Callahan Middle School

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Callahan Middle School

450121 OLD DIXIE HWY, Callahan, FL 32011

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Kimberly Shumate

Start Date for this Principal: 10/17/2020

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 Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (59%) 2017-18: B (54%) 2016-17: B (56%) 2015-16: B (55%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	N/A
* 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 Nassau 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

Callahan Middle School

450121 OLD DIXIE HWY, Callahan, FL 32011

[no web address on file]

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	**2019-20 Title I School**	**2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
Middle School 6-8	No	46%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	10%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Nassau 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.

Nassau County's mission is to develop each student as an inspired life-long learner and problem-solver with
the strength of character to serve as a productive member of society.

At Callahan Middle School our mission is to provide students with high quality educational experiences that stimulate their desire to gain knowledge and equip students with the necessary skills to become productive citizens in a global society.

Provide the school's vision statement.

A caring faculty and staff at Callahan Middle School is committed to the facilitation of authentic student achievement through academic, social-emotional, and physical/ developmental growth.

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
Devereaux, Rhonda	Principal	
Henderson, Kristin	Teacher, K-12	
Way, Kyanne	Teacher, ESE	
Lundquist, Stephanie	Teacher, K-12	
Mizendo, Rebekah	Teacher, K-12	
Smith, Julie	Teacher, K-12	
Evans, Jamie	Teacher, K-12	
Hays, Lindsay	Assistant Principal	

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Saturday 10/17/2020, Kimberly Shumate

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.*
21

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 Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (59%) 2017-18: B (54%) 2016-17: B (56%) 2015-16: B (55%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	N/A
* 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	224	222	249	0	0	0	0	695
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	45	49	63	0	0	0	0	157
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	8	3	0	0	0	0	18
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	3
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	4	16	0	0	0	0	33
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	7	8	0	0	0	0	21

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	10	6	9	0	0	0	0	25

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	0	0	0	0	0	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

Date this data was collected or last updated

Saturday 10/17/2020

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	239	246	243	0	0	0	0	728
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	41	32	0	0	0	0	93
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	3	0	0	0	0	6
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	0	1	0	0	0	0	7
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	22	59	0	0	0	0	92

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	5	7	13	0	0	0	0	25

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	0	0	0	0	0	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	3

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	239	246	243	0	0	0	0	728
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	41	32	0	0	0	0	93
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	3	0	0	0	0	6
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	0	1	0	0	0	0	7
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	22	59	0	0	0	0	92

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	5	7	13	0	0	0	0	25

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	0	0	0	0	0	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	3

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	63%	64%	54%	57%	63%	52%
ELA Learning Gains	51%	53%	54%	49%	57%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	47%	44%	47%	39%	42%	44%
Math Achievement	73%	74%	58%	68%	68%	56%
Math Learning Gains	57%	62%	57%	49%	57%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	54%	56%	51%	48%	45%	50%
Science Achievement	62%	64%	51%	68%	68%	50%
Social Studies Achievement	70%	72%	72%	68%	73%	70%

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)			Total
	6	**7**	**8**	
	(0)	(0)	(0)	0 (0)

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey is the title of the first table.

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%	63%	3%	54%	12%
	2018	58%	64%	-6%	52%	6%
Same Grade Comparison		8%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	56%	59%	-3%	52%	4%
	2018	55%	57%	-2%	51%	4%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison		-2%				
08	2019	61%	65%	-4%	56%	5%
	2018	69%	68%	1%	58%	11%
Same Grade Comparison		-8%				
Cohort Comparison		6%				

MATH

Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2019	79%	71%	8%	55%	24%
	2018	69%	64%	5%	52%	17%
Same Grade Comparison		10%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	69%	76%	-7%	54%	15%
	2018	69%	70%	-1%	54%	15%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2019	58%	62%	-4%	46%	12%
	2018	51%	60%	-9%	45%	6%
Same Grade Comparison		7%				
Cohort Comparison		-11%				

SCIENCE

Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2019	61%	60%	1%	48%	13%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	60%	60%	0%	50%	10%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison						

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	69%	72%	-3%	71%	-2%
2018	57%	67%	-10%	71%	-14%
Compare		12%			
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	88%	74%	14%	61%	27%
2018	92%	77%	15%	62%	30%
Compare		-4%			
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	0%	68%	-68%	57%	-57%
2018					

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	29	44	47	50	50	51	41	45			
BLK	57	58		43	50						
HSP	52	47		70	56						

