Fort Meade Middle/Senior High School

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Fort Meade Middle/Senior High School

700 EDGEWOOD DR N, Fort Meade, FL 33841

http://schools.polk-fl.net/fmmshs

Demographics

Principal: Matthew Blankenship

Start Date for this Principal: 5/28/2020

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	High School 6-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students* White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (50%) 2017-18: B (56%) 2016-17: C (44%) 2015-16: C (47%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	
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 Polk 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

Fort Meade Middle/Senior High School

700 EDGEWOOD DR N, Fort Meade, FL 33841

http://schools.polk-fl.net/fmmshs

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)
High School 6-12	Yes	94%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	65%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Polk 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.

The Mission of Fort Meade Middle Senior High is to promote academic and social success for all students.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The vision of Fort Meade Middle Senior High is to prepare students for college and career success.

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
Hardee, Amy	Principal	All members of the leadership team share in the decision making process as it pertains to the safety of the students and staff of the school, evaluating the effectiveness of the instructional program, and identifying the academic and social/emotional needs of the students. In addition, a distributed leadership approach is used whereby all administrators are assigned an academic area of focus to monitor, support, and coach. This administrative team meets weekly to share feedback related to instructional observations and student progress. The leadership team are also active members of instructional PLC's.
Dent, Jason	Assistant Principal	All members of the leadership team share in the decision making process as it pertains to the safety of the students and staff of the school, evaluating the effectiveness of the instructional program, and identifying the academic and social/emotional needs of the students. In addition, a distributed leadership approach is used whereby all administrators are assigned an academic area of focus to monitor, support, and coach. This administrative team meets weekly to share feedback related to instructional observations and student progress. The leadership team are also active members of instructional PLC's.
Browning, Michelle	Assistant Principal	All members of the leadership team share in the decision making process as it pertains to the safety of the students and staff of the school, evaluating the effectiveness of the instructional program, and identifying the academic and social/emotional needs of the students. In addition, a distributed leadership approach is used whereby all administrators are assigned an academic area of focus to monitor, support, and coach. This administrative team meets weekly to share feedback related to instructional observations and student progress. The leadership team are also active members of instructional PLC's.
Cannon, Susan	Instructional Coach	Instructional coaches are active members of instructional PLC's and are primarily responsible for professional development, implementation of the coaching cycle, and leading collaborative planning among the content areas. In addition, instructional coaches mentor new teachers and oversee the PEC program.
Myers, Cynthia	Instructional Coach	Instructional coaches are active members of instructional PLC's and are primarily responsible for professional development, implementation of the coaching cycle, and leading collaborative planning among the content areas.

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		In addition, instructional coaches mentor new teachers and oversee the PEC program.
Cornelius, Jemalle	Dean	Maintaining safety and security of campus
Lambert, Seth	Assistant Principal	All members of the leadership team share in the decision making process as it pertains to the safety of the students and staff of the school, evaluating the effectiveness of the instructional program, and identifying the academic and social/emotional needs of the students. In addition, a distributed leadership approach is used whereby all administrators are assigned an academic area of focus to monitor, support, and coach. This administrative team meets weekly to share feedback related to instructional observations and student progress. The leadership team are also active members of instructional PLC's.

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Thursday 5/28/2020, Matthew Blankenship

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*
1

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*
13

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
53

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	High School 6-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	Yes

2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students* White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (50%) 2017-18: B (56%) 2016-17: C (44%) 2015-16: C (47%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	
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	128	119	132	130	104	94	84	791
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	11	14	8	12	11	17	87
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	19	13	11	18	5	6	6	78
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	10	5	3	2	4	0	27
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	9	3	1	5	2	0	24
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	51	32	34	32	24	11	3	187
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	32	35	18	10	12	28	6	141

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	47	44	44	44	26	23	16	244

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	2	9	8	2	2	1	2	26
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	2	13	14	8	8	48

