Howard Middle School

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Howard Middle School

1655 NW 10TH ST, Ocala, FL 34475

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Suzette Parker

Start Date for this Principal: 6/10/2018

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)	97%
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 (61%) 2017-18: B (56%) 2016-17: B (55%) 2015-16: C (53%)
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 is pending approval by the Marion 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

Howard Middle School

1655 NW 10TH ST, Ocala, FL 34475

[no web address on file]

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	66%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	68%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Marion 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.

Howard Middle School is committed to developing all students in partnership with our community to become knowledgeable, compassionate global citizens, and we believe that every student should be provided opportunity to achieve their personal best.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The faculty and staff of Howard Middle School are committed to providing our students with quality educational experiences, integrating curriculum content with real world experiences. All students are provided opportunities to achieve and reach their full potential through rigorous instruction, relevant curriculum, and relationships with staff.

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
Rembert, Bernard	Principal	The Principal is the driving force and instructional leader of the school. She provides a common vision for the use of data-based decision–making, models the Problem Solving Process; supervises the development of a strong infrastructure; conducts assessment of the skills of school staff; ensures implementation of high yield instructional strategies, collaborative learning, intervention support and documentation; provides adequate professional learning opportunities; develops a culture of expectation with the school staff; ensures resources are assigned to those areas of most need; and communicates with parents as necessary.
Daubenmire, Matthew	Dean	The Student Services Manager provides teachers with classroom support and feedback to ensure a safe, cooperative environment for learning to take place. Resources, such as behavior contracts, for at-risk students are carefully considered and shared by the SSM. He coordinates efforts to use positive reinforcements to encourage more positive behavior choices by students. He also monitors and shares disciplinary/attendance data, and serves on the PBIS/Safety committee. In addition, the SSM may act as a liaison with outside agencies that offer support to students and families
Oliver, Natasha	School Counselor	The Guidance Counselor participates in collection, interpretation, and analysis of data; facilitates development of intervention plans; provides support for intervention fidelity and documentation; assists with professional development for behavior concerns; assists in facilitation data-based decision making activities. She also provides quality services and expertise on issues ranging from IEP development to intervention with individual students. She communicates with child-serving community agencies to support the students' academic, emotional, behavioral, and social success.
Shaheed, Aisha	Dean	The Student Services Manager provides teachers with classroom support and feedback to ensure a safe, cooperative environment for learning to take place. Resources, such as behavior contracts, for at-risk students are carefully considered and shared by the SSM. He coordinates efforts to use positive reinforcements to encourage more positive behavior choices by students. He also monitors and shares disciplinary/attendance data, and serves on the PBIS/Safety committee. In addition, the SSM may act as a liaison with outside agencies that offer support to students and families
Leach-Cotton, Jennifer	Assistant Principal	The Assistant Principal assists the Principal in providing a common vision for the use of data-based decision-making, assists in the development of a strong infrastructure of resources for the implementation of high yield instructional strategies, further assists the principal in the assessment of school staff, assists with the monitoring of implementation of intervention and necessary documentation, assists with the delivery of professional development for effective instructional delivery. The assistant principal carefully monitors the additional academic support schedule to ensure all personnel are serving in their specified areas.

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Ponder, Angela	Instructional Coach	The Content Area Specialist assists teachers with the interpretation and implementation of the Florida Standards for Language Arts and Writing and provides instructional support to include preparation of lesson plans, content alignment, content delivery methods and instructional modeling.She also assists in the design and implementation for progress monitoring, data collection, and data analysis, participates in the design and delivery of professional development.
Manges, Diana	Other	This is secretarial work of considerable variety and complexity. An employee in a position allocated to this class performs duties which involve taking and transcribing dictation for a supervisor who is carrying out a broad program; composing correspondence; typing memoranda, reports and correspondence. Duties include making travel arrangements and keeping the supervisor's calendar regarding minor administrative and/or clerical functions and exercising considerable initiative in carrying out assignments. Work may include taking and transcribing legal documents and records. An employee in a position allocated to this class may perform advanced clerical-accounting work which involves maintaining general books of accounting and related accounting records; assisting in preparing routine accounting reports and statements; and/or pre-auditing and coding the more complex fiscal documents not requiring accounts analysis. An employee in this position reports directly to the assigned administrator.
Watts, Columbus	Assistant Principal	The Assistant Principal assists the Principal in providing a common vision for the use of data-based decision-making, assists in the development of a strong infrastructure of resources for the implementation of high yield instructional strategies, further assists the principal in the assessment of school staff, assists with the monitoring of implementation of intervention and necessary documentation, assists with the delivery of professional development for effective instructional delivery. The assistant principal carefully monitors the additional academic support schedule to ensure all personnel are serving in their specified areas.
Carpenter, Constance	Instructional Coach	The Content Area Specialist assists teachers with the interpretation and implementation of the Florida Standards for Language Arts and Writing and provides instructional support to include preparation of lesson plans, content alignment, content delivery methods and instructional modeling.She also assists in the design and implementation for progress monitoring, data collection, and data analysis, participates in the design and delivery of professional development.
Jones, Heather	School Counselor	

