

The School District of Palm Beach County

# Christa Mcauliffe Middle School



## 2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

---

## Table of Contents

---

|   |           |
|---|-----------|
| <b>School Demographics</b>                | <b>3</b>  |
| <b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>     | <b>4</b>  |
| <b>School Information</b>                 | <b>7</b>  |
| <b>Needs Assessment</b>                   | <b>12</b> |
| <b>Planning for Improvement</b>           | <b>18</b> |
| <b>Positive Culture &amp; Environment</b> | <b>23</b> |
| <b>Budget to Support Goals</b>            | <b>24</b> |

# Christa McAuliffe Middle School

6500 LE CHALET BLVD, Boynton Beach, FL 33472

<https://cmms.palmbeachschools.org>

## Demographics

**Principal: Dwight Graydon**

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2012

|  |   |
|--|---|
| <b>2019-20 Status</b><br>(per MSID File)   | Active  |
| <b>School Type and Grades Served</b><br>(per MSID File)  | Middle School<br>6-8  |
| <b>Primary Service Type</b><br>(per MSID File)   | K-12 General Education  |
| <b>2019-20 Title I School</b>  | No  |
| <b>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b><br>(as reported on Survey 3)  | 57%   |
| <b>2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b><br>(subgroups with 10 or more students)<br>(subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Students With Disabilities<br>English Language Learners*<br>Asian Students<br>Black/African American Students<br>Hispanic Students<br>Multiracial Students<br>White Students<br>Economically Disadvantaged Students |
| <b>School Grades History</b>   | 2018-19: A (68%)<br>2017-18: A (71%)<br>2016-17: A (69%)<br>2015-16: A (64%)  |
| <b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>  |   |
| <b>SI Region</b>   | Southeast   |
| <b>Regional Executive Director</b>   | <a href="#">LaShawn Russ-Porterfield</a>  |
| <b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>   | N/A   |
| <b>Year</b>  |   |
| <b>Support Tier</b>  |   |
| <b>ESSA Status</b>   | N/A   |

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

## School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Palm Beach County School Board.

## SIP Authority

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

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

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

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

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

## Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

---

## Table of Contents

---

|                                       |           |
|---------------------------------------|-----------|
| <b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b> | <b>4</b>  |
| <b>School Information</b>             | <b>7</b>  |
| <b>Needs Assessment</b>               | <b>12</b> |
| <b>Planning for Improvement</b>       | <b>18</b> |
| <b>Title I Requirements</b>           | <b>0</b>  |
| <b>Budget to Support Goals</b>        | <b>24</b> |

## Christa McAuliffe Middle School

6500 LE CHALET BLVD, Boynton Beach, FL 33472

<https://cmms.palmbeachschools.org>

### School Demographics

| School Type and Grades Served<br>(per MSID File) | 2019-20 Title I School | 2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate<br>(as reported on Survey 3) |
|--|------------------------|--|
| Middle School<br>6-8                             | No                     | 44%  |
| Primary Service Type<br>(per MSID File)          | Charter School         | 2018-19 Minority Rate<br>(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 | A       | A       | A       | A       |

### School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Palm Beach 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.**

Christa McAuliffe Middle School is committed to providing a world-class education with excellence and equity to empower each student to reach his or her highest potential with the most effective staff to foster knowledge, skills, and ethics required for responsible citizenship and productive careers.

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

Christa McAuliffe Middle School along with the entire School District of Palm Beach County envisions a dynamic collaborative multi-cultural community where education and lifelong learning are valued and supported, and all learners reach their highest potential and succeed in the global economy.