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 6/10/2020

Prior Year - As Reported

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	125	123	138	103	113	76	68	746
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	15	11	12	11	11	18	91
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	26	16	33	17	19	15	7	133
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	6	0	0	9
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	47	48	51	30	39	21	12	248

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	15	14	22	14	15	16	7	103

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	0	11	2	2	4	0	24
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	19	18	14	6	4	63

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	125	123	138	103	113	76	68	746
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	15	11	12	11	11	18	91
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	26	16	33	17	19	15	7	133
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	6	0	0	9
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	47	48	51	30	39	21	12	248

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	15	14	22	14	15	16	7	103

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	0	11	2	2	4	0	24
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	19	18	14	6	4	63

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	42%	47%	56%	35%	44%	53%
ELA Learning Gains	46%	46%	51%	41%	41%	49%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	39%	37%	42%	31%	33%	41%
Math Achievement	46%	43%	51%	31%	37%	49%
Math Learning Gains	45%	45%	48%	31%	33%	44%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	49%	44%	45%	32%	32%	39%
Science Achievement	37%	58%	68%	38%	56%	65%
Social Studies Achievement	59%	61%	73%	55%	60%	70%

Indicator	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey								
	Grade Level (prior year reported)							**Total**
Indicator	**6**	**7**	**8**	**9**	**10**	**11**	**12**	
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(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	38%	48%	-10%	54%	-16%
	2018	33%	41%	-8%	52%	-19%
Same Grade Comparison		5%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	38%	42%	-4%	52%	-14%
	2018	40%	42%	-2%	51%	-11%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison		5%				
08	2019	41%	48%	-7%	56%	-15%
	2018	45%	49%	-4%	58%	-13%
Same Grade Comparison		-4%				
Cohort Comparison		1%				
09	2019	42%	45%	-3%	55%	-13%
	2018	44%	43%	1%	53%	-9%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison		-3%				
10	2019	41%	42%	-1%	53%	-12%
	2018	53%	42%	11%	53%	0%
Same Grade Comparison		-12%				
Cohort Comparison		-3%				

MATH

Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2019	40%	47%	-7%	55%	-15%
	2018	34%	40%	-6%	52%	-18%
Same Grade Comparison		6%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	59%	39%	20%	54%	5%
	2018	60%	40%	20%	54%	6%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison		25%				
08	2019	41%	35%	6%	46%	-5%
	2018	47%	34%	13%	45%	2%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Same Grade Comparison		-6%				
Cohort Comparison		-19%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2019	29%	41%	-12%	48%	-19%
	2018	33%	42%	-9%	50%	-17%
Same Grade Comparison		-4%				
Cohort Comparison						

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	51%	54%	-3%	67%	-16%
2018	83%	59%	24%	65%	18%
Compare		-32%			

CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	62%	70%	-8%	71%	-9%
2018	79%	84%	-5%	71%	8%
Compare		-17%			

HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	52%	57%	-5%	70%	-18%
2018	63%	57%	6%	68%	-5%
Compare		-11%			

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	39%	50%	-11%	61%	-22%
2018	70%	60%	10%	62%	8%
Compare		-31%			

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	59%	53%	6%	57%	2%
2018	43%	41%	2%	56%	-13%

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
Compare		16%			

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	22	37	29	25	48	51	17	41		93	15
ELL	16	37	38	41	46	52	12	46	23	93	38
BLK	29	45	43	28	31	27	14	46		100	25
HSP	42	48	38	46	45	49	38	59	42	97	48
WHT	47	44	36	53	50	57	45	65	48	100	55
FRL	37	45	37	45	47	48	32	59	40	98	41
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	15	26	24	21	44	47	18				
ELL	22	39	38	32	57	65	19	33		91	20
BLK	34	42	24	36	56	68	33	44		85	29
HSP	40	49	41	49	62	62	41	72	72	82	55
WHT	49	49	37	53	63	54	64	72	50	90	57
FRL	38	47	38	45	60	60	46	63	61	82	50
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	5	27	33	11	27	28	12	30		60	
ELL	14	32	30	13	21	24	7	32			
BLK	20	41	36	18	28	19	22	48		71	33
HSP	31	38	29	30	31	34	40	50	52	85	52
WHT	45	45	28	38	34	46	44	67	65	78	65
FRL	27	37	33	28	34	38	32	50	44	78	54

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	67

ESSA Federal Index	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	617
Total Components for the Federal Index	12
Percent Tested	99%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	38
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	42
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	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	39
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	52
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	

Multiracial Students	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
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	55
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	49
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.

