Meadowlawn Middle School

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Meadowlawn Middle School

6050 16TH ST N, St Petersburg, FL 33703

http://www.meadowlawn-ms.pinellas.k12.fl.us

Demographics

Principal: Melissa Athanson

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2017

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)	100%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Asian Students Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students* Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (54%) 2017-18: D (40%) 2016-17: C (41%) 2015-16: C (44%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	N/A
Support Tier	N/A
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 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.

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

Meadowlawn Middle School

6050 16TH ST N, St Petersburg, FL 33703

http://www.meadowlawn-ms.pinellas.k12.fl.us

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	100%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	51%

School Grades History

Year	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17
Grade	B	B	D	C

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.

Meadowlawn Middle School will provide an academic environment that engages, motivates, and inspires students to reach 100% student success.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Meadowlawn Middle School will employ Restorative Practices in guiding teachers and students in the use of social and emotional learning to improve each student's ability to become productive members of their community and reach high academic success.

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
Parris, Ursula	Principal	
Blanco, Alfredo	Assistant Principal	Assistant Principal of Curriculum
Gordon, Kevin	Assistant Principal	Assistant Principal of Operations
Wicks, Gerald	Assistant Principal	Assistant Principal of Activities
Donnelly, Leah	Instructional Coach	Literacy Coach
Sager, Shawn	Instructional Coach	Math Coach

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Saturday 7/1/2017, Melissa Athanson

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
60

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)	100%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Asian Students Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students* Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (54%) 2017-18: D (40%) 2016-17: C (41%) 2015-16: C (44%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	[Lucinda Thompson](#)
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	N/A
Support Tier	N/A
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	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	334	339	330	0	0	0	0	1003
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	108	76	77	0	0	0	0	261
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	32	33	38	0	0	0	0	103
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	2	1	0	0	0	0	8
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	21	6	0	0	0	0	28
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	89	80	94	0	0	0	0	263
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	94	77	80	0	0	0	0	251

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

Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	249	227	223	0	0	0	0	699

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Retained Students: Current Year	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	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 7/20/2020

Prior Year - As Reported

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

Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	301	341	343	0	0	0	0	985
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	71	61	63	0	0	0	0	195
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	39	66	105	0	0	0	0	210
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	92	46	0	0	0	0	153
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	73	103	118	0	0	0	0	294

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

Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	204	226	230	0	0	0	0	660

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	14	10	0	0	0	0	25
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	5

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	301	341	343	0	0	0	0	985
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	71	61	63	0	0	0	0	195
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	39	66	105	0	0	0	0	210
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	92	46	0	0	0	0	153
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	73	103	118	0	0	0	0	294

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	204	226	230	0	0	0	0	660

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	14	10	0	0	0	0	25
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	5

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	44%	52%	54%	36%	51%	52%
ELA Learning Gains	51%	55%	54%	43%	51%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	48%	47%	47%	35%	40%	44%
Math Achievement	47%	55%	58%	34%	54%	56%
Math Learning Gains	58%	52%	57%	37%	52%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	56%	46%	51%	33%	44%	50%
Science Achievement	40%	51%	51%	39%	51%	50%
Social Studies Achievement	67%	68%	72%	59%	65%	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	43%	51%	-8%	54%	-11%
	2018	33%	49%	-16%	52%	-19%
Same Grade Comparison		10%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	38%	51%	-13%	52%	-14%
	2018	33%	48%	-15%	51%	-18%
Same Grade Comparison		5%				
Cohort Comparison		5%				
08	2019	41%	55%	-14%	56%	-15%
	2018	40%	55%	-15%	58%	-18%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison		8%				

MATH						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
06	2019	38%	44%	-6%	55%	-17%
	2018	23%	45%	-22%	52%	-29%
Same Grade Comparison		15%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	45%	60%	-15%	54%	-9%
	2018	36%	59%	-23%	54%	-18%
Same Grade Comparison		9%				
Cohort Comparison		22%				
08	2019	25%	31%	-6%	46%	-21%
	2018	11%	31%	-20%	45%	-34%
Same Grade Comparison		14%				
Cohort Comparison		-11%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
08	2019	37%	51%	-14%	48%	-11%

