

Leon County Schools

Raa Middle School



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	12
Planning for Improvement	17
Positive Culture & Environment	32
Budget to Support Goals	32

Raa Middle School

401 W THARPE ST, Tallahassee, FL 32303

<https://www.leonschools.net/raa>

Demographics

Principal: Marcus Scott

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2020

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Middle School 6-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	79%
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 Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (51%) 2017-18: B (58%) 2016-17: B (54%) 2015-16: B (55%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northwest
Regional Executive Director	Rachel Heide
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TS&I

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

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	12
Planning for Improvement	17
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	32

Raa Middle School

401 W THARPE ST, Tallahassee, FL 32303

<https://www.leonschools.net/raa>

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2019-20 Title I School	2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Middle School 6-8	No	76%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	73%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Leon 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.

It is the mission of Augusta Raa Arts Magnet Middle School to provide an educational setting designed to prepare students to be successful lifelong learners. Through curricula and extracurricular activities, each student will have the opportunity to be active participants in the learning process and engage in activities that allow them to explore their individual interests.

Provide the school's vision statement.

It is the vision of Augusta Raa Arts Magnet Middle School to prepare all students to achieve in academics and the arts through inspiring investments in leadership and service.

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
Scott, Marcus	Principal	Oversee all operations of the school. Manage leadership team with follow up to a make sure team has the resources to complete school goals.
Cowart, Chris	Assistant Principal	Assistant Principal of Administration Oversee 8th \ 7th discipline Supervisor of the Math Department Manager of school-wide PBIS
Collins, Terry	Teacher, K-12	Social Studies Department Chair
Harrison, Natalee	Teacher, K-12	ELA Department Chair Coaches Intensive Reading / Civics Teachers
Kerrigan, Kathy	School Counselor	Guidance Department Chair
Van Camp, BJ	Assistant Principal	Assistant Principal of Curriculum. Oversees ELA, ESE, and Guidance Departments
White, Trikia	Instructional Coach	Reading Coach 8th Grade Team Leader
Wheeler, Mary	Teacher, K-12	Math Department Chair Mentor for beginning teachers
Aylward, Katharine	Teacher, K-12	Arts Department Chair Mentor for beginning teachers
Farmer, Erica	Teacher, K-12	6th Grade Team Leader
Hill, Daphne	Teacher, K-12	Science Department Chair
Robinson, Portia	School Counselor	Referral Coordinator Manages MTSS Team
Zackery, Pat	Assistant Principal	Assistant Principal for Attendance Oversee Social Studies Department
Parker, Alma	Teacher, ESE	ESE Department Chair

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Wednesday 7/1/2020, Marcus Scott

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.*

9

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

52

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Middle School 6-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	79%
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 Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (51%) 2017-18: B (58%) 2016-17: B (54%) 2015-16: B (55%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northwest
Regional Executive Director	Rachel Heide

Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TS&I
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here .	

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

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

Indicator	Grade Level														Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12		
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	271	318	301	0	0	0	0	890	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	96	142	91	0	0	0	0	329	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	2	0	0	0	0	5	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	2	0	0	0	0	9	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	56	51	70	0	0	0	0	177	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	41	61	75	0	0	0	0	177	

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	48	59	68	0	0	0	0	175	

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level														Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12		
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	3	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	4	5	0	0	0	0	14	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Saturday 9/12/2020

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	328	285	0	0	0	0	954	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	24	37	22	0	0	0	0	83	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	4	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	15	11	0	0	0	0	29	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	92	114	78	0	0	0	0	284	

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	11	27	15	0	0	0	0	53	

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

Prior Year - Updated

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

Indicator	Grade Level														Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12		
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	341	328	285	0	0	0	0	954	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	24	37	22	0	0	0	0	83	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	4	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	15	11	0	0	0	0	29	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	92	114	78	0	0	0	0	284	

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	11	27	15	0	0	0	0	53	

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school, or combination schools).

