

Polk County Public Schools

Shelley S. Boone Middle School



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	16
Positive Culture & Environment	21
Budget to Support Goals	21

Shelley S. Boone Middle School

225 22ND ST S, Haines City, FL 33844

<http://schools.polk-fl.net/boonemiddle>

Demographics

Principal: Shawn Livingston

Start Date for this Principal: 7/24/2019

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)	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* Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students* White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: C (41%) 2017-18: C (44%) 2016-17: C (42%) 2015-16: D (32%)
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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	16
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	21

Shelley S. Boone Middle School

225 22ND ST S, Haines City, FL 33844

<http://schools.polk-fl.net/boonemiddle>

School Demographics

<p>School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Middle School 6-8</p>	<p>2019-20 Title I School</p> <p style="font-size: 1.2em;">Yes</p>	<p>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p style="font-size: 1.2em;">96%</p>
<p>Primary Service Type (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">K-12 General Education</p>	<p>Charter School</p> <p style="font-size: 1.2em;">No</p>	<p>2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p style="font-size: 1.2em;">87%</p>

School Grades History

Year	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17
Grade	C	C	C	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 Shelley S. Boone Middle School is to educate every student with the knowledge and tools necessary to succeed in high school and beyond.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The vision of Shelley S. Boone Middle School is a student body that extends learning beyond our campus into the community, living and giving as responsible and productive citizens.

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
Tarver, Brad	Principal	
liames, Kenneth	Assistant Principal	
Adams, Sandra	Assistant Principal	
Scott, Lakisha	Assistant Principal	
Cruz, Daffne	Dean	

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Wednesday 7/24/2019, Shawn Livingston

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.*

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.*

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

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)	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* Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students* White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: C (41%) 2017-18: C (44%) 2016-17: C (42%) 2015-16: D (32%)
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	329	335	395	0	0	0	0	1059
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	44	68	63	0	0	0	0	175
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	161	112	142	0	0	0	0	415
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	139	135	211	0	0	0	0	485
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	153	129	138	0	0	0	0	420

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	288	224	252	0	0	0	0	764

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	0	0	76	0	0	0	0	76
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	248	224	262	0	0	0	0	734

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 6/15/2020

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	409	383	513	0	0	0	0	1305
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	89	35	93	0	0	0	0	217
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	37	55	107	0	0	0	0	199
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	17	54	0	0	0	0	88
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	213	167	272	0	0	0	0	652

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	43	138	72	0	0	0	0	253

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	72	47	88	0	0	0	0	207
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	2	15	0	0	0	0	23

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	409	383	513	0	0	0	0	1305
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	89	35	93	0	0	0	0	217
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	37	55	107	0	0	0	0	199
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	17	54	0	0	0	0	88
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	213	167	272	0	0	0	0	652

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	43	138	72	0	0	0	0	253

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	72	47	88	0	0	0	0	207
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	2	15	0	0	0	0	23

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	29%	48%	54%	29%	48%	52%
ELA Learning Gains	43%	52%	54%	51%	51%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	40%	48%	47%	45%	43%	44%
Math Achievement	31%	50%	58%	26%	47%	56%
Math Learning Gains	41%	50%	57%	45%	50%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	38%	48%	51%	47%	46%	50%
Science Achievement	31%	44%	51%	31%	44%	50%
Social Studies Achievement	57%	72%	72%	51%	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	29%	48%	-19%	54%	-25%
	2018	24%	41%	-17%	52%	-28%
Same Grade Comparison		5%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	22%	42%	-20%	52%	-30%
	2018	34%	42%	-8%	51%	-17%
Same Grade Comparison		-12%				
Cohort Comparison		-2%				
08	2019	34%	48%	-14%	56%	-22%
	2018	27%	49%	-22%	58%	-31%
Same Grade Comparison		7%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2019	25%	47%	-22%	55%	-30%
	2018	23%	40%	-17%	52%	-29%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	24%	39%	-15%	54%	-30%
	2018	41%	40%	1%	54%	-13%
Same Grade Comparison		-17%				
Cohort Comparison		1%				
08	2019	26%	35%	-9%	46%	-20%
	2018	27%	34%	-7%	45%	-18%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison		-15%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2019	28%	41%	-13%	48%	-20%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	19%	42%	-23%	50%	-31%
Same Grade Comparison		9%				
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	57%	70%	-13%	71%	-14%
2018	78%	84%	-6%	71%	7%
Compare		-21%			

