Manatee County Public Schools

Carlos E. Haile Middle School

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Carlos E. Haile Middle School

9501 FL 64, Bradenton, FL 34212

https://www.manateeschools.net/haile

Demographics

Principal: IR Ene Nikitopoulos

Start Date for this Principal: 8/20/2020

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)	48%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (65%) 2017-18: B (59%) 2016-17: B (61%) 2015-16: B (60%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
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 Manatee 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

Carlos E. Haile Middle School

9501 FL 64, Bradenton, FL 34212

https://www.manateeschools.net/haile

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	33%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	38%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Manatee 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 Carlos E. Haile Middle School is to provide consistent and effective instruction that challenges all students; to actively engage our students in their lifelong education; and to create a safe and comfortable learning environment that prepares our students to be productive citizens in society and lifelong learners now and in their future.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The vision of the Manatee County School District is to establish and support standards of excellence that prepare students to become successful, well-rounded and involved citizens in the 21st Century.

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
Barlaug, Kate	Principal	
Sloman, Robert	Assistant Principal	
Bohlmann, Tracy	Teacher, K-12	
Taylor, Elmina	Teacher, K-12	
Buttari, Samantha	School Counselor	
Hart, Paula	Assistant Principal	
Collett, Felicia	Dean	
Buice, Mary Ann	School Counselor	
Morgan, Katelynn	Teacher, K-12	
Ballard, Angela	Teacher, K-12	
Kern, Theresa	Dean	
Jones, Jessica	Teacher, K-12	
Cox, John	Teacher, K-12	
Hardee, Shannon	Teacher, K-12	

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Thursday 8/20/2020, IR Ene Nikitopoulos

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.*
4

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.*
19

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
44

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)	48%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (65%) 2017-18: B (59%) 2016-17: B (61%) 2015-16: B (60%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
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	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	240	247	286	0	0	0	0	773
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	24	13	33	0	0	0	0	70
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	34	23	34	0	0	0	0	91
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	26	14	5	0	0	0	0	45
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	6	4	0	0	0	0	15
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	32	35	64	0	0	0	0	131
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	41	42	49	0	0	0	0	132

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	44	38	48	0	0	0	0	130

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	10	4	0	0	0	0	34
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 8/20/2020

Prior Year - As Reported

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

Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	249	288	342	0	0	0	0	879
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	36	43	55	0	0	0	0	134
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	25	40	54	0	0	0	0	119
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	23	20	8	0	0	0	0	51
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	64	86	77	0	0	0	0	227

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	32	38	47	0	0	0	0	117

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	31	32	17	0	0	0	0	80
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	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	249	288	342	0	0	0	0	879
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	36	43	55	0	0	0	0	134
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	25	40	54	0	0	0	0	119
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	23	20	8	0	0	0	0	51
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	64	86	77	0	0	0	0	227

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	32	38	47	0	0	0	0	117

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	31	32	17	0	0	0	0	80
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	62%	52%	54%	61%	47%	52%
ELA Learning Gains	59%	56%	54%	55%	52%	54%

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	56%	51%	47%	44%	44%	44%
Math Achievement	72%	59%	58%	74%	54%	56%
Math Learning Gains	68%	61%	57%	69%	58%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	58%	54%	51%	57%	50%	50%
Science Achievement	52%	47%	51%	65%	39%	50%
Social Studies Achievement	83%	77%	72%	72%	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	66%	52%	14%	54%	12%
	2018	53%	47%	6%	52%	1%
Same Grade Comparison		13%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	58%	48%	10%	52%	6%
	2018	52%	48%	4%	51%	1%
Same Grade Comparison		6%				
Cohort Comparison		5%				
08	2019	61%	54%	7%	56%	5%
	2018	63%	55%	8%	58%	5%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison		9%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2019	69%	57%	12%	55%	14%
	2018	60%	52%	8%	52%	8%
Same Grade Comparison		9%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	70%	57%	13%	54%	16%
	2018	68%	54%	14%	54%	14%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison		10%				

MATH						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
08	2019	57%	41%	16%	46%	11%
	2018	59%	41%	18%	45%	14%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison		-11%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
08	2019	51%	45%	6%	48%	3%
	2018	52%	45%	7%	50%	2%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison						