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	52%	55%	54%	51%	53%	52%
ELA Learning Gains	49%	53%	54%	50%	53%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	36%	42%	47%	42%	44%	44%
Math Achievement	54%	59%	58%	54%	58%	56%
Math Learning Gains	47%	58%	57%	51%	57%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	36%	47%	51%	43%	51%	50%
Science Achievement	50%	49%	51%	58%	53%	50%
Social Studies Achievement	68%	75%	72%	65%	71%	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%	54%	-3%	54%	-3%
	2018	51%	57%	-6%	52%	-1%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	49%	56%	-7%	52%	-3%
	2018	47%	54%	-7%	51%	-4%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison		-2%				
08	2019	54%	59%	-5%	56%	-2%
	2018	65%	62%	3%	58%	7%
Same Grade Comparison		-11%				
Cohort Comparison		7%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2019	48%	53%	-5%	55%	-7%
	2018	58%	59%	-1%	52%	6%
Same Grade Comparison		-10%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	54%	60%	-6%	54%	0%
	2018	59%	55%	4%	54%	5%
Same Grade Comparison		-5%				
Cohort Comparison		-4%				
08	2019	29%	45%	-16%	46%	-17%
	2018	43%	44%	-1%	45%	-2%
Same Grade Comparison		-14%				
Cohort Comparison		-30%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2019	42%	44%	-2%	48%	-6%
	2018	39%	49%	-10%	50%	-11%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison						

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	91%	70%	21%	67%	24%
2018	100%	69%	31%	65%	35%
Compare		-9%			
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	66%	75%	-9%	71%	-5%
2018	69%	73%	-4%	71%	-2%
Compare		-3%			
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	91%	69%	22%	61%	30%
2018	97%	71%	26%	62%	35%
Compare		-6%			
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	97%	67%	30%	57%	40%
2018	100%	60%	40%	56%	44%
Compare		-3%			

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	25	40	35	27	48	42	11	32			
ELL	20			30	27						
ASN	38	25		62	38						
BLK	41	43	37	42	40	29	35	56	52		
HSP	46	44		44	44			70			
MUL	59	57		57	59			92			
WHT	69	58	39	72	57	51	70	80	75		
FRL	43	44	35	46	45	36	41	59	54		
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	25	46	44	24	45	42	20	29			
ELL	25	47	60	63	73						
ASN	60										
BLK	43	53	51	48	54	46	31	55	58		
HSP	71	67	80	59	68	64	55		45		
MUL	50	55	60	50	45		27				
WHT	70	62	51	81	74	59	75	83	75		
FRL	44	51	48	51	59	46	32	58	51		
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	19	35	30	19	42	40	22	48			
ELL	10	17		40	46						
ASN		60			50						
BLK	38	42	38	39	46	39	43	54	68		
HSP	45	38		65	59		91	68			
MUL	48	39		48	48						

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
WHT	67	63	50	69	55	48	72	78	66		
FRL	39	43	39	41	45	42	46	53	56		

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	51
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	458
Total Components for the Federal Index	9
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	33
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	26
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	1
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	41
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO

Asian Students	
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	42
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	50
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	65
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	63
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	45
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.

Our lowest data components were ELA Lowest 25th percentile and Math Lowest 25th percentile making learning gains at 36% each. Contributing factors to these areas include but are not limited to gaps in instructional practices, the need for supplemental resources for Tier 2 and Tier 3 Interventions, number of students taking their appropriate grade level state assessment, and changes in staffing.

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

Our data components that showed the greatest decline from the prior year were ELA Lowest 25th percentile and Math Lowest 25th percentile making learning gains at 36%, which was down from 53% for ELA and 50% for Math the prior year. This is an overall decrease of 17% for ELA and 14% for Math. Factors contributing to this decline include, but are not limited to gaps in instructional practices, the need for supplemental resources for Tier 2 and Tier 3 Interventions, number of students taking their appropriate grade level state assessment, and changes in staffing.

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 data component that has the greatest gap when compared to the state average was Math Lowest 25th percentile making learning gains at 36% in comparison to the state average of 51%. This is a gap of 15 percentage points and contributing factors include but are not limited to gaps in instructional practices, the need for supplemental resources for Tier 2 and Tier 3 Interventions, number of students taking their appropriate grade level state assessment, and changes in staffing.

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

The component that showed the most improvement was science achievement at 50% in comparison to the prior year of 49%. Actions that contributed to this growth of 1% include but are not limited to changes in scheduling and teaching assignments and collaborative teaching practices.

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

One area of concern from the EWS data is the number of Level 1 students on statewide assessment. Specifically for 7th grade students this number has increased from 75 students to 114. Contributing factors include but are not limited to gaps in instructional practices, the need for supplemental resources for Tier 2 and Tier 3 Interventions, number of students taking their appropriate grade level state assessment, and changes in staffing.