### 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   |
|--------------------|---------------------|---|
| Silverman, Jeffrey | Principal           | The school principal is the educational leader of the school and assumes the responsibility of promoting safety, providing equity and access to the curriculum, expecting academic success for all students, and allocating and managing resources to support instruction. He oversees all aspects of the school's operational and instructional processes, people, and technology. The principal deepens understanding of standards and engages faculty, students, parents, and community members to understand the standards and the vision of academic success aligned to college- and career-readiness. He directly supervises the Assistant Principals, Social Studies Department, ESE Department, and Front Office Staff. |
| Lee, Penni         | Assistant Principal | The school assistant principal supports the principal as educational leader of the school in all aspects of administration, including promoting safety, providing equity and access to the curriculum, and expecting academic success for all students. She helps to deepen understanding of standards and engages faculty, students, parents, and community members to understand the standards and the vision of academic success aligned to college- and career-readiness. She directly supervises the ELA Department as well as assumes the roles of Testing Coordinator and Transportation contact.  |
| Lowen, Rachelle    | Assistant Principal | The school assistant principal supports the principal as educational leader of the school in all aspects of administration, including promoting safety, providing equity and access to the curriculum, and expecting academic success for all students. She helps to deepen understanding of standards and engages faculty, students, parents, and community members to understand the standards and the vision of academic success aligned to college- and career-readiness. She directly supervises the Math Department, Fine Arts Department, and Front Office staff as well as assumes the roles of Fundraising Contact and SwPBS Contact.  |
| Servos, Shawn      | Assistant Principal | The school assistant principal supports the principal as educational leader of the school in all aspects of administration, including promoting safety, providing equity and access to the curriculum, and expecting academic success for all students. He helps to deepen understanding of standards and engages faculty, students, parents, and community members to understand the standards and the vision of academic success aligned to college- and career-readiness. He directly supervises the Science Department, PE Department, Information Communications Technology Academy (ICTA) teachers, and Custodians as well as assumes the roles of Facilities Contact and SIP contact.                                    |

## Demographic Information

### Principal start date

Sunday 7/1/2012, Dwight Graydon



**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.*

16

**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.*

24

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

85

### Demographic Data

|  |   |
|--|---|
| <b>2020-21 Status</b><br>(per MSID File)   | Active  |
| <b>School Type and Grades Served</b><br>(per MSID File)  | Middle School<br>6-8  |
| <b>Primary Service Type</b><br>(per MSID File)   | K-12 General Education  |
| <b>2019-20 Title I School</b>  | No  |
| <b>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b><br>(as reported on Survey 3)  | 57%   |
| <b>2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b><br>(subgroups with 10 or more students)<br>(subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Students With Disabilities<br>English Language Learners*<br>Asian Students<br>Black/African American Students<br>Hispanic Students<br>Multiracial Students<br>White Students<br>Economically Disadvantaged Students |
| <b>School Grades History</b>   | 2018-19: A (68%)<br>2017-18: A (71%)<br>2016-17: A (69%)<br>2015-16: A (64%)  |
| <b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>  |   |
| <b>SI Region</b>   | Southeast   |
| <b>Regional Executive Director</b>   | <a href="#">LaShawn Russ-Porterfield</a>  |
| <b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>   | N/A   |

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

## Early Warning Systems

### Current Year

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

| Indicator                                 | Grade Level |   |   |   |   |   |     |     |     |   |    |    |    | Total |
|---|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|-----|-----|-----|---|----|----|----|-------|
|   | K           | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6   | 7   | 8   | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |       |
| Number of students enrolled               | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 445 | 523 | 499 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 1467  |
| Attendance below 90 percent               | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11  | 11  | 19  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 41    |
| One or more suspensions                   | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 19  | 26  | 37  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 82    |
| Course failure in ELA                     | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 83  | 44  | 35  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 162   |
| Course failure in Math                    | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 22  | 57  | 24  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 103   |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment  | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 30  | 38  | 34  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 102   |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 34  | 59  | 34  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 127   |
| FY20 ELA Winter Diag Levels 1 & 2         | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 154 | 146 | 138 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 438   |
| FY20 Math Winter Diag Levels 1 & 2        | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 141 | 108 | 101 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 350   |

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 | 26 | 39 | 28 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 93    |

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 | 28 | 21 | 30 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 79    |
| Students retained two or more times | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 1  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 1     |