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Sunday 6/10/2018, Suzette Parker

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.*

3

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.*

17

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

57

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)	97%
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 (61%) 2017-18: B (56%) 2016-17: B (55%) 2015-16: C (53%)
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	412	378	357	0	0	0	0	1147
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	155	150	147	0	0	0	0	452
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	64	46	36	0	0	0	0	146
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	16	15	0	0	0	0	51
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	24	8	12	0	0	0	0	44
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	89	97	88	0	0	0	0	274
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	108	94	98	0	0	0	0	300

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	190	207	0	0	0	0	397

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	5	8	31	0	0	0	0	44
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	10	18	0	0	0	0	30

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 7/28/2020

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	341	350	351	0	0	0	0	1042
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	40	50	60	0	0	0	0	150
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	67	72	79	0	0	0	0	218
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	55	35	41	0	0	0	0	131
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	118	106	101	0	0	0	0	325

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	189	207	218	0	0	0	0	614

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	20	25	21	0	0	0	0	66
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1

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	341	350	351	0	0	0	0	1042
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	40	50	60	0	0	0	0	150
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	67	72	79	0	0	0	0	218
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	55	35	41	0	0	0	0	131
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	118	106	101	0	0	0	0	325

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	189	207	218	0	0	0	0	614

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	20	25	21	0	0	0	0	66
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1

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	58%	49%	54%	56%	45%	52%
ELA Learning Gains	59%	54%	54%	54%	48%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	50%	46%	47%	35%	36%	44%
Math Achievement	61%	54%	58%	62%	47%	56%
Math Learning Gains	60%	58%	57%	62%	54%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	48%	50%	51%	39%	45%	50%
Science Achievement	56%	46%	51%	54%	44%	50%
Social Studies Achievement	70%	70%	72%	69%	64%	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	51%	45%	6%	54%	-3%
	2018	51%	44%	7%	52%	-1%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	58%	46%	12%	52%	6%
	2018	55%	43%	12%	51%	4%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison		7%				
08	2019	60%	50%	10%	56%	4%
	2018	59%	49%	10%	58%	1%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison		5%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2019	52%	46%	6%	55%	-3%
	2018	53%	42%	11%	52%	1%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	55%	49%	6%	54%	1%
	2018	62%	49%	13%	54%	8%
Same Grade Comparison		-7%				
Cohort Comparison		2%				
08	2019	29%	41%	-12%	46%	-17%
	2018	58%	43%	15%	45%	13%
Same Grade Comparison		-29%				
Cohort Comparison		-33%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2019	55%	44%	11%	48%	7%
	2018	56%	46%	10%	50%	6%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
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	69%	65%	4%	71%	-2%
2018	70%	64%	6%	71%	-1%
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	100%	54%	46%	61%	39%

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2018	99%	57%	42%	62%	37%
Compare		1%			
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	100%	51%	49%	57%	43%
2018	100%	54%	46%	56%	44%
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	10	45	47	7	34	37	11	7			
ELL	40	61	55	40	53	42	22	35			
ASN	94	80		97	77		100	100	100		
BLK	35	47	40	38	50	42	28	55	62		
HSP	61	67	57	59	59	46	60	63	81		
MUL	71	61		84	70		57	81	64		
WHT	69	64	72	74	65	64	71	82	90		
FRL	42	53	48	45	53	46	37	56	66		
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	38	32	20	43	34	18	40			
ELL	11	32	33	16	43	39		30			
ASN	97	71		100	88		92	100	96		
BLK	30	40	37	44	55	43	27	51	36		
HSP	57	53	41	61	60	43	59	70	50		
MUL	67	52	30	78	71		64	78	56		
WHT	69	55	40	77	74	59	73	89	61		
FRL	41	44	37	52	60	45	40	61	43		
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	6	35	32	13	40	36	12	14			
ELL	16	25	24	26	67	50					
ASN	98	82		98	85		96	100	81		
BLK	30	39	29	37	46	35	29	45	26		
HSP	56	49	28	63	66	39	33	69	59		
MUL	70	53		74	64	45	60	85	70		
WHT	72	65	54	76	69	47	74	84	67		