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

1. ELA Lowest 25th Percentile Making Learning Gains
2. Math Lowest 25th percentile Making Learning Gains
3. Overall Math Learning Gains
4. Overall ELA Learning Gains
5. Science Achievement

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

This area of focus was chosen based on ELA proficiency data from the 2018-2019 FSA assessment scores. The assessment results were that 52% of our students were a level of 3 or above school-wide while 49% of students made learning gains.. This was a 3 and 8 percentage point decrease respectively from the previous school year. It is our expectation that the use of various progress monitoring strategies, ongoing, communication based on data points, and revision of processes through our professional learning communities will help to refine and improve student performance and teacher instructional practices related to English Language Arts.

Measurable Outcome:

58% of students in grades 6-8 will score a level 3 or higher on the English Language Arts FSA Assessment. This will be an increase in proficiency by 6 percentage points. Increase overall English Language Arts FSA Learning Gains 9 percentage points from 49% to 58%.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

BJ Van Camp (vancampbj@leonschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Below are the strategies we plan to utilize in order to achieve our intended outcome:

- Literacy Night Events for Parents
- Student Data Chats each 9 weeks with students
- Increase in Explicit Vocabulary Instruction within Context
- Student Data Tracking Sheets / Charts
- Novel Studies and Advanced Enrichment Activities
- Poetry Series and Increased Public Speaking opportunities for students
- Vertical Team meetings and articulations
- Collections and Common Lit Resources along with FLVS Curriculum
- iReady Reading Program for Reading Interventions
- STAR Benchmark Testing for Level 1 and Level 2 Students
- Teaching note-taking and organizational Skills
- Common assessments on skills/standards
- Training other departments on reading strategies (NGCARPD)
- Strategic Instructional Model (SIM) Training for Learning Strategies
- Increased Parental Involvement
- Common Planning to discuss data

Our rationales for selecting the above strategies each relate to the following concerns and correlations:

- Lack of prior knowledge
- Rigor of reading lessons
- Focus needed on inference and reading application skills
- Student Reading Endurance for longer text passages
- Reading Comprehension versus just looking for answers within the text
- Keyboarding skills
- Oral Reading Fluency
- Integration of Knowledge and Ideas – Evaluate arguments and content in diverse formats
- Knowledge and Ideas – Citing Text Evidence to support conclusions
- Integration of passages (dual passages)
- English Language Learners and Students with Disabilities struggling to interpret information within the text

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

- Lack of engagement for Digital Academy students due to inconsistent learning environments.

Action Steps to Implement

School Administrators will work to monitor the trainings provided throughout the year and implementation of target English Language Arts strategies. Administrators will also provide feedback as needed. The following items will also be used to monitor performance:

- District quarterly assessments
- Reading collections
- Benchmark assessments
- Novel study Assessments
- Common Lit Unit Assessments
- Achieve 3000 Level Set
- STAR Testing
- Instructional Coaching for ELA and non-ELA Teachers

Person Responsible Natalee Harrison (harrisonn1@leonschools.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

This area of focus was chosen based on ELA Learning Gains data from the 2018-2019 FSA assessment scores. The assessment results were that 36% of our students identified in the bottom 25% showed learning gains. This was a 17 percentage point decrease from the previous school year. Based upon our current data and student needs we have committed ourselves to helping to close the achievement gap for our students that are performing below grade level in English Language Arts. Additionally, there is a gap between the performance of subgroups (African-Americans, English Language Learners, and Students with Disabilities).

Measurable Outcome:

46% of students in grades 6-8 classified as being in our lowest 25th percentile will make a learning gain on the English Language Arts FSA Assessment.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

BJ Van Camp (vancampbj@leonschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:

In addition to the core Tier I strategies that will be used school wide for English Language Arts Courses, the following additional strategies will be used to assist with our Lowest 25th percentile:

- Student Data Chats each 9 weeks
- Increase Explicit Vocabulary Instruction within Context
- Novel Studies and Advanced Enrichment Activities
- Poetry Series and Increased Public Speaking opportunities for students
- Vertical Team meetings and articulations
- Collections and Common Lit Resources (FLVS Curriculum)
- iReady Reading Program for Reading Interventions
- Oral Reading Fluency Checks
- STAR Benchmark Testing for Level 1 and Level 2 Students
- Blocked Reading and Language Arts Classes for Level 1 students
- Teaching note-taking and organizational Skills
- Common assessments on skills/standards
- Training other departments on reading strategies (NGCARPD)
- Strategic Instructional Model (SIM) Training for Learning Strategies
- Increased Parental Involvement
- Common Planning to discuss Data