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
MUL	65	57		71	65	64	82	62			
WHT	63	51	49	74	57	56	62	70	54		
FRL	56	48	46	67	55	52	56	66	43		
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	28	49	48	33	31	30	20	39			
BLK	59	53		59	41		55				
HSP	71	55		71	50						
MUL	64	61		68	39			50			
WHT	60	57	50	68	49	43	62	56	48		
FRL	54	55	46	64	45	38	56	56	41		
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	16	33	33	24	46	47	17	16			
BLK	44	25		39	50			82			
HSP	57	59		65	73		73				
MUL	72	63		78	50		85		73		
WHT	57	49	37	68	49	47	67	67	58		
FRL	48	43	36	61	48	45	57	63	58		

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)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	59
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	531
Total Components for the Federal Index	9
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	45

Students With Disabilities	
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
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	52
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	56
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	67
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	60
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	54
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 lowest data component for CMS was the ELA Lowest Quartile category. In 2019, the score was 47%, which was down 3% from 2018 (50%).
Contributing factors-
1. Grade -level teams and departments did not have a common vision or instructional model.
2. Decrease in instructional time in ELA for all sixth through eighth grade students.
3. Lack of usage of curriculum pacing guides
4. Teachers needed continued professional development in research- based reading strategies.
5. Lowest quartile students were not provided with targeted intervention and remediation.
6. ESE teachers needed professional development in researched -based instructional strategies for teaching students with reading difficulties.

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 the ELA Learning Gains. In 2019 the score was 51%, which was down 5% from 2018 (56%).
Contributing factors-
1. Grade- level teams and departments did not have a common vision or instructional model.
2. Decrease in instructional time in ELA for all sixth through eighth grade students.
3. Lack of usage of curriculum pacing guides
4. Teachers needed continued professional development in research- based reading strategies.
5. Lowest quartile students were not provided with targeted intervention and remediation.
6. ESE teachers needed professional development in researched -based instructional strategies for teaching students with reading difficulties.

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 the ELA Learning Gains. The school score was 51% and the state score was 54%.
Contributing factors-

1. Grade- level teams and departments did not have a common vision or instructional model.
2. Decrease in instructional time in ELA for all sixth through eighth grade students.
3. Lack of usage of curriculum pacing guides
4. Teachers needed continued professional development in research- based reading strategies.

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

Several categories demonstrated significant improvement.
Social Studies - 56% (2018) to 70% (2019)
Math Learning Gains- 48% (2018) to 57% (2019)
Math Lowest Quartile Learning Gains- 42% (2018) to 54% (2019)
6th grade ELA- 58% (2018) to 66% (2019)
6th grade Math- 69% (2018) to 79% (2019)
We attribute the gains in both reading and math to increased instructional time. All ELA classes and sixth grade math classes transitioned to 90 -minute instructional blocks. Both ELA and Math teachers in sixth grade implemented a new instructional model, incorporating opportunities for whole group and small group, as well as ample opportunities for student collaboration. Additionally, all teachers in every subject area were provided collaborative planning time weekly to evaluate student data and share best teaching practices.

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

Attendance is an area of concern. A total of 157 students, grade 6-8, have been identified with attendance below 90%. Lack of school attendance impacts student performance.
2019 state-wide ELA assessments also identify 33 students, grades 6-8, scoring an achievement level of 1.

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

1. Increase ELA Lowest Quartile gains by five percent. (47% to 52%)
2. Increase ELA Learning Gains by five percent. (51% to 56%)
3. Increase school-wide ELA proficiency score by 7%. (62% to 70%)
4. Increase school-wide Math proficiency score by 7%. (73% to 80%)
5. Increase science proficiency score by 8%. (62%-70%)

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Collaborative Planning	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Collaborative planning is a weekly collaboration of teachers to map out the scope and sequence of curriculum standards and identify resources to teach the identified standards. During this time, teachers analyze data, plan lessons aligned to the Florida Standards, share best practices and create common assessment tools to measure student performance. Teacher survey data and administrative observations identified these areas in need of continuous improvement. The use of data analysis and sharing of best research based teaching practices are two components that need to be refined.
Measurable Outcome:	Math and ELA proficiency will increase by 7% percent due to the intentional collaborative planning process of all ELA and Math teams grade 6th-8th. This process will include identification of Florida curriculum standards, analyzing student data points, sharing of best research-based teaching practices, and planning of lessons to increase student understanding of critical content skills and proficiency of the Florida Standards.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Rhonda Devereaux (rhonda.devereaux@nassau.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Provide math and ELA teachers a weekly common planning time for teachers to develop a deeper understanding of the Florida Standards, interpret common data points using county data management systems, design standards- based instruction, and share/model best teaching practices.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Teachers need time to collaborate and plan student instruction. Teacher leaders use this opportunity to engage other teachers in developing a deeper understanding of the Florida Standards, analyze student data points, and design standards-based instruction. During this process, novice teachers learn from their colleagues and develop necessary teaching skills, content knowledge, and a firmer understanding of data collection, analysis and interpretation. All students benefit from the collaborative planning process.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Ensure math and ELA teams have common planning time for weekly collaboration. (Administration)
2. Teacher leaders create agendas to ensure deeper understanding of Florida Standards, sharing of research-based teaching practices, analysis of common data assessments, and planning of weekly instruction aligned to the curriculum pacing guide. (Planning team lead for math and ELA grade 6-8)
3. Monitoring of weekly collaborative planning meeting and team minutes. (Administration)