Based upon the quarter 2 progress monitoring data, students performed the lowest in the areas of Biology and Civics. Only 30% of students enrolled in Biology were on track to evidence proficiency on the Biology end or course exam as compared to 74% after quarter 1. The district average also fell from 76% to 43%. Curriculum pacing, scope, and sequence need to be explored as potential contributing factors. The Biology teacher was new to Florida and did not plan consistently with the district science coach during the weekly collaborative planning sessions or closely follow the district curriculum map In the area of Civics, 59% of students were on track for proficiency after the quarter 1 assessment, but fell to 29% during quarter 2. The district average also fell from 58% to 43%. There was no apparent change in instruction and/or delivery; therefore the Civics teacher and district coach reviewed the quarter 2 assessment to compare alignment with taught standards vs. standards assessed as well as the wording of the quarter 2 assessment questions.

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

Based upon the quarter 2 progress monitoring data, our greatest decline was in the area of Biology and Civics. Only 30% of students enrolled in Biology were on track to evidence proficiency on the Biology end or course exam as compared to 52% proficiency on the 2019 EOC. As mentioned above,

curriculum pacing, scope, and sequence need to be explored as potential contributing factors. In the area of Civics, 59% of students were on track for proficiency after the quarter 1 assessment, but fell to 29% during quarter 2. This is a significant decline from the 62% proficiency rate on the 2019 EOC. There was no apparent change in instruction and/or delivery; therefore the Civics teacher and district coach reviewed the quarter 2 assessment to compare alignment with taught standards vs. standards assessed as well as the wording of the quarter 2 assessment questions.

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.

When comparing quarter 2 progress monitoring data against the 2019 state assessment averages, our greatest gaps were in the area of science (8th grade science and Biology) and social science (Civics). Only 31% of students enrolled in Biology were on track to evidence proficiency on the Biology end or course exam as compared to the 2019 state average of 67%. In addition, only 31% of 8th grade students were on track for proficiency on the state science assessment as compared to the 2019 state average of 48%. In the area of Civics, 29% of students were on track for proficiency on the Civics EOC as compared to the state's average of 71% in 2019 . Curriculum pacing, scope, and sequence need to be explored as potential contributing factors in both content areas.

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

The quarter 2 progress monitoring data demonstrates 74% of students enrolled in Algebra 1/1B are on track to score at or above the proficiency rate on the EOC as compared to 77% at the district level. In addition, 63% of black students and 56% of students with disabilities enrolled in Algebra 1/1B are on track to score at or above proficiency. This is a significant improvement from the 2019 EOC data which evidenced a 39% proficiency rate which was well below the sate average of 62% and the district average of 51%. Our success is directly contributed to tiering Algebra 1 course sections with Algebra 1 and Algebra 1B students. In addition, students who were unsuccessful in Algebra 1A were tiered with Liberal Arts Math sections for credit recovery and remediation of previously taught standards. All sections were supported with (2) classroom teachers, one content area teacher and one ESE support facilitator to provide differentiated instruction and small group/individual support to struggling students, specifically students with disabilities. Classroom teachers provided daily checks for understanding and created small group instruction based upon formative assessment data aligned with priority benchmarks.

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

According the 2019 ESSA data, two subgroups fell below the 41% threshold according to the Federal Index, students with identified disabilities (38%) and black students (39%).

