

Hendry County Schools

Clewiston 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	11
Planning for Improvement	17
Positive Culture & Environment	22
Budget to Support Goals	23

Clewiston Middle School

601 W PASADENA AVE, Clewiston, FL 33440

http://hendry-schools.org/education/school/school.php?sectionid=6&sc_id=1171294169

Demographics

Principal: Tina Kelley

Start Date for this Principal: 2/3/2020

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	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Black/African American Students Hispanic Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: D (40%) 2017-18: C (45%) 2016-17: C (47%) 2015-16: C (48%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	CS&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 Hendry 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	11
Planning for Improvement	17
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	23

Clewiston Middle School

601 W PASADENA AVE, Clewiston, FL 33440

http://hendry-schools.org/education/school/school.php?sectionid=6&sc_id=1171294169

School Demographics

<p>School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)</p> <p>Middle School 6-8</p>	<p>2019-20 Title I School</p> <p>Yes</p>	<p>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p>100%</p>
<p>Primary Service Type (per MSID File)</p> <p>K-12 General Education</p>	<p>Charter School</p> <p>No</p>	<p>2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p>85%</p>

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Hendry 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 Clewiston Middle School is to Engage. Empower, and Educate EVERY student, EVERY day, in EVERY classroom to prepare them for success in college, career, and life.

.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The vision of Clewiston Middle School is to create a safe and caring learning environment where ALL students are engaged and empowered to thrive in a global society.

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
Kelley, Tina	Principal	Instructional leader responsible for all curriculum, instruction and assessment tasks as well as building operational responsibilities.
Perry, Sandra	Assistant Principal	Observation and evaluation of ELA Management of PBIS Oversight of school maintenance team Leader of the SAC team
Johnston, Samantha	Dean	Instructional coaching and support for science Observation and evaluation of Math Dean of Students specializing in student discipline Management of school social media
Perrera, Auria	Instructional Coach	Support teachers by providing instructional coaching and professional development especially in ELA. Management of the school website and assisting in school social media. Assisting in schoolwide PBIS to improve our school culture.
Marotti, Haili	Other	Resource Teacher. Instructional coaching and support for ELL and ESE student support services. Observation, and evaluation of paraprofessionals. Management of the school calendar and information organization. State testing coordinator.
Pelham, Rosa	Instructional Coach	Support teachers by providing instructional coaching and professional development especially in Math.
Barnes, Steven	Dean	Instructional coaching and support for social studies and elective teachers. Dean of Students, specializing in student discipline, school safety, and restorative practices. School site technology representative at the district level and school site technology lead

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 2/3/2020, Tina Kelley

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.*

0

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.*

3

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

50

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* Black/African American Students Hispanic Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: D (40%) 2017-18: C (45%) 2016-17: C (47%) 2015-16: C (48%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	CS&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	279	253	218	0	0	0	0	750
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	31	43	39	0	0	0	0	113
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	26	73	65	0	0	0	0	164
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	56	51	44	0	0	0	0	151
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	49	58	41	0	0	0	0	148
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	57	41	64	0	0	0	0	162
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	41	43	90	0	0	0	0	174

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	68	62	0	0	0	0	173

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	0
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	4

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 5/6/2020

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	272	280	280	0	0	0	0	832
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	67	76	86	0	0	0	0	229
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	32	34	26	0	0	0	0	92
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	34	56	48	0	0	0	0	138
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	114	130	124	0	0	0	0	368

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	73	70	76	0	0	0	0	219

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	3	3	0	0	0	0	6

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	272	280	280	0	0	0	0	832
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	67	76	86	0	0	0	0	229
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	32	34	26	0	0	0	0	92
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	34	56	48	0	0	0	0	138
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	114	130	124	0	0	0	0	368

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	73	70	76	0	0	0	0	219

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	3	3	0	0	0	0	6

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	38%	42%	54%	39%	38%	52%
ELA Learning Gains	44%	50%	54%	47%	44%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	36%	40%	47%	43%	37%	44%
Math Achievement	34%	45%	58%	45%	44%	56%
Math Learning Gains	31%	46%	57%	48%	47%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	33%	41%	51%	46%	45%	50%
Science Achievement	34%	41%	51%	34%	34%	50%
Social Studies Achievement	53%	59%	72%	50%	50%	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	38%	41%	-3%	54%	-16%
	2018	32%	37%	-5%	52%	-20%
Same Grade Comparison		6%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	32%	38%	-6%	52%	-20%
	2018	35%	35%	0%	51%	-16%
Same Grade Comparison		-3%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2019	40%	43%	-3%	56%	-16%
	2018	38%	40%	-2%	58%	-20%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison		5%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2019	32%	43%	-11%	55%	-23%
	2018	42%	44%	-2%	52%	-10%
Same Grade Comparison		-10%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	30%	42%	-12%	54%	-24%
	2018	16%	31%	-15%	54%	-38%
Same Grade Comparison		14%				
Cohort Comparison		-12%				
08	2019	16%	30%	-14%	46%	-30%
	2018	30%	25%	5%	45%	-15%
Same Grade Comparison		-14%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2019	31%	37%	-6%	48%	-17%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	28%	34%	-6%	50%	-22%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
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	49%	56%	-7%	71%	-22%
2018	54%	55%	-1%	71%	-17%
Compare		-5%			