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 | 528 | 494 | 479 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 1501 |       |
| Attendance below 90 percent     | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11  | 23  | 27  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 61   |       |
| One or more suspensions         | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 23  | 27  | 25  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 75   |       |
| Course failure in ELA or Math   | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 66  | 42  | 85  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 193  |       |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 56  | 83  | 74  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 213  |       |

**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 | 40 | 36 | 51 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 127 |       |

**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 | 30 | 21 | 30 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 81 |       |
| Students retained two or more times | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1  | 0  | 2  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 3  |       |

**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 | 528 | 494 | 479 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 1501 |       |
| Attendance below 90 percent     | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11  | 23  | 27  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 61   |       |
| One or more suspensions         | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 23  | 27  | 25  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 75   |       |
| Course failure in ELA or Math   | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 66  | 42  | 85  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 193  |       |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 56  | 83  | 74  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 213  |       |

**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 | 40 | 36 | 51 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 127 |       |

**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 | 30 | 21 | 30 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 81 |       |
| Students retained two or more times | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1  | 0  | 2  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 3  |       |

## 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             | 72%    | 58%      | 54%   | 73%    | 56%      | 52%   |
| ELA Learning Gains          | 61%    | 56%      | 54%   | 68%    | 57%      | 54%   |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile  | 52%    | 49%      | 47%   | 50%    | 48%      | 44%   |
| Math Achievement            | 76%    | 62%      | 58%   | 79%    | 61%      | 56%   |
| Math Learning Gains         | 68%    | 60%      | 57%   | 71%    | 61%      | 57%   |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 56%    | 53%      | 51%   | 57%    | 52%      | 50%   |
| Science Achievement         | 71%    | 52%      | 51%   | 70%    | 53%      | 50%   |
| Social Studies Achievement  | 81%    | 75%      | 72%   | 86%    | 76%      | 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 | 74%    | 58%      | 16%                        | 54%   | 20%                     |
|                       | 2018 | 68%    | 53%      | 15%                        | 52%   | 16%                     |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | 6%     |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| 07                    | 2019 | 66%    | 53%      | 13%                        | 52%   | 14%                     |
|                       | 2018 | 77%    | 54%      | 23%                        | 51%   | 26%                     |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | -11%   |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      | -2%    |          |                            |       |                         |
| 08                    | 2019 | 75%    | 58%      | 17%                        | 56%   | 19%                     |
|                       | 2018 | 74%    | 60%      | 14%                        | 58%   | 16%                     |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | 1%     |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      | -2%    |          |                            |       |                         |

| MATH                  |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|-----------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade                 | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 06                    | 2019 | 72%    | 60%      | 12%                        | 55%   | 17%                     |
|                       | 2018 | 73%    | 56%      | 17%                        | 52%   | 21%                     |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | -1%    |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| 07                    | 2019 | 50%    | 35%      | 15%                        | 54%   | -4%                     |
|                       | 2018 | 65%    | 39%      | 26%                        | 54%   | 11%                     |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | -15%   |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      | -23%   |          |                            |       |                         |
| 08                    | 2019 | 78%    | 64%      | 14%                        | 46%   | 32%                     |
|                       | 2018 | 80%    | 65%      | 15%                        | 45%   | 35%                     |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | -2%    |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      | 13%    |          |                            |       |                         |

| SCIENCE               |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|-----------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade                 | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 08                    | 2019 | 71%    | 51%      | 20%                        | 48%   | 23%                     |
|                       | 2018 | 74%    | 54%      | 20%                        | 50%   | 24%                     |
| 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        | 80%    | 72%      | 8%                    | 71%   | 9%                 |
| 2018        | 86%    | 72%      | 14%                   | 71%   | 15%                |
| 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        | 99%    | 64%      | 35%                   | 61%   | 38%                |

