

Alachua County Public Schools

Fort Clarke 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	10
Planning for Improvement	16
Positive Culture & Environment	19
Budget to Support Goals	19

Fort Clarke Middle School

9301 NW 23RD AVE, Gainesville, FL 32606

<https://www.sbac.edu/fortclarke>

Demographics

Principal: Jared Taber

Start Date for this Principal: 9/9/2020

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	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	55%
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 (58%) 2017-18: B (56%) 2016-17: B (59%) 2015-16: B (59%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
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 was approved by the Alachua County School Board on 10/6/2020.

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	10
Planning for Improvement	16
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	19

Fort Clarke Middle School

9301 NW 23RD AVE, Gainesville, FL 32606

<https://www.sbac.edu/fortclarke>

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	No	69%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	61%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Alachua County School Board on 10/6/2020.

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.

We believe that it is the responsibility of the faculty and staff of Fort Clarke Middle School to promote academic and behavioral student success by providing a positive, safe, healthy, respectful and culturally responsive environment.

Provide the school's vision statement.

To become an "A" school through continuous progress monitoring and feedback supports of all school-wide data.

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
Taber, Jared	Principal	Oversee and direct all aspects of school operation.
Brown, Jr.	Assistant Principal	Student Services, Facilities
Mead, Jessica	Assistant Principal	Curriculum and ESE
Fairchild, Jeff	Dean	Assists APSS, behavior data
Hebert, Judi	Instructional Technology	Site tech, research instructional materials
Rollins, Tameka	Administrative Support	Behavioral specialist

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Wednesday 9/9/2020, Jared Taber

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.*

12

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

46

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	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	55%
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 (58%) 2017-18: B (56%) 2016-17: B (59%) 2015-16: B (59%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
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	309	314	293	0	0	0	0	916	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	29	52	31	0	0	0	0	112	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	23	20	0	0	0	0	53	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	12	3	0	0	0	0	17	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	2	0	0	0	0	8	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	50	47	86	0	0	0	0	183	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	34	30	50	0	0	0	0	114	

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	44	51	62	0	0	0	0	157	

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	19	21	31	0	0	0	0	71	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	2	0	0	0	0	5	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 9/10/2020

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	329	348	317	0	0	0	0	994	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	43	43	32	0	0	0	0	118	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	29	22	0	0	0	0	58	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	22	7	11	0	0	0	0	40	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	72	115	98	0	0	0	0	285	

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	33	40	34	0	0	0	0	107	

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	42	39	56	0	0	0	0	137
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	2	0	0	0	0	6

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	329	348	317	0	0	0	0	994
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	43	43	32	0	0	0	0	118
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	29	22	0	0	0	0	58
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	22	7	11	0	0	0	0	40
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	72	115	98	0	0	0	0	285

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	33	40	34	0	0	0	0	107

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	42	39	56	0	0	0	0	137
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	2	0	0	0	0	6

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	57%	59%	54%	62%	60%	52%
ELA Learning Gains	57%	56%	54%	62%	59%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	49%	41%	47%	35%	40%	44%
Math Achievement	60%	60%	58%	61%	60%	56%
Math Learning Gains	53%	56%	57%	58%	62%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	40%	46%	51%	38%	47%	50%
Science Achievement	61%	53%	51%	60%	57%	50%
Social Studies Achievement	68%	73%	72%	80%	72%	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	45%	53%	-8%	54%	-9%
	2018	54%	55%	-1%	52%	2%
Same Grade Comparison		-9%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	57%	54%	3%	52%	5%
	2018	59%	55%	4%	51%	8%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison		3%				
08	2019	62%	61%	1%	56%	6%
	2018	68%	61%	7%	58%	10%
Same Grade Comparison		-6%				
Cohort Comparison		3%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2019	51%	52%	-1%	55%	-4%
	2018	48%	53%	-5%	52%	-4%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	58%	59%	-1%	54%	4%
	2018	64%	58%	6%	54%	10%
Same Grade Comparison		-6%				
Cohort Comparison		10%				
08	2019	34%	27%	7%	46%	-12%
	2018	25%	24%	1%	45%	-20%
Same Grade Comparison		9%				
Cohort Comparison		-30%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2019	59%	54%	5%	48%	11%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	56%	53%	3%	50%	6%
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%	69%	-2%	71%	-4%
2018	73%	69%	4%	71%	2%
Compare		-6%			
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	87%	56%	31%	61%	26%
2018	93%	60%	33%	62%	31%
Compare		-6%			
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	0%	48%	-48%	57%	-57%
2018	0%	63%	-63%	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	15	43	40	18	38	31	14	25			
ELL	42	52		48	45						