SCIENCE							
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	40%	53%	-13%	50%	-10%
Same Grade Comparison		-3%				
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	67%	68%	-1%	71%	-4%
2018	57%	66%	-9%	71%	-14%
Compare		10%			
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	73%	55%	18%	61%	12%
2018	69%	57%	12%	62%	7%
Compare		4%			
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	100%	56%	44%	57%	43%
2018	0%	56%	-56%	56%	-56%
Compare		100%			

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	32	46	45	35	53	54	22	43			
ELL	24	44	52	34	65	62	16	59	70		

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
ASN	51	52	53	62	66	63	38	78	89		
BLK	29	44	42	31	50	47	20	41	56		
HSP	35	49	55	39	54	57	24	71	67		
MUL	52	59		53	58		60				
WHT	52	55	48	54	62	59	53	72	74		
FRL	38	48	44	41	56	55	33	62	67		

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	25	36	33	23	30	26	34	31			
ELL	16	33	35	13	34	50	15	43			
ASN	49	46	15	50	43		50	65	76		
BLK	21	31	29	13	25	30	11	36			
HSP	33	41	33	25	31	37	48	52	48		
MUL	33	41	50	23	21	7	18				
WHT	44	41	30	40	42	35	49	65	60		
FRL	33	36	28	27	33	34	34	52	52		

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	8	20	21	10	24	26	27	22			
ELL	12	41	45	17	31	35	13	42			
ASN	50	50		52	47		58	72	68		
BLK	13	29	26	11	26	30	6	31	33		
HSP	31	51	45	33	36	36	42	72	48		
MUL	36	33		30	40	40	47	56			
WHT	45	46	36	41	40	32	49	63	58		
FRL	31	40	35	28	34	32	34	56	51		

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	54
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	58
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	541
Total Components for the Federal Index	10

ESSA Federal Index	
Percent Tested	96%

Subgroup Data	

Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	40
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0

English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	48
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	60
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	40
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	51
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	59
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	50
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 performance group was our Science wiht a 40% proficiency. The contributing factor was lack of continuous standards based coaching support for teachers for the duration of the school year (2018-2019 School Year - No FSA Testing due to COVID 19)

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

The greatest decline was science by a 1% decrease. All other data groups increased. The factor contributing to this decline was inconsistent use of the coaching model with science teachers. (2018-2019 School Year - No FSA Testing due to COVID 19)

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 area with the greatest gap was ELA proficiency. We increased our proficiency by 7% but completed the year 10% below the state. Although we were able to reduce the academic gap between our data compared to the state from 17% to 10% the implementation of our instructional strategies did not impact academics as desired. (2018-2019 School Year - No FSA Testing due to COVID 19)

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

Our Math gains for our lowest 25th percentile scholars was our most improved area with an increase of 23%. We had targeted instructional support and coaching centered around task to standard alignment and implementation of identified.

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

The data indicates that two-thirds of the scholars have two or more EWS. This is an area that we will pay close attention and insure that the necessary supports and resources are in place and available for these scholars to be successful.

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

1. All content areas
2. Ensuring equitable practices in the classroom
3. College and Career Readiness
4. Family engagement and Healthy School
5. Attendance and Conditions for Learning

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Equity & Diversity	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	To address the delivery of equitable classroom practices and improve equity centered problem solving techniques, we will strengthen collaboration during School Based Leadership Team Sessions and analyze classroom descriptors.
Measurable Outcome:	Collection of data addressing Culturally Responsive Descriptors
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Ursula Parris (parrisu@pcsb.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Leadership Team will facilitate equity centered problem solving techiques to address existing deficits.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	To increase equitable practices during classroom instruction and during additional interactions throughout the school day.

Action Steps to Implement

Collection of data points by Implementing School Wide Walkthroughs which includes equitable descriptors. SBLT Leadership Team will review the PCS Culturally Responsive Classroom Descriptors and create a Checklist wich will be utilized for Walkthroughs.Teacher Feedback will be provided through Weekly Content PLCs

Person Responsible	Alfredo Blanco (blancoal@pcsb.org)

Data Review conducted monthly by School Based Leadership Team. Development of next steps to address equitable disparities.