| ALGEBRA EOC  |        |          |                       |       |                    |
|--------------|--------|----------|-----------------------|-------|--------------------|
| Year         | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2018         | 100%   | 62%      | 38%                   | 62%   | 38%                |
| Compare      |        | -1%      |                       |       |                    |
| GEOMETRY EOC |        |          |                       |       |                    |
| Year         | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2019         | 99%    | 60%      | 39%                   | 57%   | 42%                |
| 2018         | 99%    | 57%      | 42%                   | 56%   | 43%                |
| 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                                       | 37       | 44     | 37          | 40        | 50      | 44           | 37       | 54      | 55        |                   |                     |
| ELL                                       | 50       | 58     | 58          | 52        | 58      | 47           | 41       | 63      | 50        |                   |                     |
| ASN                                       | 85       | 77     | 57          | 89        | 82      | 67           | 85       | 90      | 92        |                   |                     |
| BLK                                       | 50       | 55     | 49          | 51        | 50      | 43           | 34       | 60      | 39        |                   |                     |
| HSP                                       | 71       | 58     | 46          | 72        | 65      | 58           | 66       | 81      | 78        |                   |                     |
| MUL                                       | 66       | 55     | 47          | 71        | 72      | 55           | 71       | 100     | 91        |                   |                     |
| WHT                                       | 76       | 63     | 57          | 83        | 72      | 61           | 79       | 84      | 81        |                   |                     |
| FRL                                       | 58       | 57     | 48          | 62        | 60      | 46           | 55       | 67      | 64        |                   |                     |
| 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                                       | 31       | 51     | 44          | 38        | 48      | 38           | 28       | 51      | 44        |                   |                     |
| ELL                                       | 33       | 64     | 61          | 45        | 62      | 54           |          | 76      |           |                   |                     |
| ASN                                       | 81       | 78     | 64          | 95        | 84      |              | 94       | 93      | 90        |                   |                     |
| BLK                                       | 49       | 48     | 45          | 51        | 55      | 43           | 47       | 68      | 68        |                   |                     |
| HSP                                       | 71       | 65     | 62          | 74        | 69      | 56           | 70       | 86      | 75        |                   |                     |
| MUL                                       | 73       | 59     | 50          | 78        | 73      | 50           | 100      | 69      | 90        |                   |                     |
| WHT                                       | 78       | 70     | 54          | 84        | 77      | 64           | 79       | 89      | 75        |                   |                     |
| FRL                                       | 62       | 59     | 51          | 69        | 67      | 53           | 62       | 79      | 64        |                   |                     |
| 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                                       | 27       | 41     | 31          | 35        | 45      | 34           | 26       | 38      | 47        |                   |                     |
| ELL                                       | 36       | 54     | 48          | 44        | 59      | 44           |          | 60      |           |                   |                     |
| ASN                                       | 76       | 73     | 54          | 87        | 76      |              | 79       | 93      | 89        |                   |                     |
| BLK                                       | 55       | 59     | 42          | 58        | 65      | 48           | 51       | 81      | 28        |                   |                     |
| HSP                                       | 66       | 63     | 52          | 74        | 67      | 50           | 58       | 85      | 69        |                   |                     |
| MUL                                       | 68       | 67     |             | 74        | 76      | 50           | 42       | 82      | 71        |                   |                     |
| WHT                                       | 79       | 71     | 50          | 83        | 73      | 61           | 80       | 87      | 75        |                   |                     |

| 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 |
| FRL                                       | 61       | 59     | 45          | 68        | 64      | 48           | 59       | 76      | 44        |                   |                     |

### ESSA Data

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

| ESSA Federal Index  |      |
|---|------|
| ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)  | N/A  |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students  | 68   |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students                                    | NO   |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target                                    | 0    |
| Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency |      |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index                                       | 615  |
| Total Components for the Federal Index  | 9    |
| Percent Tested  | 100% |

| Subgroup Data   |     |
|---|-----|
| Students With Disabilities  |     |
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities                                | 44  |
| Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?        | NO  |
| Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32% | 0   |
| English Language Learners   |     |
| Federal Index - English Language Learners                                 | 53  |
| 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  | 80  |
| 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                                    | 48  |
| Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?            | NO  |
| Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%     | 0   |
| Hispanic Students  |     |
| Federal Index - Hispanic Students  | 66  |
| 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   | 70  |
| 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   | 73  |
| 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                                | 57  |
| 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.**

In 2019, the ELA Low 25% Gains were the lowest performance at 52%. According to Diagnostic results, ELA achievement decreased 1% going from FY19 to FY20. Grade-level professional learning



communities (PLCs) need to be consistent across all three grade levels and implemented with fidelity and a deeper dive into progress monitoring.

