**Leon County Schools** 

## Raa Middle School



2021-22 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       | 19 |
| Positive Culture & Environment | 34 |
| Budget to Support Goals        | 35 |

#### Raa Middle School

401 W THARPE ST, Tallahassee, FL 32303

https://www.leonschools.net/raa

#### **Demographics**

Principal: Marcus Scott Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2020

| 2019-20 Status<br>(per MSID File)   | Active  |
|---|---|
| School Type and Grades Served<br>(per MSID File)  | Middle School<br>6-8  |
| Primary Service Type<br>(per MSID File)   | K-12 General Education  |
| 2020-21 Title I School  | No  |
| 2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)   | 79%   |
| 2020-21 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students |
| School Grades History   | 2018-19: C (51%)<br>2017-18: B (58%)<br>2016-17: B (54%)  |
| 2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Info  | ormation*   |
| SI Region   | Northwest   |
| Regional Executive Director   | Rachel Heide  |
| Turnaround Option/Cycle   | N/A   |
| Year  |   |
| Support Tier  |   |
| ESSA Status   |   |
| * As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. Fo  | or more information, click here.  |

#### **School Board Approval**

This plan is pending approval by the Leon 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 <a href="https://www.floridacims.org">www.floridacims.org</a>.

#### 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       | 19 |
| Title I Requirements           | 0  |
| Budget to Support Goals        | 35 |

#### Raa Middle School

401 W THARPE ST, Tallahassee, FL 32303

https://www.leonschools.net/raa

#### **School Demographics**

| School Type and Gi<br>(per MSID |          | 2020-21 Title I School | Disadvan | l <b>Economically</b><br>taged (FRL) Rate<br>ted on Survey 3) |  |  |  |  |
|---------------------------------|----------|------------------------|----------|---|--|--|--|--|
| Middle Sch<br>6-8               | nool     | No                     |          | 81%   |  |  |  |  |
| Primary Servio<br>(per MSID I   | • •      | Charter School         | (Reporte | Minority Rate ed as Non-white Survey 2)                       |  |  |  |  |
| K-12 General E                  | ducation | No                     |          | 73%   |  |  |  |  |
| School Grades Histo             | ory      |                        |          |   |  |  |  |  |
| Year                            | 2020-21  | 2019-20                | 2018-19  | 2017-18   |  |  |  |  |
| Grade                           |          | С                      | С        | В   |  |  |  |  |

#### **School Board Approval**

This plan is pending approval by the Leon 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 <a href="https://www.floridaCIMS.org">https://www.floridaCIMS.org</a>.

#### **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.

It is the mission of Augusta Raa Arts Magnet Middle School to provide an educational setting designed to prepare students to be successful lifelong learners. Through curricula and extracurricular activities, each student will have the opportunity to be active participants in the learning process and engage in activities that allow them to explore their individual interests.

#### Provide the school's vision statement.

It is the vision of Augusta Raa Arts Magnet Middle School to prepare all students to achieve in academics and the arts through inspiring investments in leadership and service.

#### School Leadership Team

#### Membership

Identify the name, email address, position title, and job duties/responsibilities for each member of the school leadership team.:

| Name                  | Position<br>Title      | Job Duties and Responsibilities  |
|-----------------------|------------------------|--|
| Scott,<br>Marcus      | Principal              | Oversee all operations of the school. Manage leadership team with follow up to a make sure team has the resources to complete school goals.                    |
| Lynch,<br>Kelly       | Assistant<br>Principal | Assistant Principal of Administration Oversee discipline Supervisor of the Math Department Manager of school-wide PBIS   |
| Van<br>Camp, BJ       | Assistant<br>Principal | Assistant Principal of Curriculum. Oversees ELA, ESE, and Guidance Departments   |
| Zackery,<br>Pat       | Assistant<br>Principal | Assistant Principal for Attendance<br>Oversee Social Studies Department  |
| Bell,<br>Lyndsey      | Dean                   | Assistant Principal of Administration Assistant Assistant Principal with Discipline Oversees ICT and Industry Level Certifications Manager of school-wide PBIS |
| Kerrigan,<br>Kathy    | School<br>Counselor    | Guidance Department Chair  |
| Harrison,<br>Natalee  | Teacher,<br>K-12       | ELA Department Chair<br>Coaches Intensive Reading / Civics Teachers  |
| White,<br>Trikia      | Reading<br>Coach       | Reading Coach  |
| Aylward,<br>Katharine | Teacher,<br>K-12       | Arts Department Chair<br>Mentor for beginning teachers   |
| Parker,<br>Alma       | Teacher,<br>ESE        | ESE Department Chair   |
| Robinson,<br>Portia   | School<br>Counselor    | Referral Coordinator<br>Manages MTSS Team  |
| Marcevski,<br>Bo      | Teacher,<br>K-12       | 8th Grade Team Leader  |
| Payne,<br>Beverly     | Teacher,<br>K-12       | Science Department Chair   |
| McNair,<br>Amber      | Teacher,<br>K-12       | 6th Team Leader  |
| Langston,<br>Julie    | Teacher,<br>K-12       | 7th Grade Team Leader  |