Person Responsible	Ursula Parris (parrisu@pcsb.org)

Professional Development Sessions conducted with Instructional and Non-Instructional Staff regularly based upon the descriptors from the PCS Culturally Responsive Classroom Document during School Opening. Additional Professional Development Sessions will be offered based upon the collected data from the walkthroughs according targeted descriptors (deficit). PD Sessions will be facilitated by Campus Equity Champions.

Person Responsible	Alfredo Blanco (blancoal@pcsb.org)

#2. Other specifically relating to School Climate / Conditions for Learning	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	As a result of improved school culture and climate,the amount of scholars that are included in "Attendance below 90%" will decrease by 10%. This is a critical need based upon an increase in this area from 2018-2019 school year compared to 2019-2020 school year.
Measurable Outcome:	Increased attendance of scholars as measured by monthly attendance reporting and Improved elements of conditions for learning based upon PBIS Model
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Ursula Parris (parrisu@pcsb.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Proactively provide behavioral supports for scholars that display warning signs of not being successful
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	By providing supports and interventions to at risk scholars, motivational factors will increase resulting with improved attendance and behavior.

Action Steps to Implement

Systematic recognition and provision of rewards for scholars that are at risk of non-attendance

Person Responsible	Gerald Wicks (wicksge@pcsb.org)

Monthly sessions scheduled which will focus on effective implementation of PBIS at the classroom level and the utilization of appropriate classroom management strategies.

Person Responsible	Gerald Wicks (wicksge@pcsb.org)

Leadership team will facilitate Professional Development Sessions with faculty and staff on Behavior Management and positive behavior supports to ensure school wide consistency, reduce unwanted behaviors, increase student engagement, and improve attendance.

Person Responsible	Gerald Wicks (wicksge@pcsb.org)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	According to 2018-2019 Florida Standard Assessment, 44% of our scholars are proficient in English Language Arts. This deficit is occurring because the level of rigor during classroom instruction is not evident based upon the standard and scholars are unable to engage with Instructional Delivery Models grounded in High Quality Instruction, Analysis of Scholarly Work, Quality Formative Assessments, and evaluation of Performance Data.
Measurable Outcome:	At the conclusion of 2020-2021 School Year, there will be an increase of proficient scholars in English Language Arts from 44% to 50% according to Florida Standards Assessment.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Kevin Gordon (gordonk@pcsb.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Enhance staff capacity to engage students with complex text that is aligned to ELA standards.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Our target for the 2020-2021 school year is to move student proficiency from 44% to 50%. All assessment data indicates that students still have a need for improvement in rigorous complex text. Focusing on student engagement with rigorous complex text will give scholars the rigor and exposure needed to properly comprehend and make inferences on the passages associated with complex text. Teachers will continue to work on not over scaffolding and providing regular use of rigorous complex text. Teachers will also engage in training and collaborative planning to ensure task alignment to standard and administrators will monitor implementation.

Action Steps to Implement

1. ELA teachers utilize a planning roadmap to choose strategies and resources for use as they plan, to ensure high engagement, rigor and progress monitoring.

Person Responsible	Kevin Gordon (gordonk@pcsb.org)

2. Teachers meet in Professional Learning Community (PLC) at least monthly to review student response to tasks and plan text- dependent questions, close reading, and skill/strategy based groups to implement during core with students to support their success with complex text.

Person Responsible	Kevin Gordon (gordonk@pcsb.org)

3. Administration, in conjunction with the Literacy Leadership Team (LLT), will monitor students' close reading of complex text using walk- through tools used for collecting data.

