.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** Carolyn Altenore (altenorec@pcsb.org)

**Evidence-based Strategy:**

1. Enhance staff capacity to identify critical content from the Standards in alignment with district resources.
2. Support staff to utilize data to organize students to interact with content in manners which differentiates/scaffolds instruction to meet the needs of each student.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:**

Overall, Mathematics proficiency decreased from 87% proficient in 2018 to 83% proficient in 2019. The percentage of students making learning gains in Mathematics remained at 71% in both 2018 and 2019. Learning gains among our L25 students decreased from 68% in 2018 to 63% in 2019. These strategies will help to adjust the decrease in proficiency and decrease in learning gains among our lowest 25 students by May 2021.

By identifying critical content, teachers can ensure mastery of all content areas that will be assessed on district cycle assessments and the FSA assessment. This will boost student proficiency levels to the target of 87% proficient.

Although student performance data is used to ensure proper placement of students into math courses, within courses, students have a variety of needs to be successful. By implementing differentiation and scaffolding, we will be able to ensure all students reach proficiency in content standards.

**Action Steps to Implement**

1. Teachers utilize systemic documents (adopted curriculum, pacing guides, etc.) to effectively plan for mathematics units that incorporate the Standards for Mathematical Practice and rigorous performance tasks aligned to Mathematics Florida Standards (MAFS).

**Person Responsible:** Carolyn Altenore (altenorec@pcsb.org)

2. Conduct regular, monthly, Professional Learning Communities (PLCs) inclusive of 'data chats' to review student responses to tasks and formative assessments and plan for instructional lessons incorporating MAFS and Practice Standards based on classroom and student level data.

**Person Responsible:** Carolyn Altenore (altenorec@pcsb.org)

3. Teachers regularly assess (formally and informally) and utilize data to modify and adjust instruction through differentiation and scaffolding and provide feedback to students to support learning.

**Person Responsible:** Carolyn Altenore (altenorec@pcsb.org)

4. Teachers use lesson planning tools to plan purposeful questions based on anticipated student solutions and misconceptions. Teachers use various mathematics tools and manipulatives (rulers, number lines, counters, pattern blocks, base ten blocks, etc.) and encourage students to select tools that support

making sense of problems. Teachers plan for the purposeful integration of mathematics tasks into science lessons (e.g., Students use number lines to measure liquid volume to the nearest mL and solve related real-world math problems).

**Person Responsible** Carolyn Altenore (altenorec@pcsb.org)

5. AVID site-based training which includes WICOR strategies, allowing for more differentiation and scaffolding to occur in the classroom.

**Person Responsible** Carolyn Altenore (altenorec@pcsb.org)

6. Administrators monitor teacher practice and provide feedback to support teacher growth in identifying critical content and providing differentiation and scaffolding. Administrators regularly observe mathematics lessons and provide feedback, with mathematics coach support as requested.

**Person Responsible** Carolyn Altenore (altenorec@pcsb.org)

7. Conduct regular Professional Learning Communities (PLCs) inclusive of 'data chats' to review student responses to tasks and plan for instruction based on data that includes identifying critical content and differentiation and scaffolding as needed to ensure student proficiency.

**Person Responsible** Carolyn Altenore (altenorec@pcsb.org)

8. Specify ESE teachers using data from formal and informal assessments to plan SDI targeted to student IEP goals to build skills to aid in mastery of grade level standards in Mathematics.

**Person Responsible** Carolyn Altenore (altenorec@pcsb.org)

9. Include ESE teachers in Math PLCs to facilitate collaborative planning.

**Person Responsible** Carolyn Altenore (altenorec@pcsb.org)

10. Teachers analyze assessment data (MAP K-5 and Cycle Assessment 6-8) by standard for their class and across the grade level. Based on analysis, remediation and enrichment activities focused on critical content will be planned and implemented.