	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	38	45	33	46	53	38	35	55	43		

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	60
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	54
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	599
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	99%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	25
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	45
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	93
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	44
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	61
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	72
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	50
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Analysis

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

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

Due to more students having access to Algebra I in 8th grade, the proficiency level in 8th grade Math showed the greatest decline. The proficiency level for 8th grade Math FSA was 29 percent.

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

Due to more students having access to Algebra I in 8th grade, the proficiency level in 8th grade Math showed the greatest decline.

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.

Our learning gains in Math bottom quartile students is 3 percent below the state average. in 2018 there was a 4 percent gap. Progress is being made and attention to these students will continue to be a focal point.

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

The greatest improvement shown was a 12 point increase in learning gains for the students in the bottom quartile. The addition of a Literacy Coach helped provide professional development, collaboration, and coaching to address the needs of these students.

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

Area of Concern: Students scoring Level 1 on state assessments.

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

1. ELA Learning Gains
2. ELA Learning Gains for Bottom Quartile
3. Increase learning gains/proficiency for students with disabilities
4. Math Proficiency
5. Engaging and educating families

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	ELA learning gains for students in the bottom quartile Howard Middle school serves students from schools in our feeder pattern that have low proficiency and learning gain levels for incoming students. Howard Middle will continue to focus on these students in order to support them in making growth as measured on FSA.
Measurable Outcome:	If we provide teachers with professional development focusing on how to integrate literacy across content areas, active learning, and student collaboration, then ELA learning gains for our bottom quartile students will increase from 50% to 53%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Bernard Rembert (bernard.rembert@marion.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	I-Ready diagnostic assessments will be used 3 times a year to monitor student growth Professional Development on Student Engagement - Critical Thinking, Student Collaboration and Discourse Reading Interventions for students in the bottom quartile - Read 180, Read to Achieve, System 44, and Escalate Training new teachers in Car-PD reading strategies that can be used in History and Science classrooms.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	The reading interventions and Car-PD are evidenced base strategies that are proven to have success in making growth with below level readers. The interventions and strategies were used at Howard Middle School last year and a 12 percent increase was made in learning gains for students in the bottom quartile.

Action Steps to Implement	
Provide Professional Development on Critical Thinking and engagement	
Person Responsible	Angela Ponder (angela.ponder@marion.k12.fl.us)
Provide coaching by Literacy Coach to ELA teachers on standard based planning and instruction	
Person Responsible	Constance Carpenter (constance.carpenter@marion.k12.fl.us)
Teacher Observation by administration focused on look fors in critical thinking and engagement	

| **Person Responsible** | Bernard Rembert (lamar.rembert@marion.k12.fl.us) |

Reading intervention Teacher who will support select ELA classrooms as
well as Intensive Reading Classrooms

| **Person Responsible** | Constance Carpenter (constance.carpenter@marion.k12.fl.us) |

Teachers will conduct Instructional Rounds or Lesson Studies as an
accountability piece for their professional development

| **Person Responsible** | Angela Ponder (angela.ponder@marion.k12.fl.us) |

Train select teachers in Car-PD reading strategies.

| **Person Responsible** | Constance Carpenter (constance.carpenter@marion.k12.fl.us) |

Professional development for leadership team members for professional
growth and development to support ELA learning gains and proficiency.

| **Person Responsible** | Angela Ponder (angela.ponder@marion.k12.fl.us) |

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Improve Federal Index for Students with Disabilities Rationale Last year the Federal Index for Students with Disabilities was 25 percent. This is the second consecutive year that it has fallen below 32 percent.
Measurable Outcome:	If teachers and students are provided consistent support, are afforded professional development in critical thinking strategies, and lessons are chunked into smaller instructional units, then the federal index for students with a disability will increase from 25 to 32 percent.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Bernard Rembert (bernard.rembert@marion.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Inclusion model with support facilitation as indicated by student's IEP I-Ready diagnostic assessments will be used 3 times a year to monitor student growth Professional Development on Student Engagement - Critical Thinking Reading Interventions for students with disabilities - Read 180, Read to Achieve, System 44, and Escalate Collaboration time with the teacher and support facilitator Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy Having students with disabilities mainstreamed with their disabled peers with support has proven to increase their skill levels
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	I-ready diagnostic tools are research based and give measures of student growth All Reading interventions used are backed in research and are evidence based

Action Steps to Implement	

Provide more support to Inclusion classrooms by having 4 support
facilitators for students with disabilities in their classrooms.