Person Responsible	Ursula Parris (parrisu@pcsb.org)

4. Teachers receive professional development around close reading, standards, assessment, and instructional methods.

Person Responsible	[no one identified]

#4. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Social Studies	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	According to 2018-2019 End of Course Assessment, 67% of our scholars are proficient in Civics. This deficit is occurring because the level of rigor during classroom instruction is not evident based upon the standard and scholars are unable to engage with Instructional Delivery Models grounded in High Quality Instruction, Analysis of Scholarly Work, Quality Formative Assessments, and evaluation of Performance Data.
Measurable Outcome:	At the conclusion of 2020-2021 School Year, there will be an increase of 7th and 8th grade proficient scholars in Civics End of Course Exam from 67% to 75%% according to Florida Standards Assessment. In addition, the Reading Proficiency based upon the Florida Standards Assessment will imcease from 44% to 50%
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Kevin Gordon (gordonk@pcsb.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Enhance staff's ability to engage students in higher-order questions by increasing reading skills through vocabulary acquisition.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	In order to increase student proficiency in Civics knowledge, students need to improve vocabulary and reading skills. This can be facilitated through engaging in complex text, DBQ's, and use of primary source material.

Action Steps to Implement

Utilize supplemental resources, regularly include shorter, challenging and technical passages that elicit close and critical reading and re-reading. Using materials from content area curriculum guides and the 6-8 SS.

Person Responsible	Kevin Gordon (gordonk@pcsb.org)

Provide primary source documents at varying complexity levels throughout the year (Writing in Response to Text resources on SharePoint, Curriculum Guide links, DBQs).

Person Responsible	Kevin Gordon (gordonk@pcsb.org)

Provide students with the opportunity to demonstrate higher order thinking strategies and processes.

Person Responsible	Kevin Gordon (gordonk@pcsb.org)

Ensure teachers receive professional development around planning and implementing teaching through inquiry, using Historical Thinking Skills. Teachers of our striving readers receive professional development around planning and implementing teaching with rotations.

Person Responsible	Kevin Gordon (gordonk@pcsb.org)

Teachers meet in PLC's at least once per month, collaborating and analyzing 'data chats' to review student responses to tasks and formative assessments and planning for instructional lessons that will meet the remediation and enrichment needs of students.

Person Responsible	Kevin Gordon (gordonk@pcsb.org)

#5. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	According to 2018-2019 End of Course Assessment, 40% of our 8th Grade scholars are proficient in Science. This deficit is occurring because the level of rigor during classroom instruction is not evident based upon the standard and scholars are unable to engage with Instructional Delivery Models grounded in High Quality Instruction, Analysis of Scholarly Work, Quality Formative Assessments, and evaluation of Performance Data.
Measurable Outcome:	At the conclusion of 2020-2021 School Year, there will be an increase of proficient scholars in Science from 40% to 65% based on the Science End of Course Assessment
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Ursula Parris (parrisu@pcsb.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Teachers will utilize data to differentiate and scaffold instruction to increase student performance; Also, implement strategies that will engage students in reading and analyzing text.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Literacy strategies and reading comprehension are vital to scholar success in all contents, but especially true when scholars are reading complex technical text within the science curriculum, textbooks, resources and assessments. Disaggregation of data is critical in providing students with individualized pathway for imporived performance in Science.

Action Steps to Implement

School Based Literacy Coach and Administration will collaborate in developing professional development opportunities for Science teachers which is centered on implementation of literacy strategies in Science Curriculum.

Person Responsible Ursula Parris (parrisu@pcsb.org)

Site based administrators will visit science classroom(s) to monitor strategy implementation and provide feedback to teacher(s). Administration, Literacy Coach, and teacher will collaborate to determine next steps.

Person Responsible Ursula Parris (parrisu@pcsb.org)

Teachers meet in PLC's at least once per month to review student response to tasks and plan text-dependent questions, close reading, and skill/strategy-based groups to implement during instruction with students to support their success with complex text.