Our rationales for selecting the above strategies each relate to the following concerns and correlations:

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

- Students lack of prior knowledge
- Rigor of reading lessons
- Focus needed on inference and reading application skills
- Student Reading Endurance for longer text passages
- Reading Comprehension versus just looking for answers within the text
- Keyboarding skills
- Oral Reading Fluency
- Integration of Knowledge and Ideas – Evaluate arguments and content in diverse formats
- Knowledge and Ideas – Citing Text Evidence to support conclusions
- Integration of passages (dual passages)
- English Language Learners and Students with Disabilities struggling to interpret information within the text

- Lack of engagement for Digital Academy students due to inconsistent learning environments

Action Steps to Implement

School Administrators will work to monitor the trainings provided throughout the year and implementation of target English Language Arts strategies. Administrators will also provide feedback as needed. The following action step items will also be used to monitor performance:

- District quarterly assessments
- Reading collections
- Benchmark assessments
- Novel study Assessments
- Common Lit Unit Assessments
- Achieve 3000 Level Set
- STAR Testing
- Instructional Coaching for ELA and non-ELA teachers

Person Responsible Natalee Harrison (harrisonn1@leonschools.net)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

This area of focus was chosen based on Math proficiency data from the 2018-2019 FSA assessment scores. The assessment results were that 54% of our students were a level of 3 or above school-wide while 47% of students made learning gains. This was a 7 and 15 percentage point decrease respectively from the previous school year. It is our expectation that the use of various progress monitoring strategies, ongoing communication based upon data points, and revision of processes through our professional learning communities will help to refine and improve student performance and teacher instructional practices related to Mathematics.

Measurable Outcome:

Increase overall Math proficiency 4 percentage points from 54% to 58%. Increase overall Math Learning Gains 11 percentage points from 47% to 58%.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Chris Cowart (cowartc@leonschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Below are the strategies we plan to utilize in order to achieve our intended outcome:

- Additional use of higher order thinking questions based upon Webb's Depth of Knowledge
- 3rd quarter morning small group sessions with digital academy students for 60 min
- Use of iXL Math Program school-wide for mastery of 2 curriculum aligned skills per week
- Use of small groups for mastery
- Use of enrichment and review activities from Go Math Curriculum
- Before/ after-school tutorials
- Student Data Chats each 9 weeks with students
- Increase use of Word Problems and literacy/vocabulary strategies
- Celebration of student success/foster a growth mindset for students grappling with challenging content
- Frequent assessments and opportunities to re-assess same skills for mastery
- FSA/EOC Saturday School Sessions
- Professional Learning Communities to analyze student data and plan instructional strategies
- Incorporate Universal Design for Learning
- Increased Involvement Strategies

Our rationales for selecting the above strategies each relate to the following concerns and correlations:

- Students lack of prior knowledge
- Number Sense learning gaps
- Rigor of Math lessons
- Students lack of math fluency
- Student Motivation/Interest through increase in fluency of basic math fundamentals
- Need for additional Intervention Supports
- Expressions and Equations – Solving real-life math problems using equations
- Geometric Concepts – Angles, Area, Surface Area and Volume
- Familiarity with online testing platform and online testing strategies
- Students Taking multiple math classes due to missing quality points (PLATO)
- Standards-aligned formative assessments

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

- English Language Learners and Students with Disabilities struggling to interpret word problems and multi-step procedures

Action Steps to Implement

School Administrators will work to monitor the trainings provided throughout the year and implementation of target Math strategies. Administrators will also provide feedback as needed. The following action step items will also be used to monitor performance:

- FOCUS grades and comments/Progress alerts for parents
- Review teacher lesson plans for instructional strategies to engage all learners
- Go Math and IXL data reports
- Baseline, Midyear, and End of Year District Course Assessments
- Standards-based assessments by module or quarter
- Student-teacher progress monitoring discussions

Person Responsible Mary Wheeler (wheelerm1@leonschools.net)

#4. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

This area of focus was chosen based on Math Learning Gains data from the 2018-2019 FSA assessment scores. The assessment results were that 36% of our students identified in the bottom 25% showed learning gains. This was a 16 percentage point decrease from the previous school year. Based upon our current data and student needs we have committed ourselves to helping to close the achievement gap for our students that are performing below grade level in Math. Additionally, there is a gap between the performance of subgroups (African-Americans, English Language Learners, and Students with Disabilities).