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	52%	38%	14%	61%	-9%
2018	78%	41%	37%	62%	16%
Compare		-26%			

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	79%	40%	39%	57%	22%
2018	95%	42%	53%	56%	39%
Compare		-16%			

Subgroup Data

2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	18	30	32	24	37	33	20	36			
ELL	19	33	31	21	27	31	15	40	50		

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	27	34	34	22	26	31	21	42	40		
HSP	41	46	35	37	32	34	37	55	63		
WHT	44	52	58	38	32	33	38	61	59		
FRL	34	41	34	30	31	33	29	49	57		
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	16	36	35	20	28	14	8	39			
ELL	16	45	48	17	33	28	9	33	40		
BLK	29	44	54	27	42	46	28	39	48		
HSP	38	45	46	41	41	40	27	61	58		
WHT	41	51	58	49	50	35	35	66	57		
FRL	35	45	51	37	42	42	27	57	55		
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	10	38	41	16	45	47	13	29			
ELL	18	43	50	31	45	53	13	42			
BLK	32	40	17	38	47	38	29	41	78		
HSP	41	49	50	48	48	53	34	53	69		
WHT	42	46	58	46	45	35	38	51	63		
FRL	37	46	39	45	48	46	34	48	70		

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)	CS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	41
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	44
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	408
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	29

Students With Disabilities	
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	2
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	31
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	1
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
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	31
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	1
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	43
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	46
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	39
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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 area of performance was in Math Learning Gains in the bottom quartile of our student population. Math scores have declined over the past three years due to the challenge of securing highly effective teachers, a lack of an aligned curriculum and pacing guide, a lack of cohesive Professional Development for mathematics, and inconsistent implementation of curriculum and a need for consistent monitoring of classroom instruction.

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

The biggest decline from the prior year was in ELA Learning Gains in the bottom quartile declining 51% to 36% for a loss of 15 % points. This was a direct reflection of failing to specifically provide Tier 3 interventions of time and curriculum to meet their needs appropriately.

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 content area with the biggest gap was in Mathematics with a gap of 17% points between school proficiency of 34% and the state proficiency of 51%. This gap aligns with all schoolwide math data due to the challenge of securing highly effective teachers, a lack of an aligned curriculum and pacing guide, a lack of cohesive Professional Development for mathematics, and inconsistent implementation of curriculum and a need for consistent monitoring of classroom instruction.

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

Sixth grade ELA proficiency increased by 6% from 32% to 38 %. Historically our sixth graders come in from our elementary feeder schools higher-performing than our seventh and eighth-graders. In addition, students were double blocked for ELA instruction providing additional time for in class interventions. t

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

1. Quantity of students that scored a level one on state assessments. 368 students compared to 345 in the prior year.
2. Number of Students in Attendance Less than 90% of the time. While the overall attendance rate of students who attended less than 90 % decreased from 407 to 229, this number is still a concern and directly correlates to the students who scored a level one on the state assessments.

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

1. Aligned Instructional Systems-Establishing consistent implementation of aligned instructional systems in ELA, Math, Science and Social Studies to increase learning gains and proficiency.
2. Data-Driven instruction in all classrooms.
3. Prescriptive Tier 2 and 3 Interventions and Strategies to meet individual students need with a focus on LPQ students
4. Aligned and consistent formative assessments to diagnose, prescribe and evaluate student learning.
- 5.. Differentiated Professional Development for Core Teachers to effectively implement curriculum

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction

Increase Learning Gains for all students based on data-driven, aligned instructional systems

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: All students deserve an equitable learning experience to demonstrate at least a years' worth of growth in all core content areas. Teachers must use data effectively to plan and implement rigorous, differentiated learning opportunities for whole group, small group, and individual instruction for all students to empower students to make a year's work of learning growth. School data indicates that only 44% of students made Learning Gains in Reading, only 31% of students made learning Gains in Math, only 36% of students in the LPQ in Reading, and only 33% of student LPQ in math. This data is significantly below the state average.