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

1. Student Engagement
2. Standards-based instruction (Target/Task Alignment)
3. Acceleration Points
4.
5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Teachers will provide a student centered learning environment focused on standards based instruction whereby all students are actively engaged in the learning process and assume responsibility for their own learning. Data collected through multiple classroom observations by administration and district staff throughout the 2019-2020 school year revealed a misalignment between learning targets and student tasks. In addition, the lesson pacing was often behind the district's recommended pacing schedule. While many teachers were beginning to incorporate cooperative learning strategies into their lessons, improvement in the monitoring of students' learning by both the teacher and student as well as promotion of individual student accountability is still needed.
Measurable Outcome:	By spring of 2021, the number of 8th graders scoring at or above proficiency on the State Science Assessment will meet or exceed the state average (48% as of 2019). By spring of 2021, at least 41% of black students and students with disabilities will demonstrate proficiency on the 8th grade State Science Assessment. By spring of 2021, the number of students scoring at or above proficiency on the Biology EOC will meet or exceed the state average (67% as of 2019). By spring of 2021, at least 41% of black students and students with disabilities will demonstrate proficiency on the Biology EOC. By spring of 2021, the number of students scoring at or above proficiency on the Civics EOC will meet or exceed the state average (71% as of 2019).
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	[no one identified]
Evidence-based Strategy:	Effective practices within the LSI framework coupled with Kagan Cooperative Learning strategies will be implemented into all content areas to promote active, student centered classrooms. Teachers will be required to develop and post daily learning targets and success criteria aligned with state standards. Success criteria will be utilized by the teacher and students to monitor progression of learning and provide immediate interventions as needed. In addition, teachers will implement Kagan structures within daily lessons to actively engage students in the learning process and promote individual student accountability..
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Learning Sciences International integrates key components for successful teaching/ learning: standards-based planning, criteria for success, instruction, conditions of learning, and collaboration. In addition, Kagan Cooperative Learning endorses highly engaging learning structures which promote positive interdependence, individual accountability, equal participation, and simultaneous interaction. Combining these research based systems will enhance teaching and learning at our school and facilitate student centered classrooms where there is shared responsibility between the teacher and students. Students will have clearly defined roles and learning targets and be able to track their own progress toward the learning target using established success criteria.

Action Steps to Implement

Teachers will participate in weekly collaborative planning with Reading and Math Coach to focus on unpacking standards, curriculum pacing, researching and aligning curriculum resources, and creating student tasks and instructional strategies aligned to the depth of the standards. Reading and Math coach's salary funded through Title One.

Person Responsible Michelle Browning (michelle.browning@polk-fl.net)

Teachers will create and post daily learning targets and success criteria to be actively used by the teacher and students to monitor learning.

Person Responsible   Amy Hardee (amy.hardee@polk-fl.net)

Teachers will provide frequent checks for understanding and create small group remediation based upon formative assessment data aligned with priority benchmarks.

Person Responsible   Susan Cannon (susan.cannon@polk-fl.net)

Teachers and administration will participate in monthly How Goes It (HGI) Academic Data Reviews to discuss student progress and modify supports as needed.

Person Responsible   Michelle Browning (michelle.browning@polk-fl.net)

Teachers and administrators will monitor ESSA subgroups, specifically, students with disabilities and black students, to determine level of progress after each quarterly assessment and assign Behavioral Interventionist/ mentors/tutors as needed. Behavioral Interventionist salary funded through Title One.

Person Responsible   Jason Dent (jason.dent@polk-fl.net)

Provide substitute teachers for teachers after each district quarterly assessment for the purpose of analyzing data and aligning the instructional program through collaborative planning. Substitutes funded through Title One.

Person Responsible   Seth Lambert (seth.lambert@polk-fl.net)

Provide Kagan training to all teachers to enhance student engagement. Kagan training funded through Title One.

Person Responsible   Amy Hardee (amy.hardee@polk-fl.net)

Provide credit recovery and after school tutoring for identified students. Teacher stipends funded through Title One.