Measurable Outcome:

46% of students in grades 6-8 classified as being in our lowest 25th percentile will make a learning gain on the Math FSA Assessment.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Chris Cowart (cowartc@leonschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Below are the strategies we plan to utilize in order to achieve our intended outcome:

- Additional use of higher order thinking questions based upon Webb's Depth of Knowledge
- 3rd quarter morning small group sessions with digital academy students for 60 min
- Use of iXL Math Program school-wide for mastery of 2 curriculum aligned skills per week
- Use of small groups for mastery
- Use of enrichment and review activities from Go Math Curriculum
- Before/ after-school tutorials
- Student Data Chats each 9 weeks with students
- Increase use of Word Problems and literacy/vocabulary strategies
- Celebration of student success/foster a growth mindset for students grappling with challenging content
- Frequent assessments and opportunities to re-assess same skills for mastery
- FSA/EOC Saturday School Sessions
- Professional Learning Communities to analyze student data and plan instructional strategies
- Incorporate Universal Design for Learning
- Increased Involvement Strategies

Our rationales for selecting the above strategies each relate to the following concerns and correlations:

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

- Students lack of prior knowledge
- Number Sense learning gaps
- Rigor of Math lessons
- Students lack of math fluency
- Student Motivation/Interest through increase in fluency of basic math fundamentals
- Need for additional Intervention Supports
- Expressions and Equations – Solving real-life math problems using equations
- Geometric Concepts – Angles, Area, Surface Area and Volume
- Familiarity with online testing platform and online testing strategies
- Students Taking multiple math classes due to missing quality points (PLATO)

- Standards-aligned formative assessments
- English Language Learners and Students with Disabilities struggling to interpret word problems and multi-step procedures

Action Steps to Implement

School Administrators will work to monitor the trainings provided throughout the year and implementation of target Math strategies. Administrators will also provide feedback as needed. The following action step items will also be used to monitor performance:

- FOCUS grades and comments/Progress alerts for parents
- Review teacher lesson plans for instructional strategies to engage all learners
- Go Math and IXL data reports
- Baseline, Midyear, and End of Year District Course Assessments
- Standards-based assessments by module or quarter
- Student-teacher progress monitoring discussions

Person Responsible Mary Wheeler (wheelerm1@leonschools.net)

#5. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Social Studies**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

This area of focus was chosen based on Social Studies proficiency data from the 2018-2019 FSA assessment scores. The assessment results were that 68% of our students were a level of 3 or above school-wide. This was a 1 percentage point decrease from the previous school year. It is our expectation that the use of various progress monitoring strategies, ongoing, communication based on data points, and revision of processes through our professional learning communities will help to refine and improve student performance and teacher instructional practices related to reading strategies through Social Studies content.

Measurable Outcome: 80% of students will score a level 3 or higher on the Social Studies FSA Assessment. This will be an increase in proficiency by 12 percentage points.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

[no one identified]

Evidence-based Strategy:

Below are the strategies we plan to utilize in order to achieve our intended outcome:

- Progress Monitoring through Baseline, Midterm, and Diagnostic assessments.
- Student Data Chats each 9 weeks with students
- Review (Blitz) of content material leading up to FSA assessment.
- Student Data Tracking Sheets / Chartss
- Vertical Team meetings and articulations
- Increased reading and vocabulary comprehension through content
- Teaching note-taking and organizational Skills
- Training other departments on reading strategies (NGCARPD)
- Common Planning to discuss data (where possible)

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Our rationales for selecting the above strategies each relate to the following concerns and correlations:

- Lack of prior knowledge
- Rigor of content lesson with and emphasis on reading strategies
- Focus needed on inference and reading application skills
- Student Reading Endurance for longer text passages
- Reading Comprehension versus just looking for answers within the text
- Oral Reading Fluency
- Integration of Knowledge and Ideas – Evaluate arguments and content in diverse formats
- Knowledge and Ideas – Citing Text Evidence to support conclusions

Action Steps to Implement

Administrators will also provide feedback as needed. The following items will also be used to monitor performance:

- District progress monitoring assessments
- Reading collections
- Benchmark assessments
- Achieve 3000 Level Set

Person Responsible

[no one identified]

#6. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

As one of our top five lowest performing areas in the previous school year it is our expectation that the use of various progress monitoring strategies, ongoing communication based upon data points, and revision of processes will help to refine and improve student performance in science. Building background knowledge in lower grades will also be helpful.