Person Responsible Gerald Wicks (wicksge@pcsb.org)

Teachers will reveiw diagnostic data of students , conduct data chats establishing specific learning goals, and monitor their progress

Person Responsible Gerald Wicks (wicksge@pcsb.org)

#6. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	According to 2019 Florida Standards Assessments, 47% of our scholars are proficient in Math. This deficit is occurring because the level of rigor during classroom instruction is not evident based upon the standard and scholars are unable to engage with Instructional Delivery Models grounded in High Quality Instruction, Analysis of Scholarly Work, Quality Formative Assessments, and evaluation of Performance Data.
Measurable Outcome:	At the conclusion of 2020-2021 School Year, there will be an increase of proficient scholars in Math from 47% to 55% according to Florida Standards Assessment
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Alfredo Blanco (blancoal@pcsb.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Support staff to identify critical content and engage students in learning activities that align with the rigor of the mathematics standards.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Teachers need to be able to unpack standards, do the math, and identify critical content, at the level of rigor identified by each standard to increase student achievement. In addition, as a result of reviewing student work, designing formative assessments, analyzing data and creating high quality instruction, math achievement will increase by 8%.

Action Steps to Implement	

Teachers will participate in professional learning activities, including PLCs, peer collaboration, and Facilitated Planning, to identify the critical content of the standards and plan high quality instruction that engages students in learning activities aligned to the rigor of the standards.

Person Responsible	Alfredo Blanco (blancoal@pcsb.org)

Math Coach will lead PLC's and provide professional development during Tier 2 sessions monthly with a focus on High Quality Instruction at the rigor of the standard, Analysis of Scholarly Work to assess if the work meets the rigor of the standard, Quality Formative Assessments designed at the rigor of the standard, and evaluation of Performance Data.

Person Responsible	Alfredo Blanco (blancoal@pcsb.org)

Administrator will monitor for the teachers' implementation of instruction with a focus on identified critical content aligned to the rigor of the standards and the administrator and math coach provide actionable and timely feedback to support teacher growth.

Person Responsible	Alfredo Blanco (blancoal@pcsb.org)

Instructional Leadership Team (ILT) will engage in rigor-focused learning walks utilizing the Math Instructional Practice Guide (IPG) to observe and discuss various strategies that engage student in learning activities aligned to the rigor of the standards.

Person Responsible	Alfredo Blanco (blancoal@pcsb.org)

#7. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to African-American	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	According to the ESSA Federal Index, 40% of our African American population is performing proficiently. ESSA requires a minimum of 41% to meet federal guidelines. This rate is 29% lower than their White counterparts. The problem is occurring because African-American students are not exposed to enough rigorous and complex text. They often are not provided equitable opportunities to access more rigorous task and the content is often not culturally relevant
Measurable Outcome:	The proficiency of African-American students will increase from 40% to 45% as measured by ESSA Federal Index.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Kevin Gordon (gordonk@pcsb.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Implement standards-based focused groups for AA scholars to facilitate tiered interventions via mentors. We will also use AVID, advanced courses and instructional technology to provide scholars with access to rigorous curriculum and instruction.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	As a result of standards based focus groups the percentage of African-American scholars will increase to 50% or greater performing at or near proficiency on interim and state assessments. In addition, increased enrollment of African-American scholars in technology, AVID, and Advanced Courses will result in improved Acceleration from 72% to 85% proficiency and an increased awareness of college and career readiness

Action Steps to Implement

Provide each subgroup checkpoints, connected with specific resources and instructional support designed according to their academic need.

Person Responsible	Kevin Gordon (gordonk@pcsb.org)

Include AVID strategies daily to support student achievement at all levels.

Person Responsible	Alfredo Blanco (blancoal@pcsb.org)

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	Ursula Parris (parrisu@pcsb.org)

Performance, enrollment and/or staffing allows all students access to and success in rigorous advanced courses.

Person Responsible	Kevin Gordon (gordonk@pcsb.org)

#8. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	According to the ESSA Federal Index, 40% of our Students with Disabilities are performing proficiently. ESSA requires a minimum of 41% to meet federal guidelines. This problem is occurring because learning gaps for students with disabilities are not addressed instructionally. If the Co-Teacher or Support Facilitation Model is implemented effectively, then the ESSA Federal Index would increase to 45% (minimum).
Measurable Outcome:	Students with Disabilites demonstrating proficiency, based upon ESSA Federal Index, will increase from 40% to 45%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Alfredo Blanco (blancoal@pcsb.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Students with Disabilities will receive additional instructional interventions, facilitated by ESE Certified Instructional Staff which will disaggregate data in order to differentiate instruction according to the need of each scholar. Students requiring ESE services work towards mastery of meaningful Individualized Education Plan (IEP) goals while learning the foundational skills they need to engage in rigorous, grade-level content in the Least Restrictive Environment (LRE).
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	If students are instructed in their areas of need as identified by individual IEP goals, they will learn the skills needed to engage in rigorous, grade level work and increase mastery of grade level standards.