Person Responsible   Michelle Browning (michelle.browning@polk-fl.net)

Provide professional development related to specific content area needs. Substitutes and registration fees funded through Title One.

Person Responsible   Seth Lambert (seth.lambert@polk-fl.net)

Purchase Gateway Civics resource book for 8th grade students to enhance reading and writing in the Civics classroom. Books funded through Title One.

Person Responsible   Michelle Browning (michelle.browning@polk-fl.net)

Purchase additional classroom libraries and magazine subscriptions funds to provide students with multiple opportunities to interact with grade level text. Funding through Title One.

Person Responsible   Susan Cannon (susan.cannon@polk-fl.net)

Fund field trip to the Polk History Museum for social studies classes to enhance students' background knowledge of historical concepts. Funding through Title One.

Person Responsible	Seth Lambert (seth.lambert@polk-fl.net)

Purchase science materials, Orlando Science Center consultants, and curriculum resources to enhance instruction, support course standards, and engage students. Funding through Title One.

Person Responsible	Jason Dent (jason.dent@polk-fl.net)

Renew subscription for Turnitin service to elicit meaningful writing in ELA classrooms with immediate feedback provided to students. Subscription funded through Title One.

Person Responsible	Susan Cannon (susan.cannon@polk-fl.net)

Hold Parent and Family Engagement workshops to discuss curriculum, state assessments, college and career planning, and introduce parents to online resources. Cost for dinner and supplies funded through Title One.

Person Responsible	Seth Lambert (seth.lambert@polk-fl.net)

Purchase laptops, iPads, and iPad cases for use in classrooms for students to access online resources. Technology funded through Title One.

Person Responsible	Seth Lambert (seth.lambert@polk-fl.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

Data analysis reveals a need to concentrate on increasing acceleration points at the middle and high school levels.

Action Steps:
• At the middle school level, consider placement in Algebra 1 or higher-level math course for all 8th grade students scoring a level 3 or higher on the 2019 FSA Math/EOC assessment.
• Guidance counselors will track high school students earning acceleration points and encourage all high school students to participate in dual enrollment, Advanced Placement, and Industry Certification courses throughout their high school career.
• Seek assistance from Workforce Education and high schools with high passing rates to increase passing rates on Industry Certification exams.
• College tours will be scheduled for all freshmen as a means of exposure to higher educational opportunities and promotion of a focus on Advanced Placement, Dual Enrollment, and/or Industry Certification courses. Transportation funded through Title One.

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.

The School-based Leadership Team meets weekly to review school-wide, grade level, and teacher data focusing on improving student achievement outcomes with evidence based interventions implemented with fidelity and frequent progress monitoring. Instructional coaches and assigned administrators meet with content area teacher on a weekly basis to facilitate collaborative planning, discuss progress toward school initiatives, and/or participate in professional development. District coaches and curriculum specialists are an integral part of our school improvement process and are encouraged to attend our weekly meetings. In addition, the SBLT meets with all teachers on a monthly basis to review and discuss student progress and modify supports as needed.

All new teachers are provided additional support through the PEC program and mentorship. Instructional coaches are assigned as mentors for all new teachers and help guide them through their first year. Furthermore, Fort Meade Middle Senior High School has applied for a Teacher Ambassador stipend through Title One to provide additional support and guidance to all new teachers.

Parents meeting for incoming 6th graders, high school students, and migrant families are sponsored throughout the year to provide students and parents with information as well as to seek feedback and input regarding Fort Meade Middle Senior High School programs and expectations.

Local business partners,community leaders, and college representatives help to facilitate college and career awareness by participating in annual collegiate and career fairs, college tours freshmen, and round robin career sessions.

Parents, students, community leaders, and district staff participate on the School Advisory Council and meet monthly to discuss school and community issues/concerns, review progress monitoring data, and/or plan for school improvement. Community business leaders also serve as advisory board members for select career academies.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

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

Part V: Budget

The approved budget does not reflect any amendments submitted for this project.

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Standards-aligned Instruction	$0.00
		Total:	$0.00