Measurable Outcome:

58% of students in grades 6-8 will score a level three or higher on the State Science or Biology EOC Assessment.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Marcus Scott (scottma@leonschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Below are the strategies we plan to utilize in order to achieve our intended outcome:

- Increased attention to the scientific process
- Vertical team meetings
- Purchase of additional sets of science resources
- Additional incorporation of science labs and literacy strategies
- Use of real world science experiments
- Hands-on inquiry based lessons
- Use of instructional computer software and Pearson Textbooks resources
- iXL Subscriptions for 8th grade science
- Increased use of informational text and reading comprehension strategies
- Teacher training in science teaching and learning
- Test retake to help show mastery of curriculum
- Before school tutorials
- Science Field trips and Saturday Sessions
- Increased Parental Involvement

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Our rationales for selecting the above strategies each relate to the following concerns and correlations:

- Gaps in scientific knowledge
- Moderate understanding of scientific process
- Vocabulary and word recognition
- Rigor of Science Lessons
- Life Science
- Nature of Science Concepts
- Reading comprehension Skills
- Inability to make connections with abstract content (graphs, charts, variable identification, data analysis)

Action Steps to Implement

School Administrators will work to monitor the trainings provided throughout the year and implementation of target Science strategies. Administrators will

also provide feedback as needed. The following items will also be used to monitor performance:

- County tests: baseline, mid-year, end-of-year exams
- Progress reports
- Performance Matters/ Unify
- iXL Progress Monitoring for 8th Grade
- Chapter/unit tests
- Standards Based Assessments

Person Responsible

Daphne Hill (hilld@leonschools.net)

#7. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Discipline**Area of Focus
Description and
Rationale:**

Based upon previous school data related to academic performance, attendance, discipline, and other Early Warning Systems there is a need for additional attention to be given to designing programs to meet the psycho-social, emotional, and economic needs of our student population

**Measurable
Outcome:**

Maintain a safe and orderly school environment by integrating school wide discipline plan through assemblies, incentives, and visual reinforcement of the school wide behavior expectations throughout the campus. Reduce number of referrals for minority students and reduce number of students with multiple referrals and/or suspensions. Increase the percent of students with attendance rates above 90%.

**Person
responsible for
monitoring
outcome:**

Marcus Scott (scottma@leonschools.net)

**Evidence-based
Strategy:**

Below are the strategies we plan to utilize in order to achieve our intended outcomes:

- Guidance, parents and student conferences
- Full-time dean of students
- PBIS Committee Chair
- School-wide PBIS Committee
- Increase signage around campus with behavior expectations
- Faculty/staff mentor program for students needing additional support
- Initiate attendance incentives and recognition each 9 weeks
- Hiring of School Safety Monitor
- Continuation of New Horizons Program targeting character building and conflict resolution
- The Leader In Me Pilot project to target character building and mutual respect for diversity and differences.
- 7 Habits of Highly Effective Teens
- School PBIS Committee will continue to meet monthly to discuss and plan school-wide initiatives.
- Continue to disaggregate data by subgroups, times of day, pre-existing conditions, etc in order to fine tune intervention strategies and programs being used.

Increased Parental Involvement

Our rationales for selecting the above strategies each relate to the following concerns and correlations:

**Rationale for
Evidence-based
Strategy:**

- Teacher professional development needed
- Consistent implementation of PBIS goals/incentives is needed
- Reinforces that are based on student interest
- Use of Common language with adults and students
- Class Dojo Infrastructure through FOCUS to ensure consistent implementation
- School-wide discipline data
- School-wide attendance data
- Early Warning System Data

Action Steps to Implement

School Administrators will work to monitor the training provided throughout the year and implementation of target Discipline/Attendance/PBIS strategies.

