

Hernando County School District

Fox Chapel Middle School



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	12
Planning for Improvement	18
Positive Culture & Environment	20
Budget to Support Goals	0

Fox Chapel Middle School

9412 FOX CHAPEL LN, Spring Hill, FL 34606

<https://www.hernandoschools.org/fcms>

Demographics

Principal: Tom Dye

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2020

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Middle School 6-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	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: C (44%) 2017-18: C (50%) 2016-17: C (48%) 2015-16: C (42%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
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 Hernando 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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	12
Planning for Improvement	18
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Fox Chapel Middle School

9412 FOX CHAPEL LN, Spring Hill, FL 34606

<https://www.hernandoschools.org/fcms>

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	42%

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 Hernando County School Board.

SIP Authority

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

Our mission is to provide knowledge through a rigorous and globalized learning environment to enable students to become successful life-long learners.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Learn, Lead, Succeed

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
Rufa, Carmine	Principal	Mr. Rufa is responsible for supervising the School's Educational Program, teachers and staff. He is also responsible for Implementing, evaluating and monitoring school curriculum to increase student achievement scores.
Thornton, Kerry	Assistant Principal	Assist the Principal in developing, implementing and monitoring the school's curriculum. Supporting and working with teachers and staff to increase student achievement.
Kiley, Rachel	Dean	Assist with disciplines, monitoring discipline and Multi Systems of Support for Behavior Assist and support teachers
Witt, Roxanne	Administrative Support	Assist with Data Assist with Development of School Improvement Plan
Walby, Kim	School Counselor	Developing a school counseling program that identifies and supports the needs of the student population. Advocates for students. Plans and assists students in increasing student achievement, social skill development and providing career awareness. Identifies and addresses the needs of individual students. Communicates with families, school staff and community agencies.
Pastore, Maria	Instructional Coach	Assist and Support Teachers through the Coaching Cycle Facilitate and participate in Professional Development Facilitate Lesson Planning with individual Departments
Renczkowski, AJ	Teacher, K-12	Assist and support math teachers with lesson planning, curriculum and school programs. Assist with schedules, school and grade level activities and events. Increase and maintain staff morale. Assist teachers and staff in supporting the goals and strategies included in the School Improvement Plan.
Grefe, Alecia	Teacher, K-12	Assist and support ELA teachers with lesson planning, curriculum and school programs. Assist with schedules, school and grade level activities and events. Increase and maintain staff morale. Assist teachers and staff in supporting the goals and strategies included in the School Improvement Plan.
Peitzman, Maxine	Teacher, K-12	Assist and support science teachers with lesson planning, curriculum and school programs. Assist with schedules, school and grade level activities and events. Increase and maintain staff morale. Assist teachers and staff in supporting the goals and strategies included in the School Improvement Plan.

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Hall, Tina	Teacher, ESE	Teach and support students with Disabilities. Provide support to classroom teachers. Create IEPs and develop individual goals based on data. Provide individualized and small group instructions based on student needs. Maintain accurate records.
Enders, Brandy	Instructional Coach	Assist and Support Teachers through the Coaching Cycle Facilitate and participate in Professional Development Facilitate Lesson Planning with individual Departments
Bradburn, SarahAnn	Teacher, K-12	Assist and support social studies teachers with lesson planning, curriculum and school programs. Assist with schedules, school and grade level activities and events. Increase and maintain staff morale. Assist teachers and staff in supporting the goals and strategies included in the School Improvement Plan.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Wednesday 7/1/2020, Tom Dye

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.*

1

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

55

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: C (44%) 2017-18: C (50%) 2016-17: C (48%) 2015-16: C (42%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
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	231	221	252	0	0	0	0	704
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	
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

Wednesday 9/9/2020

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	246	273	233	0	0	0	0	752
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	22	28	44	0	0	0	0	94
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	61	70	88	0	0	0	0	219
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	16	7	0	0	0	0	26
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	61	66	66	0	0	0	0	193