**Person Responsible** Carolyn Altenore (altenorec@pcsb.org)

**#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science**

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** By focusing on instruction and differentiation practice in Science, we will improve the proficiency level of all students. Teachers will focus on instructional practices that identify critical content while differentiating and scaffolding instruction in order to improve student learning and increase the overall level of proficiency in Science across all grade levels.

**Measurable Outcome:** The percent of all students achieving Science proficiency will increase from 76% to 80%, as measured by the Statewide Science Assessment.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** Christopher Ateek (ateekc@pcsb.org)

**Evidence-based Strategy:** Support staff to utilize data to organize students to interact with content in manners which differentiates/scaffolds instruction to meet the needs of each student.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** Overall, Science proficiency decreased from 86% proficient in 2018 to 76% proficient 2019. These strategies will allow us to address the drop in proficiency seen at both 5th and 8th grade, and work toward increased proficiency percentages by May 2021. In 2019-2020, we moved to two levels of instruction (Advanced and Accelerated/Honors) at the 8th grade level. In 2020-2021, we are expanding this model to all middle school grade levels, so differentiation of instruction is important to ensure the success of all students.

**Action Steps to Implement**

1. Regularly assess (formally and informally) and utilize data to modify and adjust instruction. Teachers utilize ongoing formative assessment (unit and cycle assessments) and use the information gained to adjust instruction, enrich and reteach, and provide research-based interventions.

**Person Responsible** Christopher Ateek (ateekc@pcsb.org)

2. Use data to plan instruction that ensures differentiation, intervention and enrichment while scaffolding learning to increase student performance.

**Person Responsible** Christopher Ateek (ateekc@pcsb.org)

3. Conduct regular, monthly, Professional Learning Communities (PLCs) inclusive of 'data chats' to review student responses to tasks and formative assessments and plan for instructional lessons that include text-dependent questions, close and critical reading and skill/strategy-based groups to implement during core instruction to support success with complex texts.

**Person Responsible** Christopher Ateek (ateekc@pcsb.org)

AVID site-based training which includes the WICOR strategy of focused note taking, allowing for more differentiation and scaffolding to occur in the classroom.

**Person Responsible** Christopher Ateek (ateekc@pcsb.org)

**#4. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Equity & Diversity**

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** As the result of equity-centered problem solving within an MTSS framework, our school will develop an equity goal to build relational capacity, empower student voice, and hold high expectations within one of the following school improvement areas for equity systems change:  
 Provide professional development on equitable grading practices.  
 Increase the use of equitable grading practices  
 This area of focus impacts student learning and success and impacts changes in staff practice.

**Measurable Outcome:** To increase the use of equitable grading practices, we will initiate a group of teachers with commitment to these practices. Our current data illustrates variations in grading policies across grade levels as evidenced by staff grading survey. The issue may be impacted by a discussion around what grading should reflect through PLC's. We will measure progress by reviewing changes in data by the use of problem solving and report actions taken as a result. We will measure long term student outcomes by reducing grading inequity.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** Christopher Ateek (ateekc@pcsb.org)

**Evidence-based Strategy:** To improve Equitable grading practices

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** These strategies and practices were identified using the Racial Equity Analysis Protocol.

**Action Steps to Implement**

Targeted group of teachers will participate in Equitable Grading Practices online course.

**Person Responsible** Christopher Ateek (ateekc@pcsb.org)

Administration will monitor implementation of equitable grading practices by the targeted group of teachers through walk-thrus and data analysis of grade distribution and will distribute data and feedback from targeted group of teachers through monthly PLC meetings.

**Person Responsible** Christopher Ateek (ateekc@pcsb.org)

Provide professional development and data to all staff for equitable grading practices implementation school wide by May 2021.

**Person Responsible** Christopher Ateek (ateekc@pcsb.org)

Continue to target teacher leaders for equity champion microcredentialing.

**Person Responsible** Christopher Ateek (ateekc@pcsb.org)



**#5. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Social Studies**

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** By focusing on instruction and differentiation of practice in Social Studies, we will improve the proficiency level of all students. Teachers will focus on instructional practices that identify critical content and engage students in complex tasks in order to improve student learning and increase the overall level of proficiency in Social Studies across all grade levels.