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	**School**	**District**	**School Minus District**	**State**	**School Minus State**
2019					
2018					
CIVICS EOC					
Year	**School**	**District**	**School Minus District**	**State**	**School Minus State**
2019	82%	77%	5%	71%	11%
2018	81%	78%	3%	71%	10%
Compare		1%			
HISTORY EOC					
Year	**School**	**District**	**School Minus District**	**State**	**School Minus State**
2019					
2018					
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	**School**	**District**	**School Minus District**	**State**	**School Minus State**
2019	93%	65%	28%	61%	32%
2018	100%	65%	35%	62%	38%
Compare		-7%			
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	**School**	**District**	**School Minus District**	**State**	**School Minus State**
2019	100%	61%	39%	57%	43%
2018	100%	56%	44%	56%	44%

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
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	22	49	49	35	51	45	23	46			
ELL	25	51	52	26	51	52	4	38			
ASN	88	69		94	88		54	92	82		
BLK	35	53	50	40	47	34	21	58	38		
HSP	47	57	54	58	65	59	44	67	69		
MUL	63	48	27	69	64	67	62	80	70		
WHT	70	61	61	81	72	66	59	90	74		
FRL	44	57	54	54	59	51	39	67	61		
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	36	32	30	48	42	16	52			
ELL	13	38	40	22	43	43	8				
ASN	63	67		89	78						
BLK	24	44	41	37	48	43	13	58	19		
HSP	40	40	35	51	57	48	33	74	43		
MUL	64	53		78	74	70	43	90	50		
WHT	68	57	47	79	71	57	66	86	64		
FRL	36	39	34	51	58	51	32	69	22		
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	15	34	35	38	44	36	22	33			
ELL	9	41	45	26	55	56	8	31			
ASN	65	68		83	82		69		36		
BLK	27	33	30	42	48	43	21	41	14		
HSP	47	48	41	61	60	43	56	53	46		
MUL	63	63		71	72		69	72	58		
WHT	71	60	50	82	75	72	74	82	50		
FRL	39	45	37	54	56	46	44	52	26		

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

ESSA Federal Index	
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	63
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	48
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	629
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	40
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	39
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	81
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	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	57
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO

Hispanic Students	
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	61
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	70
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	53
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.

-Haile Middle School did not meet the Subgroup marks in the SWD and ELL categories.
-The data group that had the lowest performance based on scoring would be Science Achievement.
-Science has stayed consistent with its data, but will need to continue to find strategies to bring up our scores.
-SWD had some personnel concerns that needed to and have been adjusted.
-ELL had to new teachers working with these students in their ELA ESOL class.

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

-The category that had the largest decline was Algebra I Honors End of Course Exam. This category dropped by 7 points. The primary reason for this decline is an adjustment to have level 3 students take this course for acceleration credit.

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.

None of our subgroups had a lower score than the state average. This shows that the strategies that we have been using have made significant signs of success and we are competing against our previous scores for our achievement goals.

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

-6th Grade ELA as well as both Math and ELA Lowest Quartile made the largest gains this previous year.
-6th Grade ELA personnel changes were made that we believe made a great influence on the strategies used in class.
-Lowest Quartile students were tracked monthly so that our teachers had an updated list and knew who was in their class that fell into that category. We believe this assisted with their success in both learning gains and becoming proficient last year.

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

Haile Middle School did not meet the Subgroup marks in the SWD and ELL categories.

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

1. SSA Science
2. SWD
3. ELL
4. Lowest Quartile ELA
5. Lowest Quartile Math

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Achieve success for students with disabilities. To effectively implement accommodations to support academic performance.
Measurable Outcome:	42% of Students with Disabilities will achieve grade level performance on the Spring 2021 Florida State Assessments.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Debra Stroup (stroupd@manateeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	-Teachers will all receive a copy of the accommodations for all of their students with disabilities. -The students that require it based on their IEP will be placed in an Inclusion class with both a subject area and ESE teacher to support them. -Deans will support and mentor students that need the support with discipline. -Teachers will incorporate AVID strategies into the classroom.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	-Inclusion classes will support the students with disabilities with their accommodations that they need to create an equal opportunity. -When the teachers have common planning, then the teachers will all be on the same page and will be able to share ideas to support the students. -Homeroom will allow students to get the extra support they in need in several different areas on campus. -If a student has lower discipline issues then they will be in class more.