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	89	85		93	73		89	93	90		
BLK	28	43	47	30	40	34	31	49	60		
HSP	54	58	55	63	53	44	59	61	83		
MUL	65	60	35	56	49	40	62	71	69		
WHT	73	63	58	78	61	52	79	78	80		
FRL	31	45	46	35	40	38	34	49	56		
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	18	35	31	16	31	26	19	24			
ELL	53	58		56	56						
ASN	91	67		86	74		76	100	94		
BLK	28	40	36	25	38	34	16	44	65		
HSP	61	59	35	61	63	33	55	71	70		
MUL	63	54	42	53	55	28	58	73	90		
WHT	76	60	47	75	62	29	76	88	77		
FRL	41	46	39	38	46	32	36	55	61		
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	27	25	21	38	27	8	39			
ELL	27	54		27	43						
ASN	80	77		73	64		67	89	92		
BLK	33	45	29	32	41	33	30	63	62		
HSP	62	69	42	64	60	36	63	74	64		
MUL	53	65	63	55	57	35	35	64	50		
WHT	78	67	39	76	67	50	77	89	75		
FRL	43	49	29	40	45	33	34	64	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	58
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	581
Total Components for the Federal Index	10

ESSA Federal Index	
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	28
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	49
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	87
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	59
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	56
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	69
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, LQ, 40%. Increased from year prior (33%) but below current District average of 46%. Possible factors include: teacher retention, lack of progress monitoring, inadequate standards based instruction.

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

SS achievement down 4% (72-68%). Possible factors include: lack of progress monitoring, inadequate standards based instruction.

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.

LQ Math, 9% lower than State average. Possible factors include: teacher retention, lack of progress monitoring, inadequate standards based instruction.

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

ELA LQ increased 11%. Department-wide focus on using AIMS assessment data, common planning, standards based instruction with fidelity.

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

Large number of retained students in each grade level, repeated course failures in Math.

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

1. Increase gains of the LQ in ELA to meet or exceed 52% (current 49%).
2. Increase gains of the LQ in Math to meet or exceed 43% (current 40%).
3. Reduce the racial achievement gap in ELA (W, 73%, AA 28%).
4. Reduce the racial achievement gap in Math (W 78%, AA 30%).
5. Disproportionate discipline. Reduce AA OSS by 15%.
6. Increase participation of AA students in advanced coursework/programs.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Increase gains of LQ in ELA and MA. While the current rate is higher than previous year, it has lagged behind State and District data. ELA achievement impacts all curricula.

Measurable Outcome: Increasing the learning gains of the LQ to meet or exceed 52% in ELA, MA 41%.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Jessica Mead (meadjf@gm.sbac.edu)

Evidence-based Strategy: Frequent progress monitoring during AIMS cycles, reteaching and remediation informed by standards-based assessment data as part of everyday instruction. Frequent data chats at dept. chair meeting (2x month), individual interventions as needed.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: These are high impact, effective strategies provided by the District office.

Action Steps to Implement

Identify target group. Plan for improvement. Set meeting dates. Share feedback with Teams. Provide remediation to targeted groups based on assessment data.