**Measurable Outcome:** The percent of 7th grade students achieving proficiency on the Civics EOC will increase from 93% to 96%, as measured by the spring 2021 administration of the Civics EOC. The percent of students in all grade levels scoring in the "green" on Social Studies cycle assessments will be 75% or higher on all cycle assessments during the 2020-2021 school year.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** [no one identified]

**Evidence-based Strategy:** Support staff to utilize data to organize students to interact with content in manners which differentiates/scaffolds instruction to meet the needs of each student. Strengthen staff ability to engage students in complex tasks.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** Overall, Social Studies proficiency increased from 90% proficient in 2018 to 93% proficient 2019 as measured by the Civics EOC assessment.. These strategies were beginning to be implemented in 2019-2020 and we will continue with implementation in 2020-2021 to continue to increase learning gains, but also to show increased overall proficiency by May 2021. A new social studies course, pre AP World History and Geography, is being implemented in the 2020-2021 school year. In order to ensure success of students in all social studies courses, teachers will engage students in complex tasks and differentiate and scaffold instruction so that each student can meet the expectations of these complex tasks.

**Action Steps to Implement**

1. Conduct regular, monthly Professional Learning Communities (PLCs) inclusive of 'data chats' to review student responses to tasks and formative assessments to plan for instructional lessons that meet the remediation and enrichment needs of students.

**Person Responsible** Christopher Ateek (ateekc@pcsb.org)

2. Regularly assess (formally and informally) and utilize data to modify and adjust instruction. Teachers utilize ongoing formative assessment and use the information gained to adjust instruction, enrich and reteach, and provide research-based interventions.

**Person Responsible** Christopher Ateek (ateekc@pcsb.org)

3. Use data to plan instruction that ensures differentiation, intervention and enrichment while scaffolding learning to increase student performance.

**Person Responsible** Christopher Ateek (ateekc@pcsb.org)

4. AVID site-based training which includes the WICOR strategy of focused note taking, allowing for more differentiation and scaffolding to occur in the classroom.

**Person Responsible** Christopher Ateek (ateekc@pcsb.org)

5. Encourage productive-struggle for students as they work throughout the year and ensure they have the time to struggle through document analysis.

**Person Responsible** Christopher Ateek (ateekc@pcsb.org)

6. Utilize primary source documents at varying complexity levels throughout the year.

**Person Responsible** Christopher Ateek (ateekc@pcsb.org)

**#6. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Career & Technical Education**

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** We want to strengthen stakeholders' understanding of the Advanced Course Pathways in middle school. Once students understand the opportunities available to them, they will be more likely to enroll in advanced courses and to seek the supports to help them be successful in these courses. Teachers will implement rigorous instructional practices to ensure that students are prepared for success in courses on the Advanced Course Pathway.

**Measurable Outcome:** The level of performance will increase from 83% in 2019 to 87% by May 2021 as measured by the Acceleration Rate in our School Grade calculation.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** Valerie Santos (santosv@pcsb.org)

**Evidence-based Strategy:** Strengthen teacher implementation of rigorous instructional practices.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** Overall, the Acceleration Rate increased from 81% accelerated in 2018 to 83% accelerated in 2019. These strategies were beginning to be implemented, and we will continue with implementation in 2020-2021 to continue to increase student access to advanced/acceleration coursework, to increase the overall level of acceleration, and to increase success of students working on the Advanced Course Pathways.

**Action Steps to Implement**

1. Teachers monitor the extent to which their students demonstrate deeper levels of understanding in rigorous tasks and adjust academic support structures as needed.

**Person Responsible** Christopher Ateek (ateekc@pcsb.org)

2. Principal and school leadership team implement, monitor and adjust school-wide systems for academic support for students in rigorous courses.

**Person Responsible** Christopher Ateek (ateekc@pcsb.org)

3. Provide remediation and enrichment opportunities for students in accelerated courses through in-class activities and Extended Learning Programs.