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

In 2019, the Math Gains showed the greatest decline of -4.9%, decreasing from 73.4 to 68.4. Math achievement showed some improvement since then, based on Diagnostic comparisons from 2019 to 2020. Students achievement results on the Diagnostics increased from 66.1% to 69.8%.

**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 school outperformed the State significantly in all comparisons except when looking at 2019 data in Grade 7 Math. The AMP students entering middle school are on an accelerated trajectory and thus no longer incorporated into Grade 7 achievement data. This phenomena was observed across the State. However, a 15% same grade-comparison decrease and 23% cohort-comparison decrease was not acceptable and action steps with strategies were put into place as a result.

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

Middle School Acceleration in 2019 showed a 2.5% increase and according to Diagnostics 2020 the Math Achievement increased 3.7%. Math was a focus area from the previous year. Teachers were provided PD and placed strategically to meet the needs of students.

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

Data from the EWS demonstrates positive momentum. Over the last 5 years, students with less than 90% attendance have improved by moving from more than 100 students in previous years down to 40 students in the most current year. In-school and Out-of-School Suspensions have also improved moving from more than 100 down to 63. However, counts of students with a Failure in Math and ELA need to be decreased. In Math, 69 students had at least one failing grade and 127 were Level 1 on Statewide Assessments. In ELA, 120 students had at least one failing grade and 102 were Level 1 on Statewide Assessments. Although these data are improvements as compared to previous years, we can do better. In addition, students with two or more indicators could be reduced. One hundred fifty-two students with two or more early warning indicators are currently active at the school. Progress monitoring for these potential areas of concern needs to be enhanced and these potential areas of concern to be better tracked.

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

1. Ensure the ELA Gains percentage increases this year. The 2019 to 2020 ELA Achievement District Diagnostics reveal that Achievement decreased from 71.47% to 70.39%. The 2018 to 2019 ELA Gains percentage decreased from 66.2% to 61.4%. Teachers were provided professional development and support to maximize professional learning communities (PLCs). The progress monitoring of student achievement will be enhanced and reviewed during PLCs. ELA Gains have been a focus for the school for many years and knowing that PYG, Gains, and Achievement go hand-in-hand, a laser-like focus will remain in place. If teachers work to get the academic growth needed in every student, then those gains will equate to achievement increases across the board.

2. Ensure Math Gains percentage increases this year. The 2019 to 2020 Math Achievement District Diagnostics reveal that Achievement increased from 66.12% to 69.8%. However, the 2018 to 2019 Math Gains percentage decreased from 73.4% to 68.4%. To date, we had not observed a decline in

Math Performance like this. Teachers were provided professional development and support to maximize professional learning communities (PLCs). The progress monitoring of student achievement will be enhanced and reviewed during PLCs. Math teachers need to stay focused on the academic growth of all students so that gains and achievement levels increase.

3. Ensure progress for the following ESSA categorized subgroups: SWD Achievement and Black student Achievement. These two subgroups have not shown growth at the rate of their peers. Looking at a composite score across all achievement cells: ELA; Math; Science; and Civics, these two subgroups are less than 50% proficient whereas all other subgroups are performing above 60% proficiency. Intensive classes and tutorial programs have been scheduled to support all students, particularly those in these two subgroups who are not performing at or above proficiency. We were focused on these two subgroups several years ago and closed the gap some at that time. Then, we shifted our focus away and noticed a slight dip in achievement and a greater gap developing in these two subgroups as compared to their peer subgroups. So, reviving the focus is necessary and will bring about the positive change that is necessary for all student success. Teachers have been trained in content-literacy strategies and provided differentiated professional development to better meet the needs of varying students based on classroom-level data of the teacher.