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	128	138	128	0	0	0	0	394

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	3	5	4	0	0	0	0	12
Students retained two or more times	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	0	0	0	0	0	0	246	273	233	0	0	0	0	752	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	22	28	44	0	0	0	0	94	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	61	70	88	0	0	0	0	219	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	16	7	0	0	0	0	26	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	61	66	66	0	0	0	0	193	

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	128	138	128	0	0	0	0	394	

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	3	5	4	0	0	0	0	12	
Students retained two or more times	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	40%	56%	54%	32%	54%	52%
ELA Learning Gains	44%	53%	54%	39%	56%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	39%	47%	47%	34%	49%	44%
Math Achievement	42%	61%	58%	49%	62%	56%
Math Learning Gains	39%	55%	57%	49%	55%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	34%	51%	51%	60%	55%	50%
Science Achievement	38%	56%	51%	40%	50%	50%
Social Studies Achievement	73%	72%	72%	68%	74%	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	40%	52%	-12%	54%	-14%
	2018	41%	53%	-12%	52%	-11%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	36%	53%	-17%	52%	-16%
	2018	40%	51%	-11%	51%	-11%
Same Grade Comparison		-4%				
Cohort Comparison		-5%				
08	2019	45%	53%	-8%	56%	-11%
	2018	42%	54%	-12%	58%	-16%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison		5%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2019	33%	53%	-20%	55%	-22%
	2018	49%	53%	-4%	52%	-3%
Same Grade Comparison		-16%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	46%	62%	-16%	54%	-8%
	2018	56%	63%	-7%	54%	2%
Same Grade Comparison		-10%				
Cohort Comparison		-3%				
08	2019	27%	50%	-23%	46%	-19%
	2018	41%	53%	-12%	45%	-4%
Same Grade Comparison		-14%				
Cohort Comparison		-29%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2019	39%	54%	-15%	48%	-9%
	2018	34%	56%	-22%	50%	-16%
Same Grade Comparison		5%				
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	70%	75%	-5%	71%	-1%
2018	71%	74%	-3%	71%	0%
Compare		-1%			
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	79%	59%	20%	61%	18%
2018	90%	62%	28%	62%	28%
Compare		-11%			
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	0%	55%	-55%	57%	-57%
2018	0%	45%	-45%	56%	-56%
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	17	34	33	17	23	15	19	49			
ELL	32	47	40	26	32	18					
BLK	31	47	40	25	28	37	20	57			
HSP	32	39	30	31	37	40	27	58	33		
MUL	50	48		50	37		57				
WHT	43	45	44	47	42	32	42	79	52		
FRL	38	44	40	39	36	29	33	70	45		

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	10	25	29	18	43	44	22	44			
ELL	21	43		25	42						
ASN	70			60							
BLK	25	33	31	30	45	33	32	67			
HSP	35	43	28	38	43	56	27	66	56		
MUL	50	53		50	33		20	88			
WHT	44	48	46	59	59	64	39	76	45		
FRL	38	44	37	47	52	55	35	72	42		
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	10	28	27	25	43	44	21	31			
ELL	14	50	50	48	75	92	8				
ASN	55			73							
BLK	15	24	29	27	53	62	15	63			
HSP	31	40	40	48	49	66	38	65	33		
MUL	35	47		58	69			83			
WHT	34	40	32	50	47	57	43	68	67		
FRL	30	39	35	47	48	60	39	69	58		

ESSA Data

This data has been updated for the 2018-19 school year as of 7/16/2019.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	TS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	44
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	4
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	399
Total Components for the Federal Index	9
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	26
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	2

English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	33
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	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	36
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	36
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	48
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	47
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	42
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 quartile showed the lowest performance overall based on 2019 FSA data. The most inhibiting factor was a continuous change in Math teachers in grade levels and in both Intensive Math classes. There was a lack of continuity and consistency with teachers throughout the entire school year.