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	73%	50%	23%	61%	12%
2018	51%	60%	-9%	62%	-11%
Compare		22%			

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	62%	53%	9%	57%	5%
2018	62%	41%	21%	56%	6%
Compare		0%			

Subgroup Data

2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	15	30	27	24	35	32	19	34			
ELL	16	39	39	22	39	35	18	37	44		

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
BLK	23	42	49	19	35	47	12	63			
HSP	31	43	38	34	43	37	34	55	61		
WHT	30	42	39	33	37	30	36	61	50		
FRL	27	41	41	30	40	37	29	56	64		
2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	17	38	36	23	51	51	24				
ELL	20	41	42	27	46	56	10	76	42		
BLK	28	40	48	29	50	44	20	64	69		
HSP	29	46	42	33	50	60	23	79	46		
MUL	55			60							
WHT	39	45	32	40	46	41	20				
FRL	29	45	42	33	49	53	23	72	47		
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	21	27	11	44	45		19			
ELL	17	43	51	21	43	39	15	49	43		
BLK	26	46	30	9	36	55	28	59	40		
HSP	31	52	52	31	47	40	30	55	59		
MUL				20							
WHT	27	56	36	30	56	68	36	29			
FRL	27	54	50	26	46	51	26	53	48		

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	42
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	4
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	46
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	417
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	97%

Subgroup Data

Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	28
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	1
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	34
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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	37
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	42
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 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	40
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	41
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.

The data component for Boone that showed the lowest performance was ELA achievement, which was 29% proficient. Within the data, 155 of SWDs were proficient and 16% of ELLs were proficient. According to ESSA, 46% of ELLs are making progress achieving English Language proficiency. A large percent of our population are ELLs and are in need of extra support for learning the English language. This trend continued within December 2019 STARR data which has an overall school proficiency score of 21%. This trend effects all academic areas of school.

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

The data component that showed the greatest decline from the prior year was Social Studies achievement. During 2018, Social Studies had an achievement rate of 74%, whereas 2019 there was an achievement rate of 57%. This decline is primarily due to the fact that in 2018 only 7th grade advanced students took the Civics EOC compared to 2019 where 7th grade advanced and all 8th grade students took the Civics EOC. Due to the pandemic, all state assessments were suspended; however, we anticipate that Civics will still be an area of need.

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 had the greatest gap when compared to the state average was Math achievement. The state average was 58% and Boone's average was 31%, which is a difference of 27%. One factor that contributed to this gap was a lack of resources in the Math area. Students with previous achievement levels of 1 and 2 were placed in a Research (intensive math) class and this was designed to provide students with individualized instruction, but often teachers were unable to access technology needed. This year we are providing newer technology and an additional support of a math interventionist. Another factor that contributed to this gap is our large population of ELL students. Due to the pandemic we were unable to determine the effectiveness of our interventions. However, according to the December 2019 STARR test the overall math achievement level was a 23%, which is still lower than the state average.

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

The data component that showed the most improvement was Science achievement. Boone's science achievement went from 22% in 2018 to 31% in 2019. Some of the new actions that we took in this area were targeting our ELLs with bi-lingual resources, identified weaknesses with target-task alignment, made adjustments, and also focused on remediation and differentiation. Due to the pandemic, we do not have 2019 Science data.

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

Based on the EWS data, one potential area of concern is student attendance. 10% of 6th grade, 17% of 7th grade, and 11% of 8th grade students had attendance below 90%. Poor attendance correlates with low academic achievement.