Action Steps to Implement

Assistant Principal of Curriculum and VE Specialist will collaborate and effectively schedule ESE Students in order to optimize service delivery and clustering process to meet student needs.

Person Responsible	Alfredo Blanco (blancoal@pcsb.org)

Administrative Team will provide opportunities for ESE and general education teachers to co-plan for differentiated instruction and support delivery of services during weekly Tier 2 collaborative planning sessions, and weekly scheduled common planning sessions.

Person Responsible	Alfredo Blanco (blancoal@pcsb.org)

ESE teachers will make rigorous texts, materials, content and activities accessible to students through supplementary aids including annotated texts, assistive technology, direct scaffolded instruction and differentiation of materials and options for demonstrating mastery.

Person Responsible	Alfredo Blanco (blancoal@pcsb.org)

#9. Other specifically relating to Bridging the Gap Plan

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	FSA data indicates that 40%of African-American students were proficient in ELA. ESSA requires a minimum of 41% to meet federal guidelines. This rate is 29% lower than their White counterparts. The problem is occurring because African-American students are not exposed to enough rigorous and complex text. They often are not provided equitable opportunities to access more rigorous task and the content is often not culturally relevant.
Measurable Outcome:	The proficiency of African-American students will increase from 40% to 45% as measured by the ELA FSA.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Kevin Gordon (gordonk@pcsb.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Enhance African-American students access, exposure and engagement to rigorous complex text with task aligned to the standards. This should be guided by the use of culturally relevant curriculum and artifacts as well as ensuring that equitable practices are used in the instructional delivery process. Additionally, the instructional leadership team will monitor and provide feedback on the implementation of these strategies.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	If staff are able to increase the frequency that African-American students are exposed to and engaged with rigorous complex text that is relevant and accessible, the number of student proficient in ELA should increase by a minimum of 5%.

Action Steps to Implement

ELA teachers utilize a planning road-map to choose strategies and resources for use as they plan, to ensure high engagement, rigor and progress monitoring.

Person Responsible	Kevin Gordon (gordonk@pcsb.org)

Support the implementation of reading programs– including the use of grade-appropriate, culturally relevant complex texts in reading intervention classes, typically during small group instruction.

Person Responsible	Leah Donnelly (donnellyl@pcsb.org)

Teachers 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	Kevin Gordon (gordonk@pcsb.org)

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

Person Responsible	Kevin Gordon (gordonk@pcsb.org)

Principals, in conjunction with the Literacy Leadership Team (LLT), monitor students' close reading of complex text using walk-through tools used for collecting data

Person Responsible	Kevin Gordon (gordonk@pcsb.org)

#10. Other specifically relating to Healthy Schools	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Our current level of performance is 2 out of 6 topics "Working Towards" Bronze level recognition, as evidenced in Alliance for a Healthier Generation, Healthy Schools Program Framework. We expect to be eligible to achieve bronze level recognition by April 2021. The problem/gap is occurring because we have not met all of the criteria for the Physical Activity, Nutrition and Policy topics. 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 4 out of 6 topics "Working Towards" bronze level recognition by April 2021 as evidenced by the Alliance for a Healthier Generation's Healthy Schools Program Framework.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	[no one identified]
Evidence-based Strategy:	Enhance staff capacity to support students through purposeful activation and transfer strategies.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	

Action Steps to Implement

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

Person Responsible	Gerald Wicks (wicksge@pcsb.org)

Complete Healthy Schools Program Assessment and develop an action plan.

Person Responsible	Gerald Wicks (wicksge@pcsb.org)

Celebrate healthy school changes/activities with incentives and rewards sponsored by Business Partners.