Measurable Outcome:
 54% of all students will make a Learning Gain in Reading (2019-44%)
 47% of all students identified in the LPQ will make a Learning Gain in Reading (2019 -36%)
 57% all students will make a Learning Gain in Math (2019-31%)
 51 % of all students identified in the LPQ will make a Learning Gain in Math (2019-33%)
 51% of all students will achieve proficiency in Science (2019-34%)
 72% of all students will achieve proficiency in Social Studies (2019-53%)

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Tina Kelley (kelleyt@hendry-schools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Data based decision making and aligned instructional systems

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Data based decision making will empower our teachers to develop prescriptive, standards-based instruction to meet individual needs. Data needs to drive our choices for the curriculum, instruction, and assessment tools that must be aligned and intentional to achieve desired results. This has been a gap in our practice as we have not consistently trained our teachers or carefully monitored and required our teachers to effectively use of data to provide a rigorous aligned systems of instruction.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Implement a data-driven, aligned system of instruction including standards, curriculum, instruction, assessments, and interventions in ELA, Math, Science, and Social Studies empowering teachers with a rigorous and intentional instructional pathway.

Person Responsible Tina Kelley (kelleyt@hendry-schools.net)

2. Secure Academic Coach to provide coaching and professional development for ELA teachers and classroom support.

Person Responsible Tina Kelley (kelleyt@hendry-schools.net)

3. Hire ELA and MATH Interventionists to support small group instruction and intervention with a focus on inclusionary classes which often represent our LPQ group.

Person Responsible Tina Kelley (kelleyt@hendry-schools.net)

4. Establish weekly PLC schedule of Professional Development for ELA, Math, and Science teachers to provide time for teachers to collaborate, plan and model lessons for instructional growth,

Person Responsible Tina Kelley (kelleyt@hendry-schools.net)

5. Develop Power Hour intervention after-school program for remediation and acceleration of standards for students struggling to meet standards.

Person Responsible Sandra Perry (perrys@hendry-schools.net)

6. Develop 'Working On the Work' Professionals Development Plan for intensive lesson study around critical curriculum issues lead by Academic Coaches with on the clock release time for teachers covered by substitutes once per semester and two hours after school on Wednesdays.

Person Responsible Sandra Perry (perrys@hendry-schools.net)

7. Contract Leadership Development Coach for SIP Planning, Implementation, and Monitoring of Instruction.

Person Responsible Tina Kelley (kelleyt@hendry-schools.net)

8. Implement a one-to-one student-to-device instructional environment to increase equity of access to instructional materials and individualized prescriptive instruction.

Person Responsible Steven Barnes (barness@hendry-schools.net)

9. Extended Hours for planning and MTSS once a month for 46 teachers/2 hours per month .

Person Responsible Tina Kelley (kelleyt@hendry-schools.net)

No description entered

Person Responsible [no one identified]

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Increase Schoolwide Math Proficiency. Data indicates that only 34% of students are meeting proficiency as compared to the state average of 58%. In addition, only 31% of students are making learning gains as compared to the state average of 57%. Lastly, only 33% of our lowest quartile are making learning gains as compared to the state average of 51%.

Measurable Outcome: 58% of students will make proficiency. (2019 - 34%)
57% of students will make learning gains. (2019 - 31%)
51% of LPQ will make learning gains. (2019 - 33%)

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: [no one identified]

Evidence-based Strategy: Alignment of standards, curriculum, instruction, and assessment to ensure student mastery of standards.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Existing Math curriculum was piecemeal and inconsistently implemented without fidelity. Teachers needed a more scripted, aligned curriculum guide and pacing guide to effectively address all standards and student needs.

Action Steps to Implement

Develop a new scripted, aligned math curriculum guide, pacing guide assessments and lesson plans for all math teachers with ongoing professional development and coaching support.

Person Responsible Samantha Johnston (ortizs@hendry-schools.net)

Provide professional development through WOW days (monthly) , Professional Learning Communities (weekly), and side by side coaching (daily) for effective implementation math curriculum and pacing.

Person Responsible Samantha Johnston (ortizs@hendry-schools.net)

Conduct monthly classroom walkthroughs with School Leadership, Math Consultant, and Leadership Coach to monitor effective implementation.

Person Responsible Tina Kelley (kelleyt@hendry-schools.net)

Provide a summer STEM camp for remediation and enrichment.

Person Responsible Sandra Perry (perrys@hendry-schools.net)

Provide an instructional coach for mathematics to support classroom instruction, interventions and assessment.

