Escambia County School District

Jim C. Bailey Middle School

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Jim C. Bailey Middle School

4110 BAUER RD, Pensacola, FL 32506

www.escambiaschools.org

Demographics

Principal: Tara Palasciano R

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2015

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)	94%
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: C (50%) 2017-18: C (49%) 2016-17: C (49%) 2015-16: C (51%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northwest
Regional Executive Director	[Rachel Heide](#)
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TS&I

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

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Table of Contents

Jim C. Bailey Middle School

4110 BAUER RD, Pensacola, FL 32506

www.escambiaschools.org

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	**2019-20 Title I School**	**2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
Middle School 6-8	Yes	76%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	50%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

Jim C. Bailey Middle School prepares students with the academic skills, social skills, and character traits necessary to perform on or above grade level in middle school and to succeed in rigorous high school courses.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Jim C. Bailey Middle School envisions a safe and effective learning environment that promotes student achievement through effective cooperation and communication with families, teachers, and administrators. Through academics, strength in athletics and creativity in the arts, students will learn to develop skills that will allow them to be contributing members of society.

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
Penrose, Janet	Principal	
Rush, Tara	Assistant Principal	
Baney, Laura	Teacher, K-12	
Campbell, Tracey	Teacher, ESE	
Dean, Denise	School Counselor	
Germain, Jennifer	Other	Behavior Coach
Harden, Maureen	Teacher, K-12	
Hill-Phillips, Laura	Dean	
Whitley, Linsey	School Counselor	
Harris, Jamie	Instructional Coach	

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Wednesday 7/1/2015, Tara Palasciano R

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.*
4

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.*
14

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
69

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)	94%
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: C (50%) 2017-18: C (49%) 2016-17: C (49%) 2015-16: C (51%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northwest
Regional Executive Director	Rachel Heide
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TS&I

* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, [click here](#).

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	382	418	418	0	0	0	0	1218
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	57	77	80	0	0	0	0	214
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	30	75	72	0	0	0	0	177
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	3	5	0	0	0	0	14
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	7	2	0	0	0	0	16
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	69	86	107	0	0	0	0	262
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	77	85	112	0	0	0	0	274

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	10	28	29	0	0	0	0	67

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	3	2	0	0	0	0	6
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	6	7	0	0	0	0	20

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 8/13/2020

Prior Year - As Reported

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	409	451	447	0	0	0	0	1307
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	71	52	81	0	0	0	0	204
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	34	89	89	0	0	0	0	212
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	36	28	11	0	0	0	0	75
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	120	158	157	0	0	0	0	435

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	65	81	82	0	0	0	0	228

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	2	0	0	0	0	9
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	11	3	0	0	0	0	18

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	409	451	447	0	0	0	0	1307
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	71	52	81	0	0	0	0	204
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	34	89	89	0	0	0	0	212
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	36	28	11	0	0	0	0	75
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	120	158	157	0	0	0	0	435

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	65	81	82	0	0	0	0	228

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	2	0	0	0	0	9
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	11	3	0	0	0	0	18

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	45%	48%	54%	44%	46%	52%
ELA Learning Gains	50%	52%	54%	47%	51%	54%

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	44%	45%	47%	41%	42%	44%
Math Achievement	49%	46%	58%	50%	43%	56%
Math Learning Gains	49%	47%	57%	47%	43%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	41%	43%	51%	45%	40%	50%
Science Achievement	45%	43%	51%	49%	44%	50%
Social Studies Achievement	57%	58%	72%	54%	56%	70%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

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

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

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2019	41%	42%	-1%	54%	-13%
	2018	43%	40%	3%	52%	-9%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	40%	43%	-3%	52%	-12%
	2018	39%	41%	-2%	51%	-12%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison		-3%				
08	2019	52%	50%	2%	56%	-4%
	2018	50%	51%	-1%	58%	-8%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison		13%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2019	39%	36%	3%	55%	-16%
	2018	42%	36%	6%	52%	-10%
Same Grade Comparison		-3%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	53%	50%	3%	54%	-1%
	2018	53%	45%	8%	54%	-1%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		11%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2019	22%	21%	1%	46%	-24%
	2018	25%	24%	1%	45%	-20%
Same Grade Comparison		-3%				
Cohort Comparison		-31%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2019	44%	42%	2%	48%	-4%
	2018	47%	45%	2%	50%	-3%
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	56%	54%	2%	71%	-15%
2018	54%	51%	3%	71%	-17%
Compare		2%			
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%	52%	21%	61%	12%
2018	71%	51%	20%	62%	9%
Compare		2%			
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	100%	47%	53%	57%	43%
2018	90%	48%	42%	56%	34%

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
Compare		10%			

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	19	39	39	22	46	45	24	25	35		
ELL	24	53		35	47						
ASN	73	69		76	55		67	92	83		
BLK	28	43	46	27	42	39	24	38	52		
HSP	42	55	54	47	52	49	45	58	73		
MUL	48	47	35	47	43	46	52	56	64		
WHT	52	50	42	58	52	40	50	62	74		
FRL	36	45	44	38	47	40	33	49	57		

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	14	39	40	17	34	34	25	29			
ELL	20	60		30	36						
ASN	60	56		81	74		82	75	73		
BLK	24	42	44	27	41	38	23	40	44		
HSP	44	46	45	50	52	52	54	54	76		
MUL	55	50	48	53	57	59	68	63	73		
WHT	50	50	50	53	48	38	54	57	66		
FRL	32	43	46	32	42	40	30	39	41		

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	17	29	32	19	31	31	27	38	36		
AMI	9	40		36	45						
ASN	65	53		74	56		60	91	85		
BLK	26	36	36	32	43	38	22	38	59		
HSP	50	54	43	48	45	58	55	67	74		
MUL	47	51	50	51	43	39	60	64	81		
WHT	48	50	44	56	50	48	56	56	66		
FRL	34	40	36	39	43	44	39	43	50		

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

ESSA Federal Index	
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	50
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	450
Total Components for the Federal Index	9
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	33
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	40
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	74
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	38
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	53
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO

Hispanic Students	
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	49
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	53
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	43
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Analysis

Data Reflection

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

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

Math Lowest 25 percentile- We have shown a decline in basic math skills with our students entering middle school.