Person Responsible	Gerald Wicks (wicksge@pcsb.org)

#11. Other specifically relating to Family and Community Engagement	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Our current levels of parent involvement, as evidenced in the school climate survey indicate a need to increase commuication with families regarding academic tools and resources that would provide opportunities for academic and behavior improvements with students. The problem/gap is occurring because parents are not provided with specific sessions on how to support students academically. If training opportunities were targeted and content specific, the problem would be reduced.
Measurable Outcome:	Communication with families about their students' progress and school processes/practices will result with improved performance from 3.5 to 4.0 as noted on the School Climate Survey.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Ursula Parris (parrisu@pcsb.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Fostering opportunities and collaboration with families in establishing learning readiness for scholars builds positive relationships and opportunities for improved academics of students.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	If family and community engagement opportunities are informative and meaningful to the families, then positive relationships will be cultivated and families will feel more involved with their child's education.

Action Steps to Implement

Increase communication from School to Families by recognizing teachers monthly with stellar communication as noted in FOCUS.

Person Responsible	Gerald Wicks (wicksge@pcsb.org)

Implement Parent Engagement activity monthly which is centered on Academic and Behavioral Resources and Suppport for students and families

Person Responsible	[no one identified]

Conduct monthly Q & A Sessions with Families. These virtual sessions will be facilitated by School Principal and designated leadership team member.

Person Responsible	Ursula Parris (parrisu@pcsb.org)

No description entered

Person Responsible	[no one identified]

#12. Other specifically relating to College Career Readiness	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	According to 2018-2019 Florida Standard Assessments, 47% of 8th grade students are proficient in Reading and ready for high school. The problem/gap is occurring due to students not provided the opportunity to engage deeply with a text and develop a higher-level understanding of a concept or topic. If instructional practices are adjusted to include rigorous learning opportunities and student centered collaborative activities, proficiency of 8th Grade Students will increase from 47% to 55%.
Measurable Outcome:	The percent of 8th grade students ready for high school with an ELA FSA score of 3 or higher will increase from 47% to 55%
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	[no one identified]
Evidence-based Strategy:	Strengthen teacher implementation of rigorous, student centered learning.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	If teachers collaborate, design, and deliver instruction grounded in Writing, Inquiry, Collaboration, and Organizarion, students will develop critical thinking skills necessary for college career readiness

Action Steps to Implement

AVID Site Team will provide Professional Development on WICOR strategies during Tier 2 sessions on a monthly basis.

Person Responsible	Alfredo Blanco (blancoal@pcsb.org)

ILT (which includes AVID Site Team members) will conduct rigor walks weekly to monitor use of WICOR strategies in classrooms.

Person Responsible	Alfredo Blanco (blancoal@pcsb.org)

The AVID Site Team will meet monthly to review the data collected from the rigor walks and plan monthly PD in identified areas of need.

Person Responsible	Alfredo Blanco (blancoal@pcsb.org)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

The school leadership team will assign a member to oversee each one of the priorities identified in 2E. We will communicate with faculty and staff about the priorities and use a system of training, monitoring , and feed back to track progress. In some instances, we will also implement focus groups, surveys, and additional stakeholder input to assist in tracking our progress and improvement.

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.

Within the first 5 days of school, scholars will engage in teacher directed lessons regarding common area expectations and behaviors directly connected to positive incentives and rewards. School Based Leadership Team will conduct monthly sessions evaluating the effectiveness of PBIS and determine specific adjustments needed based upon data collected. Teachers will also be provided training and resources such as Positive Behavior Referrals, Lancer Loot to facilitate expectations of positive and appropriate school and classroom behavior.

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: Culture & Environment: Equity & Diversity	$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Other: School Climate / Conditions for Learning	$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	$0.00
4	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Social Studies	$0.00
5	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Science	$0.00
6	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math	$0.00
7	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: African-American	$0.00
8	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities	$0.00
9	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Other: Bridging the Gap Plan	$0.00
10	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Other: Healthy Schools	$0.00
11	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Other: Family and Community Engagement	$0.00
12	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Other: College Career Readiness	$0.00

	Total:	$0.00