Person Responsible Tina Kelley (kelleyt@hendry-schools.net)

Secure Tier 3 Math Intervention, Math 180 for bubble students to help move students to proficiency.

Person Responsible [no one identified]

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science

Area of Focus Increase Science Proficiency Schoolwide
Description and Rationale: Eighth grade science data indicates only 34% of students achieve proficiency compared to the State average of 51%. Science standards need to be addressed in grades 6, 7 and 8th with an aligned curriculum, instruction and assessment.

Measurable Outcome: 51% of students in grades 6, 7, and 8 will achieve proficiency as measured by district assessments or Science FSA. This number trends with the state average.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Samantha Johnston (ortizs@hendry-schools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Alignment of standards, curriculum, instruction, and assessment to ensure student mastery of standards.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Our science program has historically focused on 8th grade with little accountability for vertical coordination and planning. The Science curriculum has not been implemented completely or effectively. Teachers need an aligned instructional system to follow in order to ensure standards mastery.

Action Steps to Implement

Develop new science curriculum guides, pacing guides, and assessments for schoowide standards-based aligned instruction.

Person Responsible Samantha Johnston (ortizs@hendry-schools.net)

Provide science professional development for effective implementation of the science curriculum, instruction and assessment using an external consultant.

Person Responsible Samantha Johnston (ortizs@hendry-schools.net)

Develop school-based formative and summative assessments for the sixth and seventh grade to monitor academic achievement and measure standards mastery.

Person Responsible Samantha Johnston (ortizs@hendry-schools.net)

Conduct monthly classroom walkthroughs with School Leadership and Leadership Coach to monitor effective implementation.

Person Responsible Samantha Johnston (ortizs@hendry-schools.net)

Provide Science Classroom libraries aligned with standards for all science teachers (7) to help students develop science content and reading stamina.

Person Responsible [no one identified]

Secure Tier 2 Science Test Prep materials for Grade 8- Speedbags to help students achieve standards in Science.

Person Responsible [no one identified]

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

N/A

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.

A new leadership team at CMS, as of February 2020, has already begun to create a more invitational and engaging school culture and environment for all stakeholders.

Internally, a Principal Survey will be conducted to get input from all faculty and staff to determine organizational and individual strengths, needs, interests, and suggestions for creating a positive and inclusive school culture.

Teachers and students will be scheduled into cohorts to build a team identity and a more personal relationship with a common group of students and teachers. Students with disabilities will be served in inclusion classes with the support of a paraprofessional that follows the students to all their core classes for additional support. A new and expanded Leadership team will be developed to allow for shared decision making and distributive leadership opportunities for teacher leaders. Our AVID program which promotes college and career readiness will be expanded to include..... Mental Health and Guidance Services will be provided by two full-time guidance counselors and a full-time mental health counselor available to all students.

Externally, the principal will survey parents to identify their concerns, needs, and suggestions for improving school experiences for their children and themselves as well as host a business leadership forum to share the challenges and needs of CMS with local business leaders as well as seek their guidance about how they might be involved in supporting the goals of CMS. Our School Advisory Council will be developed with parents representing each stakeholder group with quarterly meetings to involve parents and community members in learning and informing schoolwide decisions that impact students. Digital parent meetings/conferences will be held at least once a quarter to discuss student progress. Parent & Student Orientation nights at the beginning of the year will allow educational opportunities for our parents and students to become acclimated to CMS procedures and programs. A new digital parent newsletter will be launched providing timely information to parents on a variety of devices including their cell phones.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