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

Math learning gains showed the greatest decline from 2018 to 2019. Math learning gains dropped from 54% to 39%. There were numerous substitute teachers in the Math and Intensive Math classes that led to the decline in percentage experienced in 2019

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

The greatest gap was in Math learning gains when compared to the state average. The state average was 57%, whereas the school average was 39%. Along with the continuous flux of teachers, the Math classes need to demonstrate to students how what they are learning is relevant to their own lives. Due to late funding, before and after school tutoring was not able to take place last school year as well.

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

8th grade Science showed the most improvement overall when compared to FSA ELA and Math data as well as Civics. The 8th grade Science teachers planned together daily with in depth lessons and hands on labs, Formative data was closely examined to determine mastery or the need to reteach with fidelity. FCMS had a Science coach that assisted the teachers and helped them plan when necessary. There was also a Science Night put on by the Science teachers that welcomed parents in to see what their children have been studying and the importance of what they were learning

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

1. The number of students that scored a Level 1 on FSA ELA and Math is of great concern. This needs to be an area of focus to close learning gaps and scaffold learning so that students have better opportunity to demonstrate achievement on upcoming FSA assessments. This school year, we have 193 students that demonstrated a level 1 on either FSA ELA or Math or both. That equates to 25% of

FCMS population. 2. Attendance is also concerning. Students will not learn from their teachers if they are not at school. 94 students, 13%, have shown poor attendance in prior school years

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

1. Increase ESSA Federal Index by 5% for all students with sustained growth of 3% through the 2022 school year for the four targeted subgroups: Students with Disabilities, English Language Learners, Hispanic and African American students.
2. Implementation of Grade Level standards based lesson planning, with a focus on LFS strategies and Universal Design.
3. Increase the overall student attendance rate by 20%.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Based on our 2018-2019 state assessment data in English Language Arts and Mathematics, student subgroups who were below the 41% Federal Index included African American, Hispanic, English Language Learners (ELL), and Students with Disabilities (SWD).
Measurable Outcome:	ESSA students within the Hispanic subgroup will increase by 5% , students within the African-American subgroup will increase by 5% , students within the SWD subgroup will increase by 15%, and students within the ELL subgroup will increase by 8% to reach the federal index requirement of 41% or higher. The 2020-2021 FSA scores will be used to determine the growth in federal index.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Kerry Thornton (thornton_k@hcsb.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	During Multi-Tiered Systems of Support (Tiger Time), students are placed using 2018-2019 FSA data along with emphasis on the lowest quartile and ESSA subgroups. In the classroom, the focus of instruction is determined based on individual student needs within impacted FSA strands..
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	FCMS has four subgroups that are below the federal index 41% requirement. The criteria used for selecting this strategy is the 2018-2019 assessment data.

Action Steps to Implement

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Collaborative Planning

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Collaborative planning will ensure that lessons are aligned to Florida standards and students are receiving consistent instruction across the grade level and subject matter. This provides teachers with the opportunity to reflect on lesson delivery and formative assessment strategies. Additional planning time has been provided for ESE and general education teachers to co-plan biweekly. ELA and Math teachers will hold quarterly data chats with individual students to review formative assessment and iReady data. Students will develop goals with teacher assistance based on prior data.
Measurable Outcome:	Departments will meet with administration biweekly during SWAP to present and reflect on data, share teaching strategies, and determine next instructional steps for students. Departments will submit lesson plans biweekly to administration for review.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Carmine Rufa (rufa_c@hcsb.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	During Professional Learning Communities, teachers will receive opportunities for collaborative lesson planning within the department. Evidence based strategies will provide teachers with a platform to apply higher order thinking and experience higher engagement through the use of learning maps and student led collaborative groups. Universal Design for learning encompasses multiple means of engagement and options for how students demonstrate their knowledge and provides a framework for differentiated instruction in the classroom. Teachers will reflect on lesson delivery successes or failures with their peers.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Cohesive lesson development will be achieved as teachers plan within their departments. Based on our district-developed curriculum maps, resources are outlined and provided by these curriculum maps. At FCMS, when teachers participated in common lesson planning with fidelity, an increase in test scores was evident in 8th grade Science and 8th grade ELA.