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

ELA Lowest 25 percentile- We have had several new teachers in the past, however, they have worked hard with our district staff to improve their practice.

Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends.

Math Lowest 25 percentile and Social Studies Achievement- some of these students are also ones that have a high absentee rate and behavior concerns.

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

Social Studies- We have been following the district pacing guide and made the change from US History at the 8th grade level to introducing this content a the 6th grade level, our students have shown improvement in their overall scores in Civics.

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

1. Number of Suspensions (1 or more)
2. Level 1 on state assessments
3. Student attendance on 90%

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

1. Increase all areas by 5%
2. Black/African American students
3. Students with Disabilities
4.
5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Instructional practice specifically relating to Math Learning Gains. Instruction will focus on supporting teachers with research-based practices that follow strategies implemented in the classroom. This area continues to be our lowest performing area. We have many of our students that fit into this category who currently have IEP's and we want to better serve our students.
Measurable Outcome:	Increase our learning gains for all students in math from 49% to 54%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Janet Penrose (jpenrose@ecsdfl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Math teachers will meet monthly for center-based instructional planning for the Intensive Math class. Math teachers will work in small groups with students addressing their specific needs determined by their STAR 360 assessment data. We have added a math coach and she will work with the teachers in this area.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	The STAR 360 assessment data will be taken quarterly and the teachers will discuss the progress of the students with the core Math teacher or the Math Coach. Teachers will plan collaboratively to create centers that can be used at each grade level. The math coach will rotate in classes and assist with the centers.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Determine the students that need to be scheduled into Intensive Math.
2. Determine the students that will work in a small group with the Math Coach
3. Use the STAR 360 assessment to determine their starting point
4. Monitor their progress through the STAR 360 assessment and adjust where necessary.

Person Responsible Maureen Harden (mharden@escambia.k12.fl.us)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Instruction practices specifically related to Reading Learning Gains. Instruction will focus on supporting teachers with research-based strategies. Our school overall needs to see an increase in our students testing proficient in Reading. By increasing our learning gains, we should see improvement in the overall achievement on the Reading assessment.
Measurable Outcome:	Increase our learning gains for all students from 50% to 55%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Janet Penrose (jpenrose@ecsdfl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Sustained Silent Reading Close Reading Strategies iReady Sonday System
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	As part of our STAR Block , we have included 30 minutes of Sustained Silent Reading to help our students improve their stamina along with introducing themselves to vocabulary that will in turn give them a broader depth of knowledge in their other courses. We will also incorporate Close Reading strategies to ensure they are understanding the concepts being covered. iReady will be used in all Reading classes with our level one students. Sonday System will be used for our students showing signs of Dyslexia. A Reading Coach was added to assist teachers in reading strategies. We have added a creative writing class that will focus on improving the students writing through reading strategies.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Ensure all level 1 students are in a Reading Class
2. STAR 360 assessments will be given throughout the year. Teachers will use it along with iReady to determine the needs of their students, with assistance from the Reading Coach.
3. Teachers will work with the Reading Coach to implement a plan of action for their students and adjust as the year progresses.

Person Responsible	Jamie Harris (jharris@ecsdfl.us)

#3. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Discipline	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Support teachers with research based strategies to reduce our Students with Suspensions (1 or more) If we reduce our suspensions we can, in turn, increase in other areas. We want our students to be present at school. When they are suspended, they are losing valuable class instruction time.
Measurable Outcome:	Decrease the number of students receiving Out of School Suspension by at least 5% From 2018-2019 we reduced suspensions from 212 to 177. We want to continue the downward trend by implementing our PBIS and Capturing Kids' Hearts and continuing to train new teachers.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Tara Rush (trush1@ecsdfl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	PBIS Strategies Suite 360 Lessons Capturing Kids' Hearts
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Our PBIS strategies promote rewarding positive behavior. When students are receiving the attention they crave in a positive manner, the discipline issues tend to decrease. We also want them to learn from their inappropriate decisions by reflecting and learning strategies to cope and think before acting.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Student Success Team meets weekly to proactively address student needs who may be going down the wrong path.
2. Teachers are trained in using the new addition to FOCUS that will allow them to track minor infractions.
3. SST will share out with the faculty of students needing help to work on strategies to improve their success.

Person Responsible	Tara Rush (trush1@ecsdfl.us)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

As a school, our main focus is the to improve in ALL of our areas by at least 5%. Teachers are meeting weekly to discuss strategies to help our students succeed.

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.

Bailey Middle School will focus our parental involvement and engagement on increasing parents' knowledge of school initiatives including STEM educations, maker spaces and literacy across the content areas. This year we have also been utilizing our school info app to keep parents involved in our day to day events. A positive school environment is maintained with PBIS program and Capturing Kids' Hearts training.

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: Math	$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Discipline	$0.00
		Total:	$0.00