Action Steps to Implement

dentify and review accommodations in Peer

Provide Peer training as needed

Individual student goal setting

Use district resources to plan and differentiate for disabled students

Person Responsible   Debra Stroup (stroupd@manateeschools.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	To increase the lowest quartile ELA learning gains. We want to increase the learning gains achieved from 2018-2019 by keeping consistency within the department. ELL and ESE students were our lowest performing subgroups. With a home room in place and smaller class sizes, we expect to be able to offer more support to these subgroups and help increase scores.
Measurable Outcome:	To increase Lower Quartile learning gains to 60%, which is a 4% increase.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Shannon Hardee (hardee2s@manateeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	-Students in the Lowest Quartile will be also taking an Intensive Reading Course. -Common planning and department meetings to ensure fidelity of standard based teaching. -Homeroom to allow students to gain a mentor on campus, work on reading strategies, and check scores. -Deans will work with students to help lower discipline concerns.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	-Intensive classes will support the students with their reading strategies in an attempt to get on grade level. -When the teachers have common planning, then the teachers will all be on the same page and will be able to share ideas to support the students. -Homeroom will allow students to get the extra support they in need in several different areas on campus. -If a student has lower discipline issues then they will be in class more.

Action Steps to Implement

Common planning and department meetings to ensure fidelity of standard based teaching.

Quarterly check in per subject area for current learning goals and grade goals.

Admin focus on lesson plans to ensure teachers are teaching standards with fidelity.

Teacher breakdown of quarterly benchmark data and turn into admin with action plan.

After school tutoring for lowest quartile students.

Staff incentive for good attendance (free lunches, recognition, massages, etc.)

Student-to-student mentoring/peer mentoring during homeroom

Person Responsible	Shannon Hardee (hardee2s@manateeschools.net)

#3. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to English Language Learners	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	To increase proficiency in ELL Students. Based upon data from the past two years ELA scores from FSA, ELL students have shown a slight increase in numbers each year, however these numbers are still well below expected outcomes.
Measurable Outcome:	The goal is to increase ELA proficiency for ELL students by 4% for the 20/21 school year.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Chad Lovewell (lovewellc@manateeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	-Students will be grouped together in their ESOL ELA class with two ESOL Teachers and two ESOL Aides. -Students are grouped in the remainder of their classes in order to allow our two ESOL Aides to circulate and support as many of them as possible. -Teachers will be informed of strategies to support their students.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	-Students will be able to work together and support each other when they are paired together. -The more our ESOL Aides can get into classes with our ELL students, the more we can support them and their achievements. -The more our teachers know about what strategies work for our ELL students, the more they can support them and their achievements.

Action Steps to Implement

*Students will be provided an ELL aide for extra support in class

*Students are paired and tracked together for pull out assistance

*Students are ability grouped in ELL classes per schedule

*Students are provided assistance such as technology translation and dictionaries

Person Responsible	Chad Lovewell (lovewellc@manateeschools.net)

#4. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Increase Science SSA Scores. Our 2018-2019 Science scores remained stable at 52%.
Measurable Outcome:	By the end of the 2020-2021 school year, we will increase our SSA Science scores by 5% to 57%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Tracy Bohlmann (bohlmannt@manateeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	-Incorporate reading articles on different levels in order to drive student assessment rigor up. -ELA support for science with vocab and reading comprehension. -Common Assessments amongst grade levels. -Consistent use of SSA testing style questioning.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	-These strategies will help our entire school work together to grow cross-curricular. -These strategies will drive our science department to collaborate together on common assessments -These strategies will drive our students to see SSA style questions in preparation for the exam.

Action Steps to Implement

-Conference Call with other schools that had success on SSA with the same demographics as Haile MS.
-Use Schoology for shared resources (teacher to teacher, teacher to student)
-Common assessments incorporating more SSA style questions
-ELA support - vocab, reading comprehension.
-Incorporate reading articles on different levels in order to drive student assessment rigor up.

Person Responsible   [no one identified]

#5. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	To increase Learning Gains in Math. Increase FSA Math Learning Gains so that students can get on grade level by the time the reach high school.
Measurable Outcome:	During the 2020-2021 school year, there will be a 1% overall increase in math learning gains.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Elmina Taylor (taylore@manateeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	-Students in the Lowest Quartile will be also taking an Intensive Math Course. -Common planning and department meetings to ensure fidelity of standard based teaching. -Homeroom to allow students to gain a mentor on campus, work on math strategies, and check scores. -Deans will work with students to help lower discipline concerns.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	-Intensive classes will support the students with their math strategies in an attempt to get on grade level. -When the teachers have common planning, then the teachers will all be on the same page and will be able to share ideas to support the students. -Homeroom will allow students to get the extra support they in need in several different areas on campus. -If a student has lower discipline issues then they will be in class more.

Action Steps to Implement

All lower quartile students will be in Intensive Math class using iReady and Acaletics.
Grade level math teachers will have common planning.
7th and 8th grade to increase the use of online assessments.
Increase usage of math vocabulary.
Consistency with math teachers using specific strategies.
Use Schoology for shared resources.

Person Responsible	Elmina Taylor (taylore@manateeschools.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

n/a