## Part III: Planning for Improvement

### Areas of Focus:

**#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Professional Learning Communities**

**Area of Focus**  
**Description and Rationale:** To ensure progress in Learning Gains within ELA and Mathematics instruction in alignment with the District's Strategic Plan to support the expectations of LTO # 2; Ensure High School Readiness.

**Measurable Outcome:** By the end of FY2021, ELA Learning Gains will increase from 62% to 67% and Math Learning Gains will increase from 68% to 73%.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** Rachelle Lowen (rachelle.lowen@palmbeachschools.org)

**Evidence-based Strategy:** Intensive classes along with Critical Thinking help to remediate and support students needing more time to learn standards. PLCs will be implemented with fidelity. A stronger focus on tracking student progress across the ELA and Math department will be embedded in each PLC and each teacher's professional growth plan (PGP). This single-department culture will impact single school culture and keep teachers focused on the target(s).

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** Pillars of Effective Instruction - Student are immersed in rigorous tasks encompassing the full intent of the Florida State Standards and content required by Florida State Statute 1003.42. Professional Learning Communities enable teachers to collaboratively utilize the Continuous Improvement Model whereby teachers analyze how to best meet student needs through data-informed decisions and best-practice discussions. Standards-based instruction, high expectations, personalized teaching and learning, and increased student engagement within ELA and Math courses, including the additional Intensive Courses, will help to achieve this outcome.

**Action Steps to Implement**

Increase number of students in Intensive Reading, Intensive Mathematics, and Critical Thinking.

**Person Responsible** Penni Lee (penni.lee@palmbeachschools.org)

All Science and Social Studies teachers will be trained in Content Literacy Strategies (Reading).

**Person Responsible** Shawn Servos (shawn.servos@palmbeachschools.org)

Increase tutoring programs specific to State Standards.

**Person Responsible** Rachelle Lowen (rachelle.lowen@palmbeachschools.org)

Implement co-teacher service delivery model for ELA and Math Inclusion classes (Regular with ESE Full-Time Teacher). Provide PD for inclusion.

**Person Responsible** Jeffrey Silverman (jeff.silverman@palmbeachschools.org)

Implement PLCs with fidelity and greater emphasis on progress monitoring with data from USAs and Diagnostics. Monitor, much more closely, the progress toward achieving these goals.

**Person Responsible** Shawn Servos (shawn.servos@palmbeachschools.org)

**#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities**

|   |  |
|---|--|
| <b>Area of Focus Description and Rationale:</b>   | To increase SWD Achievement in alignment with the District's Strategic Plan to support the expectations of LTO #2; Ensure High School Readiness.   |
| <b>Measurable Outcome:</b>                        | By the end of FY2021, the mean composite score of the four achievement areas for SWD will increase from 39% to 45%.  |
| <b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome:</b> | Shawn Servos (shawn.servos@palmbeachschools.org)   |
| <b>Evidence-based Strategy:</b>                   | PLCs will be implemented with fidelity and a stronger focus on tracking student progress across all departments will be embedded into each PLC. Collaboration among teachers to meet the intent of the standards while targeting increases in learning gains will yield positive results. Cultural awareness and sensitivity to varying students needs will be incorporated throughout faculty growth goals. Inclusionary practices reveal benefits to the students who are increasingly included in mainstream classrooms.  |
| <b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:</b>     | Pillars of Effective Instruction - Research supports that students are immersed in rigorous tasks encompassing the full intent of the Florida State Standards and content required by Florida State Statute 1003.42. Professional Learning Communities enable teachers to collaboratively utilize the Continuous Improvement Model whereby teachers analyze how to best meet student needs through data-informed decisions and best-practice discussions. A single school culture as well as an appreciation of multicultural diversity is instilled across the campus and contributes to a positive climate for increasing academics and enhancing school performance. Remaining steadfast on staying focused on monitoring progress and implementing greater collaborative PLCs will enhance learning gains and school performance. In addition, getting all teachers to buy-in to the importance of everyone teaching literacy and all learners can make gains will help us to achieve this goal. |

**Action Steps to Implement**

1. Students will be assessed using USAs and FSQs / NGSSQs in the four academic areas. Teachers will utilize the data from these assessments and anecdotal observations to meet the needs of this targeted subgroup.
2. An analysis of the data will determine strengths and weakness in content areas.
3. PLCs and PDs will focus on strengthening this subgroups performance to improve achievement levels.