Person Responsible Jessica Mead (meadjf@gm.sbac.edu)

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to African-American

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Closing the Racial achievement gap. Currently, these are approx. 40% points apart.
Measurable Outcome:	Increase ELA achievement to 31% and Math to 43% thus decreasing gap between races.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Jessica Mead (meadjf@gm.sbac.edu)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Explicit communication of high expectations in warm up activities, common board planning format focus on standards based lessons. Increase faculty awareness of culturally relevant practices, via AA mentor on campus. Shares curriculum and strategies throughout the year at team/faculty meetings.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Will increase overall achievement rates in ELA and Math, meet District wide Equity goals.

Action Steps to Implement

Identify target groups, plan for monitoring. Monitor during AIMS cycle, share results with Dept. Chairs, data chats.

Person Responsible Jessica Mead (meadjf@gm.sbac.edu)

#3. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Equity & Diversity

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Reducing OSS for AA students.
Measurable Outcome:	Reduce OSS of AA students by 15%, goal of 85 or less.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Lawson Brown, Jr. (brownl@gm.sbac.edu)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Tracking OSS data, offer viable alternatives (In Lieu of, Restart Room etc.), implement Tier 2/3 interventions, create disproportionate discipline cohort to review data once a month with SS team.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	These strategies will allow our SS team to focus on restorative practices that have been shown to reduce future disciplinary incidences. Selected by our District office as high effective strategies.

Action Steps to Implement

Identify at risk students, share school-wide plan with staff, monitor OSS incidences, provide restorative opportunities.

Person Responsible Lawson Brown, Jr. (brownl@gm.sbac.edu)

#4. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: SWD is below federal target of 41%, (28%). SWD require supports that ensure success in the classroom and statewide assessments.

Measurable Outcome: SWD achievement will meet or exceed 41%.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Jessica Mead (meadjf@gm.sbac.edu)

Evidence-based Strategy: Continue to decrease LRE, focus on collaborative planning with gen. ed. teachers (several new) targeted used of IXL, iReady, UDL supports.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: These strategies will allow for a multi-tiered approach depending on specific student needs.

Action Steps to Implement

Identify target group. Plan for instruction. Share plan and monitor assessment data. Remediate as needed.

Person Responsible Jessica Mead (meadjf@gm.sbac.edu)

#5. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Equity & Diversity

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Increased participation of African American students in accelerated coursework. Levels have not increased over the past 3 years, additional opportunities needed. This will allow for an increase in other school-wide AA goals (ELA/MA) while supporting the District's Equity plan.

Measurable Outcome: AA enrollment in advanced coursework will increase by 2% points.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Jared Taber (taberjc@gm.sbac.edu)

Evidence-based Strategy: Removing barriers to access in advanced coursework. Creating an "advanced mindset" of all students as they prepare for high school.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: This will allow students to make independent choices based on their goals instead of past achievement data.

Action Steps to Implement

Review course registrations, analyze minority enrollment. Plan to support current students via mentoring and data chats. Include parents in conversations, planning options. Identify areas of growth, student potential from grades, recommendations and student feedback. Review PSAT data.

Person Responsible Jared Taber (taberjc@gm.sbac.edu)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

We have adopted a new, school-wide data assessment calendar for team leaders, dept. chairs and faculty meetings. Common agendas will be used to track the SIP goals at each possible interval. All departments will create a common PDP that relates to SIP goals. All teachers are trained in Skyward, AIMS data reporting and will be required to provide interventions for area of focus students identified in the SIP.

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.

Fort Clarke has redesigned the PBIS framework to include all areas of the school community. Representation is part of the PTA, SAC in addition to all grade level teams. An increased effort is underway to build business/community involvement that has been historically low. This is solicited from weekly parent emails, website posts and marquee advertisements. In addition, the administrative team attends community functions to promote SIP goals and solicit additional community involvement.

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: Standards-aligned Instruction	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: African-American	\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Equity & Diversity	\$0.00
4	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities	\$0.00
5	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Equity & Diversity	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00