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

1. Increase ELA achievement to 35%
2. Increase Math achievement to 37%
3. Increase Science achievement to 37%
4. Increase Civics achievement to 63%
5. Increase ESSA subgroups' achievement

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: According to progress monitoring, ELA continues to be an area of a opportunity for our school.

Measurable Outcome: To move the overall ELA proficiency rat to 35%

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Brad Tarver (brad.tarver@polk-fl.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Professional development, tutoring focusing on foundational reading and writing skills, improving overall culture of school, family engagement, and technology use

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: The ELA proficiency rate last year was 29%, which is 19% below the district average and 25% below the state average. Our ESSA subgroups that are below 41% of the federal index are ELLS, SWDs, White, and Black/African American, which is a majority of our school's student demographics. By improving teacher capacity, providing individualized student tutoring, utilizing behavior and reading interventionists, we will be able to target the bottom 25% of students and ESSA subgroups, thereby, raising the school's overall reading proficiency.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Literacy coach will provide professional development on: Best practices, differentiated instruction, and vocabulary instruction weekly. Literacy coach will also facilitate collaborative planning, focusing on target/task alignment to increase rigor weekly, and provide coaching cycles as needed. Professional development will occur monthly.
2. Extended Learning Program will focus on comprehension skills and reading fluency bi-weekly. The students targeted for ELP will be those students who score level 1 or 2 on the FSA the previous administered year. These students will serve as priority for the program then those who met proficiency will also be provided opportunities.
3. ESOL Paras and Inclusion Teachers will support ELLs and SWDs in language arts classrooms daily by pushing into the classrooms to provide assistance with teachers. The paras will focus solely of these two populations of students and reporting the students performances to ESOL teachers and ESE LEA weekly.
4. Behavior interventionist will work with teachers and students to promote positive behaviors that will create a more conducive learning environment daily. The Behavior Interventionist will monitor teachers classroom management plans and provide support to those who tend to struggle with classroom management. The interventionist will also work with students and teachers that come from referrals from administration that will need assistance and guidance with behavior plans and resources.
5. Reading interventionist will work on foundational reading skills with students that fall within the bottom 25% by pushing in the classrooms of identified students.to provide support of instruction to the student. The interventionist will also pull small groups of the lower 25% weekly to enforce instruction and improved skills. These student in the bottom 25% will be identified by school leadership teams and through data chats with staff members monthly.
6. Intensive reading courses will utilize laptop carts to increase student engagement and provide daily differentiation to students weekly.
7. Science coach will provide professional development and support to science department on implementing effective writing and reading strategies monthly.
8. Boone will host a literacy parent night to provide strategies families can use at home to support their

students. Boone will also host an FSA information night to provide families information on how to best prepare for testing. These parent contact nights will be held monthly.

Person Responsible Brad Tarver (brad.tarver@polk-fl.net)

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

According to progress monitoring, math continues to be an area of opportunity for our school.

Measurable Outcome:

To move the overall math proficiency rate to 37%.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Brad Tarver (brad.tarver@polk-fl.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Professional development, tutoring focusing on foundational math skills, improving overall culture of school, family engagement, and technology use.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