**Person Responsible** Jeffrey Silverman (jeff.silverman@palmbeachschools.org)

**#3. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to African-American**

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** To increase Black Achievement in alignment with the District's Strategic Plan to support the expectations of LTO #2; Ensure High School Readiness.

**Measurable Outcome:** By the end of FY2021, the mean composite score of the four achievement areas for Black students will increase from 50% to 56%.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** Shawn Servos (shawn.servos@palmbeachschools.org)

**Evidence-based Strategy:** PLCs will be implemented with fidelity and a stronger focus on tracking student progress across all departments will be embedded into the regular schedule of each PLC. Collaboration among teachers to meet the intent of the standards while targeting increases in learning gains will yield positive results. Cultural awareness and sensitivity to varying students needs will be incorporated throughout faculty growth goals and professional development.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** Pillars of Effective Instruction - Research supports that students are immersed in rigorous tasks encompassing the full intent of the Florida State Standards and content required by Florida State Statute 1003.42. Professional Learning Communities enable teachers to collaboratively utilize the Continuous Improvement Model whereby teachers analyze how to best meet student needs through data-informed decisions and best-practice discussions. A single school culture as well as an appreciation of multicultural diversity is instilled across the campus and contributes to a positive climate for increasing academics and enhancing school performance. Remaining steadfast on staying focused on monitoring progress and implementing greater collaborative PLCs will enhance learning gains and school performance. In addition, getting all teachers to buy-in to the importance of everyone teaching literacy and all learners are able to make gains will help us to achieve this goal.

**Action Steps to Implement**

1. Students will be assessed using USAs and FSQs / NGSSQs in the four academic areas. Teachers will utilize the data from these assessments and anecdotal observations to meet the needs of this targeted subgroup.
2. An analysis of the data will determine strengths and weakness in content areas.
3. PLCs and PDs will focus on strengthening this subgroups performance to improve achievement levels.

**Person Responsible** Penni Lee (penni.lee@palmbeachschools.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 stay focused on tracking students with more than two early warning indicators as well as students failing courses in ELA and Math. Assistant principals and school counselors will track these data and check-in on a regular basis with higher-risk students throughout the year.**

**Our school will stay focused on the priorities and monitor progress toward the goals. The overarching goal that says, "If we deliver and monitor effective, relevant, and rigorous instruction to the meet the needs of all students, then we will increase academic achievement and ensure high school readiness" remains just as significant today as it has been in the past. Additionally, we will enhance our service-delivery models within inclusive settings. All State-level assessed courses and content areas will use the co-teacher service-delivery model for inclusion and the other courses will use support facilitation for inclusion. The ESSA subgroups SWD and Black will be monitored very closely as the gap between these subgroups and others is too large.**

**Of critical importance, our school will infuse the content required by Florida Statute 1003.42(2) and S.B. Policy 2.09 (8)(b)(ii), as applicable to appropriate grade levels, including but not limited to:**

- (a) History of Holocaust**
- (b) History of Africans and African Americans**
- (c) Hispanic Contributions**
- (d) Women's Contributions**
- (e) Sacrifices of Veterans, and the value of Medal of Honor recipients**

**Additional content required for instruction by Florida Statute 1003.42(2), as applicable to appropriate grade levels, include:**

- Declaration of Independence**
- Constitution of the United States and the Bill of Rights**
- Federalist papers: Republican form of government**
- Flag education**
- Civil government: functions and interrelationships**
- History of the United States**
- Principles of Agriculture**
- Effects of alcohol and narcotics**
- Kindness to animals**
- Florida history**
- Conservation of natural resources**
- Health education**
- Free enterprise**
- Character-development program (required K-12) with curriculum to address: patriotism; responsibility; citizenship; kindness; respect for authority, life, liberty, and personal property; honesty; charity; self-control; racial, ethnic, and religious tolerance; and cooperation.**