Person Responsible	Rhonda Devereaux (rhonda.devereaux@nassau.k12.fl.us)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Callahan Middle School had identified our ELA instruction as an area of focus. 2019 FSA data indicated improvement was needed in the areas of ELA proficiency (63%), ELA learning gains (51%), and ELA lowest quartile learning gains (47%).
Measurable Outcome:	Increase ELA lowest quartile learning gains by 5%. (47% to 52%) Increase ELA learning gains by 5%. (51% to 56%)
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Rhonda Devereaux (rhonda.devereaux@nassau.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Provide instructional model that allows for differentiated instruction to meet the needs of all learners. Provide professional development for new technology data platform, Edulastic Provide teachers collabortive planning time to plan standards -based lesson and analyze student data. Incorporate the LLI- Literacy Intervention program in all grades 6-8 to lowest quartile students. Provide professional development for ESE teachers: Book Study, Effective Instruction for Middle School Student with Reading Difficulties. Incorporate Kagan active engagement strategies into daily instruction. Provide after- school tutoring to identified students.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	1. Data analysis can provide a snapshot of what students know, what they should know, and what can be done to meet their academic needs. With appropriate analysis and interpretation of data, educators can make informed decisions that positively affect student outcomes. 2. LLI is a leveled Literacy Intervention program that provides effective small-group instruction for students who find reading and writing difficult. The LLI program provides engaging leveled books and fast-paced systematically designed lessons. 3. It is essential for teachers to be knowledgeable about reading instruction and ways to help older students with reading difficulties. Low expectancy reading students need a systematic instructional approach that will assist them in decoding fluently and comprehend material with challenging content. 4. Learning improves when students are inquisitive, interested, or inspired.

Action Steps to Implement

Provide instructional model that allows for differentiated instruction to meet the needs of all learners.
Provide professional development for new technology data platform, Edulastic.
Provide teachers collaborative planning time to plan standards- based lessons and analyze student data.
Administer the LLI- Literacy Intervention program in all grades 6-8 to lowest quartile students.
Provide professional development for ESE teachers: Book Study, Effective Instruction for Middle School Students with Reading Difficulties.
Incorporate Kagan active engagement strategies into daily instruction.
Provide after -school tutoring to identified students.

Person Responsible	Rhonda Devereaux (rhonda.devereaux@nassau.k12.fl.us)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Callahan Middle identified math instruction as an area of continuous improvement. 2019 FSA data indicated our school- wide proficiency rate was 73%.
Measurable Outcome:	Increase school-wide math proficiency rate by 7%. (73%- 80%)
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Rhonda Devereaux (rhonda.devereaux@nassau.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Implement daily spiral review math curriculum resource. Provide an instructional model that incorporates differentiated instruction to meet the needs of all learners. Provide professional development using assessment and data platform: Edulastic Provide teachers collabortive planning time to plan standards- based lessons and analyze student data. Incorporate Kagan active engagement strategies into daily instruction. Provide after -school tutoring to identified students.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	1. Spiral review, or spiraled practice, means your students are getting repeated opportunities to practice skills you've already finished teaching to help keep their skills fresh and build automaticity. 2. Data analysis can provide a snapshot of what students know, what they should know, and what can be done to meet their academic needs. With appropriate analysis and interpretation of data, educators can make informed decisions that positively affect student outcomes. 3. Learning improves when students are inquisitive, interested, or inspired.

Action Steps to Implement

Implement daily spiral review math curriculum resource.
Provide an instructional model that incorporates differentiated instruction to meet the needs of all learners.
Provide professional development using assessment and data platform: Edulastic
Provide teachers collaborative planning time to plan standards- based lessons and analyze student data.
Incorporate Kagan active engagement strategies into daily instruction.
Provide after- school tutoring to identified students.

Person Responsible	Rhonda Devereaux (rhonda.devereaux@nassau.k12.fl.us)

Implement daily spiral review math curriculum resource.
Provide an instructional model that incorporates differentiated instruction to meet the needs of all learners.
Provide professional development using assessment and data platform: Edulastic
Provide teachers collabortive planning time to plan standards- based lessons and analyze student data.
Incorporate Kagan active engagement strategies into daily instruction.
Provide after -school tutoring to identified students.