**Person Responsible** Christopher Ateek (ateekc@pcsb.org)

**#7. Other specifically relating to Bridging the Gap**

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** Our currently level of performance is 53% proficiency, as evidenced by black students scoring a Level 3 or above on the FSA ELA Assessment. If we identify areas for remediation for corrective instruction in areas of weakness as determined by formative assessments, especially in writing, and instruct students using appropriate culturally relevant teaching, we can increase the level of proficiency by May 2021.

**Measurable Outcome:** The percent of black students achieving ELA proficiency will increase from 53% to 57% as measured by the FSA English/Language Arts Assessment in May 2021.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** Christopher Ateek (ateekc@pcsb.org)

**Evidence-based Strategy:** Implementation of instructional strategies from AVID Culturally Relevant Teaching to increase engagement of diverse learners

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** Overall, ELA proficiency for black students decreased from 61.3% in 2018 to 53% proficient in 2019. These strategies will allow us to increase proficiency for black students in English Language Arts and help bridge the gap.

**Action Steps to Implement**

3. Monitor and support staff for implementation of Restorative Practice, Social Emotional Learning, and Culturally Relevant Teaching with fidelity

**Person Responsible** Christopher Ateek (ateekc@pcsb.org)

4. Review student and teacher data for trends and performance of black students and next steps for intervention (creation of progress monitoring plans for all African American students).

**Person Responsible** Christopher Ateek (ateekc@pcsb.org)

5. Implementation of instructional strategies from AVID Culturally Relevant Teaching to increase engagement of diverse learners

**Person Responsible** Christopher Ateek (ateekc@pcsb.org)

6. Provide extended learning opportunities for African American students, including before school, after school, and summer learning opportunities.

**Person Responsible** Christopher Ateek (ateekc@pcsb.org)

7. Implement culturally relevant instructional practices in classrooms such as cooperative and small group settings, music and movement, explicit vocabulary instruction, monitoring with feedback and deliberate use of cultural references in lesson plans.

**Person Responsible** Christopher Ateek (ateekc@pcsb.org)

8. Provide targeted professional development and coaching to teachers and leaders on culturally relevant strategies to increase engagement and improve pass rates and grade point averages for African American students.

**Person Responsible** Christopher Ateek (ateekc@pcsb.org)

9. Identify and provide additional culturally relevant books, resources and technology to supplement core instruction representing diverse perspectives as a way to increase student engagement.

**Person Responsible** Christopher Ateek (ateekc@pcsb.org)

**#8. Other specifically relating to Conditions for Learning - Climate and Culture****Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Our current level of performance in school-wide behavior is 45 Intervention and Appeals Committee meetings for students violating fundamental guidelines. We expect our performance level to be 36 IAC Meetings by Spring 2020. If we create a culturally relevant learning community, we will be able to maintain positive relationships among all stakeholders. If teachers and staff focus on building relationships and community among all stakeholders and using restorative practices, social emotional learning, and culturally relevant teaching practices, we would be able to reduce the number of infractions and therefore reduce the number of IAC meetings and office referrals.

**Measurable Outcome:**

The referral rate per capita of all students being referred to the Intervention and Appeals Committee or receiving office referrals will decrease from 45 IAC Meetings in 2019-2020 to 36 IAC Meetings in 2020-2021 (a 20% decrease), as measured by Intervention and Appeal Committee invitations and student discipline data.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Christopher Ateek (ateekc@pcsb.org)

**Evidence-based Strategy:**

Expectations are clearly defined, taught, and reinforced.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:**

Overall, referral to the Intervention and Appeals Committee occurred 45 times during the 2019-2020 school year. These strategies will allow staff and students to build more positive relationships and reduce the overall number of referrals to the IAC by May 2021.

**Action Steps to Implement**

1. During the first 10 days of school, students will engage in lessons on common area expectations from the behavior matrix with emphasis on changes in expectations and rules related to COVID-19. SBLT will monitor teacher delivery of these lesson plans.