The Math proficiency rate last year was 31%, which is 19% below the district average and 27% below the state average. Our ESSA subgroups that are below 41% of the federal index are ELLS, SWDs, White, and Black/African American, which is a majority of our school's student demographics. By improving teacher capacity, providing individualized student tutoring, utilizing behavior and math interventionists, we will be able to target the bottom 25% of students and ESSA subgroups, thereby, raising the school's overall reading proficiency.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Math coach will provide professional development on: Best practices, differentiated instruction, and data analysis. Math coach will also facilitate collaborative planning weekly, focusing on target/task alignment to increase rigor, and provide coaching cycles as needed.
2. Extended Learning Program will focus on grade level math skills and math fluency. This will be provided in the form of tutoring with content teachers on the weekly basis. The targeted students for ELP will be students who did not meet proficiency on the FSA. Students who scored level 1 or 2 will be priority, then students who met proficiency may be invited to improve current math skills.
3. ESOL Paras and Inclusion Teachers will support ELLs and SWDs in math classrooms by collaborating with content teachers on student deficiencies and working with those students daily. The paras will work closely with students then report progress back to the ESOL Teachers and the ESE LEA.
4. Behavior interventionist will work with teachers and students to promote positive behaviors that will create a more conducive learning environment. This will include providing trainings for CHAMPS and PBIS for teachers and students. The interventionist will monitor classroom management on a daily basis while assisting administration by providing support to students or teachers that are referred due to behavior management.
5. Math interventionist will work on foundational reading skills with students that fall within the bottom 25% by pushing into the classrooms daily to work with the targeted students. The interventionist will also provide small group instruction weekly to identified students to enhance learned skills through instruction and deficiencies. These student in the bottom 25% will be identified by school leadership teams and through data chats with staff members monthly.
6. Research (Intensive Math) courses will utilize laptop carts to increase student engagement and provide daily differentiation to students daily.
7. Boone will host a math parent night to provide strategies families can use at home to support their students. Boone will also host an FSA information night to provide families information on how to best prepare for testing.

Person Responsible Brad Tarver (brad.tarver@polk-fl.net)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: According to progress monitoring, science continues to be an area of opportunity for our school.

Measurable Outcome: To move the overall Science proficiency rate to 37%

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Brad Tarver (brad.tarver@polk-fl.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Professional development, tutoring focusing on science standards from previous year, improving overall culture of school, family engagement, and ESOL paraprofessionals.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: The school's Science proficiency level was 31%, which is a 9% increase from 2018; however, this is still 13% below the district average and 20% below the state average. Our ESSA subgroups that are below 41% of the federal index are ELLS, SWDs, White, and Black/African American, which is a majority of our school's student demographics. By improving teacher capacity, providing individualized student tutoring, utilizing the behavior interventionist and ESOL paraprofessionals, we will be able to target the bottom 25% of students and ESSA subgroups, thereby, raising the school's overall Science proficiency.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Science coach will provide professional development on: Best practices, differentiated instruction, and vocabulary instruction. Science coach will also facilitate collaborative planning weekly, focusing on target/task alignment to increase rigor, and provide coaching cycles as needed.
2. Extended Learning Program will focus on on science standards from previous year. ELP will be bi-weekly. The students that show deficiencies through 8th grade science during the year or struggle with content will be priority for ELP. These students will receive support weekly to prepare them for state Science testing.
3. ESOL Paraprofessionals will support ELLs in Science classrooms. ELL students will also utilize bi-lingual glossaries and dictionaries for support daily and work with students in the classroom one on one weekly.
4. Behavior interventionist will work with teachers and students to promote positive behaviors that will create a more conducive learning environment. This will include providing trainings for CHAMPS and PBIS for teachers and students. The interventionist will also work with administration by working with referrals on behavior plans for students and teachers.
5. Science coach will provide professional development and support to science department on implementing effective writing and reading strategies monthly. The ELA teachers will identify students deficiencies and collaborate with Science Coach to plan monthly.
6. Boone will host a science parent night to provide strategies families can use at home to support their students. Boone will also host an FSA information night to provide families information on how to best prepare for testing.

Person Responsible Brad Tarver (brad.tarver@polk-fl.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

School wide attendance has shown improvement from the 2018/19 school year. The school's Success Coach monitors attendance and works in conjunction with the school's Social Worker to provide support to students who are showing attendance needs. The school Success Coach will continue to identify truancy issues, and reach out to the students, parents, and appropriate stakeholders to address needs to continue to improve attendance.

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.

Please see attached Parent and Family Engagement Plan for full details on how we plan to build positive relationships with parents, families, and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission and support the needs of students.

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: Math	\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Science	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00