Person Responsible	Bernard Rembert (lamar.rembert@marion.k12.fl.us)

Provide content based professional development for ESE teachers

Person Responsible	Angela Ponder (angela.ponder@marion.k12.fl.us)

Monitoring the student's progress in reading interventions, I-ready, and
classroom data

Person Responsible	Constance Carpenter (constance.carpenter@marion.k12.fl.us)

Provide planning time for Support Facilitators and content area
teachers to collaborate.

Person Responsible   Bernard Rembert (lamar.rembert@marion.k12.fl.us)

Planning for differentiated lessons and utilize technology to
differentiate lessons during instructional time

Person Responsible   Constance Carpenter (constance.carpenter@marion.k12.fl.us)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Increase Math Proficiency across all grade levels Howard Middle school serves students from schools in our feeder pattern that have low proficiency and learning gain levels for incoming students. Howard Middle will continue to focus on all students in order to support them in being deemed proficient as measured on FSA.
Measurable Outcome:	If we provide teachers with supported collaboration opportunities focusing on data collection and analysis, standards based lesson planning and differentiated instruction then Math proficiency will increase from 60% to 63% as indicated on the FSA.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Bernard Rembert (bernard.rembert@marion.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	I-Ready diagnostic assessments will be used 3 times a year to monitor student growth Professional Development on Student Engagement - Critical Thinking, Student Collaboration and Discourse
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Teachers will engage in sustained professional development that is content focused, incorporating active learning, supports collaboration, and uses models of effective practice.Feedback, coaching and support will be a part of this ongoing process as well.

Action Steps to Implement	
Provide Professional Development on Critical Thinking and student engagement	
Person Responsible	Angela Ponder (angela.ponder@marion.k12.fl.us)
Provide coaching by Instructional Coach and District Content Area Specialists to all teachers on standard based planning and instruction	
Person Responsible	Constance Carpenter (constance.carpenter@marion.k12.fl.us)
Teacher Observation by administration focused on look fors in critical thinking and engagement	
Person Responsible	Bernard Rembert (lamar.rembert@marion.k12.fl.us)
Teachers will conduct Instructional Rounds or Lesson Studies as an accountability piece for their professional development	
Person Responsible	Bernard Rembert (lamar.rembert@marion.k12.fl.us)
Planning for differentiated lessons and utilize technology to differentiate lessons during instructional time.	

| **Person Responsible** | Constance Carpenter (constance.carpenter@marion.k12.fl.us) |

Utilizing data analysis to identify students who are in need of additional
mathematical support and provided remediation opportunities outside of
the school day.

| **Person Responsible** | Bernard Rembert (lamar.rembert@marion.k12.fl.us) |

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

Implementing formal and scheduled training for new teachers to promote teacher retention.

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.

We continuously consult with our teachers, students, families, volunteers and School Advisory Council
(SAC) throughout the year. We understand that our stakeholders play a key role in school performance and
addressing equity. As such, we start each school year with a meeting (notifications and invitations in
English and Spanish) to address the following:
• A description and explanation of the school's curriculum,
• Information on the forms of academic assessment used to measure student progress, and
• Information on the proficiency levels students are expected to meet;
• Explain the school parental Parent and Family Engagement Plan, and school-parent compact;
• Explain the right of parents to become involved in the school's programs and ways to do so;
• Explain that parents have the right to request opportunities for regular meetings for parents to formulate
suggestions and to participate in decisions about the education of their children.
• Allow for feedback and open discussion.

In order to increase stakeholder engagement and promote a welcoming environment we will offer different
modalities (online and paper based) of communication with to our families such as phone, email, Dojo and/
or Remind App, Twitter, school website, teacher webpage, Skyward Parent Portal and school marquee.

Family and community feedback is requested/collected during quarterly SAC meetings, the Annual Parent
Survey, Parent and Family Engagement Plan event surveys and Schoolwide Improvement Plan surveys.

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: ELA	$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities	$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math	$0.00
		Total:	**$0.00**