Action Steps to Implement

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

#3. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Student Attendance

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	13% of the student population are below a 90% attendance rate. Students who are not in regular attendance continue to struggle with grade level curriculum. Frequent absences hinder learning of foundational concepts and skills necessary to master grade level standards.
Measurable Outcome:	The overall 90% attendance rate for students will increase by 10% by the end of the 2020/2021 school year.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Kerry Thornton (thornton_k@hcsb.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Fox Chapel has Attendance Committee which includes Administration, Dean of Students, Certified School Counselors, School Social Worker, and the MTSS Coordinator. The committee will communicate with families after reviewing attendance data and following district policy. The Truancy Officer is contacted after District policy procedures have been followed with fidelity with no improvement of attendance. Administration along with MTSS coordinator will conduct home visits as determined necessary.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	13% of the student population are below a 90% attendance rate.

Action Steps to Implement

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

FCMS was graded a C after state testing in 2019. Data showed that both ELA and Math dropped significantly. Four subgroups declined to below 41% proficiency. They were Hispanic, African American, SWD, and ELL students. As part of MTSS, our on-grade level and higher students will receive enrichment instruction in ELA or Math. In addition, students from all three grade levels were selected for accelerated classes in ELA, Math, Journalism and CTE. Critical Thinking classes focusing on Science and Social Studies have also been implemented to maintain or increase the students' proficiency levels on FSA and EOC exams.

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.

Fox Chapel Middle School is a Title I school that diligently fosters positive relationships with parents, families, and community stakeholders. Print and digital communication includes automated calls, flyers, Remind, and the school's website. Teachers will communicate with parents throughout the school year using the Remind app and parent/teacher conferences. Arrangements will be made when FCMS knows in advance that a parent needs assistance (ADA accommodations or non-English language translation) at an event. The HCSD Parent Academy will be invited to provide professional learning to teachers about the importance of involving parents in their student's academics. Facebook is used to inform our community about FCMS activities, achievements, and initiatives.

FCMS conducts monthly School Advisory Council/Title I Committee meetings for parent and stakeholder input relevant to school improvement. FCMS also conducts a Title I Annual Meeting, hosts parent conferences throughout the year, and fosters parental engagement through parent curriculum workshops such as Tigers and Telescopes, Grade Level Math and Social Studies Family Nights, and ELA Student/Parent Data Chats. Parents participate in the development and revision of the Title I Compact and Title I Parent Involvement Plan. The Title I Facilitator informs the teachers of the requirements and procedures of the Title I Annual Meeting and Title I Compact. The plan is distributed to parents at the Title I Annual Meeting either face to face or digitally and sent home via students to parents who are not able to attend the Title I Annual Meeting.

FCMS staff who support the social-emotional needs of students include two site based School Counselors, a District Social Worker, an MTSS Coordinator, and a Staffing Specialist. The social-emotional needs of students are also supported by a School Resource officer who ensures students feel safe at school and feel comfortable reporting concerns. FCMS faculty participates in transitional staffings for specific incoming 6th graders and outgoing 8th graders.

FCMS has integrated a school wide Positive Behavior Plan for teaching universal expectations, rules and procedures to all students. Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports (PBIS) is an evidence based tiered framework providing structure for all students to succeed in a positive environment. Monitoring of the plan is conducted through school wide collaboration during School Leadership, Problem Solving and Grade level Meetings, allowing for all students to succeed behaviorally and academically. Tier 1 universal practices and systems establish a foundation of proactive support while promoting positive behaviors. Tier 2 interventions are developed for students who are in need of additional support in meeting Tier 1 Expectations. Tier 3 students receive intensive, individualized support to improve their behavioral and academic outcomes. Fox Chapel's PBIS Action Team has developed lesson plans for teachers to utilize in their classrooms and the MTSS Block. A school-wide reward system is linked to our procedures and expectations. Fox Chapel has also implemented clubs for all students every Friday during our daily MTSS Block. This provides students with an opportunity to work on activities and projects of their choice while building relationships with other students, teachers and stakeholders.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

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