Person Responsible	Rhonda Devereaux (rhonda.devereaux@nassau.k12.fl.us)

#4. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Callahan Middle identified Science instruction as an area of continuous improvement. 2019 FSA data indicated our school- wide proficiency rate was 62%.
Measurable Outcome:	Increase science proficiency rate by 8% - (62% to 70%)
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Rhonda Devereaux (rhonda.devereaux@nassau.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Implement daily spiral review science curriculum resource. Provide professional development using assessment and data management system: Edulastic Incorporate Kagan Structures to increase active student engagement. Provide after-school tutoring.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	1. Spiral review, or spiraled practice, means your students are getting a repeated opportunities to practice skills you've already finished teaching to help keep their skills fresh and build automaticity. 2. Data analysis can provide a snapshot of what students know, what they should know, and what can be done to meet their academic needs. With appropriate analysis and interpretation of data, educators can make informed decisions that positively affect student outcomes. 3. Learning improves when students are inquisitive, interested, or inspired.

Action Steps to Implement

Implement daily spiral review science curriculum resource.
Provide professional development using assessment and data management system: Edulastic
Incorporate Kagan Structures to increase active student engagement.
Provide after-school tutoring.

Person Responsible	Rhonda Devereaux (rhonda.devereaux@nassau.k12.fl.us)

#5. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Social Studies	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Callahan Middle identified Social Studies instruction as an area of continuous improvement. 2019 FSA data indicated our school- wide proficiency rate was 70%.
Measurable Outcome:	Increase science proficiency rate by 5% - (70% to 75%)
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Rhonda Devereaux (rhonda.devereaux@nassau.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Implement daily spiral review science curriculum resource. Provide professional development using assessment and data management system: Edulastic Incorporate Kagan Structures to increase active student engagement. Provide after-school tutoring.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	1. Spiral review, or spiraled practice, means your students are getting repeated opportunities to practice skills you've already finished teaching to help keep their skills fresh and build automaticity. 2. Data analysis can provide a snapshot of what students know, what they should know, and what can be done to meet their academic needs. With appropriate analysis and interpretation of data, educators can make informed decisions that positively affect student outcomes. 3. Learning improves when students are inquisitive, interested, or inspired.

Action Steps to Implement

Implement daily spiral review social studies curriculum resource.
Provide professional development using assessment and data management system: Edulastic
Incorporate Kagan Structures to increase active student engagement.
Provide after-school tutoring.

Person Responsible	Rhonda Devereaux (rhonda.devereaux@nassau.k12.fl.us)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

The leadership team addressed the school-wide improvement priorities in the above listed areas of focus and monitor data to identify other areas of need.

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.

Callahan Middle School has taken great strides to provide a positive school culture for all stake holders. Knowing that relationships are key, CMS has implemented the Advisory program to build a culture of trust and respect among students and faculty. Each day teachers discuss topics related to character building, respect, responsibility, and healthy social and emotional relationships. Students engage in collaborative discussion and games to reinforce key concepts and build school/classroom community. Teachers also provide students with attractive, safe, learning environments. Each classroom represents a student friendly focus. High expectations and mutual respect are core values on our campus. Students are treated with respect and provided quality instruction from highly qualified teachers.
Callahan Middle School provides a supporting environment for parents to partner with faculty and staff to ensure their student's success. Multiple means of communication provide parents with a wealth of knowledge and resources to assist with the learning process. Families are encouraged to participate in after-school events and educational programs. Parents are also encouraged to join our School Advisory Council.

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: Collaborative Planning				$1,500.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
			0131 - Callahan Middle School	Title II		$1,500.00
			Notes: Additional planning time to create standards based common assessments in grade 6-8.			
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA				$6,100.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
			0131 - Callahan Middle School	Title II		$1,100.00
			Notes: Provide additional planning time for teachers to plan standards based lessons, analyze data, and design common assessments.			

			0131 - Callahan Middle School	Other		$4,000.00
			Notes: Provide after school tutoring in reading for identified students in grades 6-8.			
			0131 - Callahan Middle School	IDEA		$1,000.00
			Notes: Book study for ESE teachers: Effective Instruction for Middle School Students with Reading Difficulties			
3	**III.A.**	**Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math**				**$4,000.00**
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
			0131 - Callahan Middle School	Other		$4,000.00
			Notes: Provide after school math tutoring for students in grades 6-8.			
4	**III.A.**	**Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Science**				**$1,000.00**
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
			0131 - Callahan Middle School	Other		$1,000.00
			Notes: Provide after school science tutoring for 8th grade students.			
5	**III.A.**	**Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Social Studies**				**$1,000.00**
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
			0131 - Callahan Middle School	Other		$1,000.00
			Notes: Provide after school Civics tutoring for 8th grade students.			
					Total:	**$13,600.00**