**Person Responsible**

Christopher Ateek (ateekc@pcsb.org)

2. All staff monitoring student behavior in common areas will engage with students to provide feedback, both positive and corrective, and will refer to signage reflecting Guidelines for Success (expectations) that are posted in common areas when doing so.

**Person Responsible**

Christopher Ateek (ateekc@pcsb.org)

3. At least weekly, teachers will review and re-teach expectations and rules. SBLT will establish plans for expectations to be reviewed weekly based on current data to be used in routine restorative circles.

**Person Responsible**

Christopher Ateek (ateekc@pcsb.org)

4. A system of recognition will be established to provide rewards to students for demonstration of positive and appropriate behaviors that are identified in the rules/expectations. By the end of the first semester, at least 90% of school members (students and staff) will participate in reward/recognition system and the rewards will be varied and reflect student interests (based on student input).

**Person Responsible**

Christopher Ateek (ateekc@pcsb.org)

**#9. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Student Attendance**

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** Our current attendance rate is 2% of students missing more than 10% of school days. This problem is occurring because extenuating circumstances and extending holidays and/or unexcused absences are impacting the attendance of our students. By creating a culturally relevant school community and appropriate conditions for learning, we would be able to reduce our number of students with attendance problems.

**Measurable Outcome:** The percent of all students missing more than 10% of school will decrease from 2% to 1%, as measured by the student attendance dashboard data.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** Christopher Ateek (ateekc@pcsb.org)

**Evidence-based Strategy:** Strengthen the attendance problem-solving process to address and support the needs of students across all Tiers on an ongoing basis.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** Our attendance rate of 2% of students missing more than 10% of school days decreased from 7% of students in the 2018-2019 school year. We will continue to implement these strategies to see a further reduction in the number of students attending less than 90% of school days.

**Action Steps to Implement**

1. Review attendance taking process and school-wide strategies for positive attendance with all staff.

**Person Responsible** Christopher Ateek (ateekc@pcsb.org)

2. Develop and implement attendance incentive programs and competitions.

**Person Responsible** Christopher Ateek (ateekc@pcsb.org)

3. Engage students and families in attendance related activities to ensure they are knowledgeable of the data and aware of the importance of attendance.

**Person Responsible** Christopher Ateek (ateekc@pcsb.org)

4. Review data and effectiveness of school-wide attendance strategies on a bi-weekly basis.

**Person Responsible** Christopher Ateek (ateekc@pcsb.org)

5. Implement Tier 2 and 3 plans for student specific needs and review barriers and effectiveness on a bi-weekly basis

**Person Responsible** Christopher Ateek (ateekc@pcsb.org)

6. Biweekly child study teams, including all required members that address students that have missed 10% or more of school and look for trends of why students are not attending at your school. Utilize the attendance codes for this purpose.

**Person Responsible** Christopher Ateek (ateekc@pcsb.org)

7. Review in school profiles the Reasons Absence Report and develop interventions that target trends of why students are absent. If “pending” is the most frequently used code then have an activity to develop processes to find out WHY students are missing school.

**Person Responsible** Christopher Ateek (ateekc@pcsb.org)

*No description entered*

**Person Responsible** [no one identified]

**#10. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Parent Involvement**

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** Our current level of performance is 98% of our families attending monthly meetings, as evidenced by attendance data from PTSA and SAC meetings. We feel the gap in attendance is occurring because families are not aware of meeting opportunities and don't see the value of meetings in enhancing their child's education.

**Measurable Outcome:** The percentage of families attending monthly meetings will increase from 98% to 100% as measured by attendance data from PTSA and SAC meetings.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** Christopher Ateek (ateekc@pcsb.org)

**Evidence-based Strategy:** Support staff to effectively communicate with families about their students' progress and school processes/practices. Provide academic tools to families in support of their students' achievement at home. Purposefully involve families with opportunities for them to advocate for their students. Intentionally build positive relationships with families and community partners.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** Family attendance at monthly meetings is a requirement of the fundamental program. However, the current attendance rate of 98%, shows a need to improve communication with families, offerings at the school, and overall engagement of families and the community. These strategies will help increase family and community engagement to 100%.