Administrators will also provide feedback as needed. The following items will also be used to monitor performance:

- Monthly meetings with PBIS team- PBIS representatives review discipline data with grade level teams
- Feedback from student mentors- set behavior goals with mentors and monitor progress
- Review of behavior guidelines on a regular basis with students and teachers to ensure appropriate practices are being followed
- Develop behavior checklists/contracts for students needing additional support
- Quarterly review of behavior data (look for trends/implement changes as needed)
- Behavior expectation assemblies will be used to discuss issues and provide avenues for guest speakers to educate our students and staff on social issues, conflict resolution, and respect for diversity.
- Daily attendance checks and Compulsive attendance assessments will be conducted to intervene with students missing more than 10 days in a month or 15 days within a semester • Perfect Attendance Incentives offered each 9 weeks
- Leaders In Training group will be sponsored and supported monthly to increase student awareness of leadership and career readiness

Person Responsible Marcus Scott (scottma@leonschools.net)

#8. Other specifically relating to Arts Magnet Program Development

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	As the premier Middle School Arts Magnet Program, our goal is to provide our Magnet Students with an opportunity to be active participants in their learning process, to engage them in opportunities to explore their individual interests and talents, and to build future consumers and producers of the Arts.
Measurable Outcome:	Our Intended Outcome for our Magnet Students include: Initiating the process of producing and managing Arts Magnet Student Portfolios based upon student interests and magnet track initiatives; Increasing the promotion of Arts Magnet Program throughout our community and increase participation in community showcase and outreach areas for Tallahassee; Matching 25% of our Arts Magnet students with an arts mentor; and Hosting one targeted field trip a year for each magnet discipline/school.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Marcus Scott (scottma@leonschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	<p>Below are the strategies we plan to utilize in order to achieve our intended outcomes above:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Build foundational understandings of the arts through various media sources (i.e. textbook, powerpoint, classroom demonstration) • Allocate and Solicit additional resources and funding from community partners to build additional program enhancements and bring opportunities to students • Adjust classes as programming enhances from semester to yearlong courses to increase student proficiency. • Host additional recruitment and interest events to showcase student talents • Participate in additional community outreach activities to showcase Arts Magnet Program • Visit local feeder schools throughout the year to highlight course offerings • Retrofit and/or modify existing spaces to meet the needs of Arts Program. • Identify additional point(s) of contact to help with development of portfolio rubrics, submission process, and tracking • Increased Parental Involvement
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	<p>Our rationales for selecting the above strategies each relate to the following concerns and correlations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lack of prior knowledge within various Arts Programs • Lack of specific program based technology • Need for updated Music Equipment and Materials • Need for additional Performing and Visual Arts Spaces (i.e. Art Gallery and Auditorium) • Expenses of Guest Artists • Impacts on student contact time due to behavior and mentoring pull-outs

Action Steps to Implement

School Administrators will work to monitor the training provided throughout the year and implementation of target Arts Magnet strategies. Administrators will also provide feedback as needed. The following items will also be used as action steps to monitor performance:

- Continued use of student performance assessments
- Provide evidence of resource use through additional programming arts showcases
- Tracking skill progression by semester versus yearlong
- Host more arts events on campus and throughout the community
- Continued partnership with Florida State University Opening Nights Program
- Host more arts events on campus and throughout the community

Person Responsible Katharine Aylward (aylwardk@leonschools.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

All school needs are addressed through school-wide goals and areas of focus.

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.

Raa would like to see the number of parents that are active in our school grow. Parents are encouraged to help with organizational tasks as well as tasks that involve building positive relationships with students. At this time our parent organization has parents that volunteer for specific organization events. We would like parents to become active members in the mentoring process as well as keep records of parents volunteering in all school wide events.

- Soliciting feedback from parents regarding their comfort level in contacting teachers and administrators with questions or problems;
- During Orientation, Open House, grade level nights, etc. introduce parents to teachers and administrators;
- Communicate classroom and school news to parents;
- Positive notes, letters, phone calls home
- Use of social media outlets and text alert systems for parent notifications
- Weekly postings of student performance data on Parent Portal Grading System
- Bi-weekly Rams Connect Newsletter

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: Instructional Practice: ELA	\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math	\$0.00
4	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math	\$0.00
5	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Social Studies	\$0.00
6	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Science	\$0.00
7	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Discipline	\$0.00
8	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Other: Arts Magnet Program Development	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00