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

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Standards-aligned Instruction				\$255,069.84
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	5100	150-Aides	0061 - Clewiston Middle School	UniSIG	3.0	\$45,000.00
			<i>Notes: Interventionists (3) Paras to support small group instruction in ELA and Math. Projected salaries at \$15,000 per paraprofessional.</i>			
	5100	210-Retirement	0061 - Clewiston Middle School	UniSIG	0.0	\$3,812.00
			<i>Notes: Florida Retirement (.0847) for 3 aides</i>			
	5100	220-Social Security	0061 - Clewiston Middle School	UniSIG	0.0	\$2,790.00
			<i>Notes: Social Security (.0620) for 3 aides</i>			
	5100	120-Classroom Teachers	0061 - Clewiston Middle School	UniSIG	0.75	\$33,000.00
			<i>Notes: Teacher salaries for after school tutoring and remediation. Approximately 20 teachers x 10 weeks X 5 hours per week x \$33.</i>			
	5100	210-Retirement	0061 - Clewiston Middle School	UniSIG	0.0	\$3,354.00
			<i>Notes: Florida Retirement Benefits (.0847)</i>			
	5100	220-Social Security	0061 - Clewiston Middle School	UniSIG	0.0	\$2,288.00
			<i>Notes: Social Security (.0620)</i>			
	6400	750-Other Personal Services	0061 - Clewiston Middle School	UniSIG	0.08	\$3,600.00
			<i>Notes: Substitutes daily rate of pay to cover classes for teachers to plan each semester with academic coaches and consultants for aligned instruction. These WOW days will allow teachers to have a full day once a semester to work on the work(WOW) in content area teams. (24 subs x 2 full days = 48 x \$75 per day.)</i>			
	5100	510-Supplies	0061 - Clewiston Middle School	UniSIG		\$21,084.34
			<i>Notes: Performance Coach Test Prep for ELA will be provided for Tier 1 ELA instruction and Test Prep.</i>			
	6400	310-Professional and Technical Services	0061 - Clewiston Middle School	UniSIG	1.0	\$35,000.00
			<i>Notes: External consultant will mentor and coach the new Leadership Team with a focus on Data Analysis and Strategic Planning, Curriculum Planning and Mapping, Instructional Interventions, Professional Learning Communities and Professional Development, and monitoring and coaching of teachers.</i>			
	5100	220-Social Security	0061 - Clewiston Middle School	UniSIG	0.0	\$653.00
			<i>Notes: Medicare benefits (.0145) for 3 aides</i>			
	5100	220-Social Security	0061 - Clewiston Middle School	UniSIG	0.0	\$574.00

			<i>Notes: Medicare (.0145)</i>			
	5100	644-Computer Hardware Non-Capitalized	0061 - Clewiston Middle School	UniSIG		\$31,472.10
			<i>Notes: Promethean Boards for all classrooms to teach lessons that will help reach a new level of interactivity between students and their education. 11 Promethean Boards @ \$2,861.10 each</i>			
	5100	230-Group Insurance	0061 - Clewiston Middle School	UniSIG		\$27,000.00
			<i>Notes: 3 paras x \$9,000 group insurance</i>			
	5100	590-Other Materials and Supplies	0061 - Clewiston Middle School	UniSIG		\$12,411.49
			<i>Notes: Whiteboards for classrooms 30 @338.95</i>			
	6300	510-Supplies	0061 - Clewiston Middle School	UniSIG		\$27,324.00
			<i>Notes: Extended Day Planning for Teacher -1 day a month for 9 months x2 x \$33/hour X 46</i>			
	5100	510-Supplies	0061 - Clewiston Middle School	UniSIG		\$1,611.91
			<i>Notes: Markers, Chart tables, dry erase boards, etc.</i>			
	6300	120-Classroom Teachers	0061 - Clewiston Middle School	UniSIG		\$4,095.00
			<i>Notes: Stipends to team leaders for extended standards-based planning. 6.5 hours/monthly x 9 months x \$35/hour</i>			
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math				\$55,350.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	6400	310-Professional and Technical Services	0061 - Clewiston Middle School	UniSIG	0.0	\$8,000.00
			<i>Notes: External consultant will provide coaching training for new Academic Coach and conduct quarterly classroom walkthroughs to identify strengths, weaknesses and next steps.</i>			
	5100	369-Technology-Related Rentals	0061 - Clewiston Middle School	UniSIG	0.0	\$13,600.00
			<i>Notes: Math 180 Digital Licenses for 250 students for Tier 3 intervention.</i>			
	5100	120-Classroom Teachers	0061 - Clewiston Middle School	UniSIG		\$24,750.00
			<i>Notes: Classroom teachers will be paid their hourly rate estimated at \$33 an hour to provide a summer STEM Camp program targeting 375 students with a focus on remediation and enrichment instruction and activities. There will be approximately 15 teachers x 40 hours/ 10-1/2 days x \$33.</i>			
	6400	230-Group Insurance	0061 - Clewiston Middle School	UniSIG	0.0	\$9,000.00
			<i>Notes: Group insurance</i>			
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Science				\$10,960.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	5100	510-Supplies	0061 - Clewiston Middle School	UniSIG		\$3,960.00

			<i>Notes: Speed Bag Test Prep workbooks to support core instruction will be provided for each student in 8th grade. (232 projected)</i>			
	5100	510-Supplies	0061 - Clewiston Middle School	UniSIG		\$7,000.00
			<i>Notes: Science Classroom Libraries aligned with Science standard per grade level 6,7,8 for 7 Science Teachers</i>			
					Total:	\$336,039.10