**Action Steps to Implement**

1. Conduct regular data chats with parents/students to discuss student progress (FSA scale score), MAP, Grade-level standards).

**Person Responsible** Christopher Ateek (ateekc@pcsb.org)

2. Utilize social media to increase communication with parents; PCS family Engagement APP; Facebook, Twitter, etc.

**Person Responsible** Christopher Ateek (ateekc@pcsb.org)

3. Streamline family engagement efforts that are result-oriented (linked to learning), by confirming families practice new tips or tools; learn new tips to support their child a home; share knowledge about their child with teacher.

**Person Responsible** Christopher Ateek (ateekc@pcsb.org)

4. Hold parent/family meetings/webinars to communicate school and classroom processes and procedures, as well as ways to increase student support at home.

**Person Responsible** Christopher Ateek (ateekc@pcsb.org)

5. Provide parents/families opportunity to attend workshops and trainings, join webinars, and organizations that promote parent advocacy.

**Person Responsible** Christopher Ateek (ateekc@pcsb.org)



6. Utilize student services to provide families/parents, and students with resources, tools, triage support, outside agencies referrals.

**Person Responsible** Christopher Ateek (ateekc@pcsb.org)

7. Develop and implement activities to build respect and trust between home and school.

**Person Responsible** Christopher Ateek (ateekc@pcsb.org)

8. Utilize focus groups to gather parents and family input for development of school improvement.

**Person Responsible** Christopher Ateek (ateekc@pcsb.org)

**#11. Other specifically relating to Healthy Schools**

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Our current level of performance is 6 out of 6 topics for Bronze level recognition, as evidenced in Alliance for a Healthier Generation, Healthy Schools Program Framework. We expect to achieve silver level recognition by April 2021. Our barrier to achieving silver recognition includes lack of opportunities for physical activity before, during and beyond the school day and limited opportunities for employee wellness. Healthy students attend school regularly and therefore are more likely to be successful. If our healthy school team can monitor the implementation of the administrative guidelines for wellness our school would have a great opportunity to be eligible for recognition.

**Measurable Outcome:**

Our school will be eligible in 6 out of 6 topics for silver recognition by April 2021 as evidenced by the Alliance for a Healthier Generation’s Healthy Schools Program Framework.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Christopher Ateek (ateekc@pcsb.org)

**Evidence-based Strategy:**

Enhance staff capacity to support students through purposeful activation and transfer strategies.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:**

We have maintained Bronze status level since 2018. We would like to improve our Healthy School status by moving to Silver status. This can be accomplished through the implementation of strategies to promote a healthy school environment.

**Action Steps to Implement**

1. Assemble a Health / Wellness team to include the Wellness champion, classroom teachers and PE teacher to meet monthly to discuss wellness goals.

**Person Responsible**

Christopher Ateek (ateekc@pcsb.org)

2. Attend District supported professional development for wellness.

**Person Responsible**

Christopher Ateek (ateekc@pcsb.org)

3. Complete Healthy Schools Program Assessment.

**Person Responsible**

Christopher Ateek (ateekc@pcsb.org)

4. Develop an action plan.

**Person Responsible**

Christopher Ateek (ateekc@pcsb.org)

5. Celebrate healthy school changes/activities.

**Person Responsible**

Christopher Ateek (ateekc@pcsb.org)

**Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities**

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

N/A

## 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.

Our school constantly focuses on building a a positive school culture with all stakeholders. The nature of our fundamental program is a partnership between school staff, students, and families, all with a shared vision of 100% student success. Our administration works hard to develop a positive school culture with staff by maintaining a Leadership Team to work toward our school vision as representatives of each grade level and department area. Our teachers work to build positive relationships and community within their classes from the first day of school to create a positive, safe culture for the school. Teachers and students work together in shared decision making to establish classroom community norms and expectations and hold weekly community circles to emphasize a school wide culture of honesty, respect, responsibility, and self-motivation.