**Christa McAuliffe Middle School implements schoolwide and content-specific initiatives to enhance a single school culture of excellence and diversity. The social studies department works collaboratively to implement weeks of reciting and analyzing the Declaration of Independence, the Constitution, Bill of Rights, and understanding US History as well as civic roles, responsibilities, and good character development. Social Emotional lessons are delivered schoolwide through Suite 360, an online platform, to assist all students in becoming aware and understanding the importance of mental health and individual differences.**

**Our own school motto of "Challengers SOAR!" re-emphasizes basic characteristics of civilized behavior and social justice. Where each letter in SOAR stands for: Self management, Ownership,**

## 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.

All members of the school staff participate in committee meetings that meet both informally and formally on a regular schedule. Collaboration occurs across grade levels, content areas, and feeder schools to ensure smooth transitioning into middle school and into high school. Staff members implement a formal process that promotes productive discussion about student learning along the matriculation continuum. School personnel can clearly link collaboration to improvement results in instructional practice, student performance, and increased high school readiness. Communication with families and business or community members has increased tremendously over the years. Through using the new digital marquee, parent link, and various meeting venues and platforms, the school enlists stakeholder input and feedback throughout the year.

Open House along with Parent University and several other parent-invitation events help to form bonds between the community and the school. The School Advisory Council meets consistently and helps to deepen positive relationships with parents, families, and other community stakeholders. The PTSA, volunteer, and business partner liaison reaches into the community to enhance these relationships which helps to fulfill the school's mission and support the needs of students.

The school prides itself on integrating a Single School Culture and sharing universal guidelines, following the behavior matrix, and teaching expected behaviors. Communication and monitoring of SwPBS (School-Wide Positive Behavior Support), an appreciation for multicultural diversity, and structured lessons (Suite 360) helps to achieve expected goals. We look for SOARing students and want them to get caught SOARing!

The School-based RtI Leadership Team meets regularly to review and monitor data in order to help students and their families through the process. Based on this, the team identifies the needs of students as well as professional development activities needed to create effective learning environments. Many activities and programs are offered to support student success, including but not limited to mentoring programs, data chats, counseling and behavioral health professionals, character counts, Suite 360, and SEL projects. Building student ownership is the cornerstone to success and programs such as these help to focus on positive school culture and environment.

At the end of the year, articulation meetings occur with our feeder elementary schools. The school counselors present curriculum to all our 5th grade incoming students. In addition, all 6th and 7th grade students are automatically enrolled in the pre-requisite technology courses in preparation of application to our 8th grade course for those wishing to earn high school credit and industry certification, which meets acceleration component for school grade. After the completion of the pre-requisite technology courses students will receive



information from their school counselor to apply to the Industry Certification course.

The school works closely with feeder High Schools to advance college and career awareness. The Volunteer and Business Partner liaison and many club sponsors also contribute to creating tighter ties with community and business members who help to advance awareness of careers during the school year. Stakeholders on many levels work together to build a positive school culture and environment. Challengers SOAR!

### 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: Professional Learning Communities |  |                          |        | \$1,645.00 |
|        | Function | Object  | Budget Focus   | Funding Source           | FTE    | 2020-21    |
|        | 5000     | 510-Supplies  | 1821 - Christa McAuliffe Middle Schl   | School Improvement Funds | 1495.0 | \$1,645.00 |
|        |          |   | Notes: The School Improvement Funds will be used for programs and processes to support student achievement increases as approved by the School Advisory Council. |                          |        |            |
|        |          |   | 1821 - Christa McAuliffe Middle Schl   |                          |        | \$0.00     |
| 2      | III.A.   | Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities                 |  |                          |        | \$0.00     |
| 3      | III.A.   | Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: African-American                           |  |                          |        | \$0.00     |
| Total: |          |   |  |                          |        | \$1,645.00 |