Our teachers also focus on building positive relationships with families by maintaining open lines of communication and regularly offering Parent University sessions to keep families aware of strategies to best help the success of their students.

Our Family and Community Liaison and our PTSA work hard to offer programs and opportunities for families and our community partners to be involved in creating a positive school culture and environment including large community events such as a Fall Festival and an annual Fish Fry.

### 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: Instructional Practice: ELA |                                      |                |     | \$1,000.00 |
|---|----------|---|--------------------------------------|----------------|-----|------------|
|   | Function | Object                                      | Budget Focus                         | Funding Source | FTE | 2020-21    |
|   |          |   | 2261 - Madeira Beach Fundamental K 8 |                |     | \$1,000.00 |

|           |               |   |   |                |               |                   |
|-----------|---------------|---|---|----------------|---------------|-------------------|
| <b>2</b>  | <b>III.A.</b> | <b>Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math</b>                             |   |                |               | <b>\$1,000.00</b> |
|           | Function      | Object  | Budget Focus                            | Funding Source | FTE           | 2020-21           |
|           |               |   | 2261 - Madeira Beach<br>Fundamental K 8 |                |               | \$1,000.00        |
| <b>3</b>  | <b>III.A.</b> | <b>Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Science</b>                          |   |                |               | <b>\$1,000.00</b> |
|           | Function      | Object  | Budget Focus                            | Funding Source | FTE           | 2020-21           |
|           |               |   | 2261 - Madeira Beach<br>Fundamental K 8 |                |               | \$1,000.00        |
| <b>4</b>  | <b>III.A.</b> | <b>Areas of Focus: Culture &amp; Environment: Equity &amp; Diversity</b>        |   |                |               | <b>\$0.00</b>     |
| <b>5</b>  | <b>III.A.</b> | <b>Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Social Studies</b>                   |   |                |               | <b>\$1,000.00</b> |
|           | Function      | Object  | Budget Focus                            | Funding Source | FTE           | 2020-21           |
|           |               |   | 2261 - Madeira Beach<br>Fundamental K 8 |                |               | \$1,000.00        |
| <b>6</b>  | <b>III.A.</b> | <b>Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Career &amp; Technical Education</b> |   |                |               | <b>\$1,000.00</b> |
|           | Function      | Object  | Budget Focus                            | Funding Source | FTE           | 2020-21           |
|           |               |   | 2261 - Madeira Beach<br>Fundamental K 8 |                |               | \$1,000.00        |
| <b>7</b>  | <b>III.A.</b> | <b>Areas of Focus: Other: Bridging the Gap</b>                                  |   |                |               | <b>\$0.00</b>     |
| <b>8</b>  | <b>III.A.</b> | <b>Areas of Focus: Other: Conditions for Learning - Climate and Culture</b>     |   |                |               | <b>\$1,000.00</b> |
|           | Function      | Object  | Budget Focus                            | Funding Source | FTE           | 2020-21           |
|           |               |   | 2261 - Madeira Beach<br>Fundamental K 8 |                |               | \$1,000.00        |
| <b>9</b>  | <b>III.A.</b> | <b>Areas of Focus: Culture &amp; Environment: Student Attendance</b>            |   |                |               | <b>\$0.00</b>     |
| <b>10</b> | <b>III.A.</b> | <b>Areas of Focus: Culture &amp; Environment: Parent Involvement</b>            |   |                |               | <b>\$500.00</b>   |
|           | Function      | Object  | Budget Focus                            | Funding Source | FTE           | 2020-21           |
|           |               |   | 2261 - Madeira Beach<br>Fundamental K 8 |                |               | \$500.00          |
| <b>11</b> | <b>III.A.</b> | <b>Areas of Focus: Other: Healthy Schools</b>                                   |   |                |               | <b>\$0.00</b>     |
|           |               |   |   |                | <b>Total:</b> | <b>\$6,500.00</b> |