| Name              | Position<br>Title | Job Duties and Responsibilities |
|-------------------|-------------------|---------------------------------|
| Atkins,<br>Joshua | Teacher,<br>K-12  | Social Studies Department Chair |
| Alford,<br>Stacy  | Teacher,<br>K-12  | Math Department Chair           |

#### **Demographic Information**

#### Principal start date

Wednesday 7/1/2020, Marcus Scott

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.

3

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.

9

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

52

Total number of students enrolled at the school

801

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2020-21 school year.

2

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2021-22 school year.

2

**Demographic Data** 

#### **Early Warning Systems**

#### 2021-22

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

| Indicator  |   |   |   |   |   |   | Grac | le Le | vel |   |    |    |    | Total |
|--|---|---|---|---|---|---|------|-------|-----|---|----|----|----|-------|
| mulcator   | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6    | 7     | 8   | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | TOLAT |
| Number of students enrolled                              | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 234  | 270   | 297 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 801   |
| Attendance below 90 percent                              | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 62   | 77    | 67  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 206   |
| One or more suspensions                                  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3    | 0     | 5   | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 8     |
| Course failure in ELA                                    | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8    | 26    | 0   | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 34    |
| Course failure in Math                                   | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5    | 8     | 3   | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 16    |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment             | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 51   | 83    | 63  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 197   |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment            | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 76   | 99    | 89  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 264   |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0    | 0     | 0   | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |       |
|  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0    | 0     | 0   | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |       |

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

| Indicator                            |   | Grade Level |   |   |   |   |    |    |    |   |    |    |    |       |  |  |
|--------------------------------------|---|-------------|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|---|----|----|----|-------|--|--|
|                                      |   | 1           | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6  | 7  | 8  | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | TOLAT |  |  |
| Students with two or more indicators | 0 | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 35 | 60 | 40 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 135   |  |  |

#### The number of students identified as retainees:

| Indicator                           |   | Grade Level |   |   |   |   |   |    |   |   |    |    |    |       |  |  |
|-------------------------------------|---|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|----|---|---|----|----|----|-------|--|--|
| 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 | 8 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 20    |  |  |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 4  | 1 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 9     |  |  |

#### Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 8/31/2021

#### 2020-21 - As Reported

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

| la dia eta u                              | Grade Level |   |   |   |   |   |     |     |     |   |    |    |    |       |
|---|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|-----|-----|-----|---|----|----|----|-------|
| 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 | 271 | 318 | 301 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 890   |
| Attendance below 90 percent               | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 96  | 142 | 91  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 329   |
| One or more suspensions                   | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |       |
| Course failure in ELA                     | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1   | 2   | 2   | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 5     |
| Course failure in Math                    | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1   | 6   | 2   | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 9     |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment  | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 56  | 51  | 70  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 177   |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 41  | 61  | 75  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 177   |

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

| Indicator                            | Grade Level |   |   |   |   |   |    |    |    |   |    |    |    |       |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|---|----|----|----|-------|
| 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 | 48 | 59 | 68 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 175   |

#### The number of students identified as retainees:

| Indicator                           |   |   |   |   |   | Gr | ade | e Le | eve |   |    |    |    | Total |
|-------------------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|----|-----|------|-----|---|----|----|----|-------|
| 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  | 1   | 2    | 0   | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 3     |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 5   | 4    | 5   | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 14    |

#### 2020-21 - Updated

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

| Indicator                                 | Grade Level |   |   |   |   |   |     |     |     |   |    |    |    | Total |
|---|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|-----|-----|-----|---|----|----|----|-------|
| 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 | 271 | 318 | 301 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 890   |
| Attendance below 90 percent               | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 96  | 142 | 91  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 329   |
| One or more suspensions                   | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |       |
| Course failure in ELA                     | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1   | 2   | 2   | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 5     |
| Course failure in Math                    | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1   | 6   | 2   | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 9     |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment  | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 56  | 51  | 70  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 177   |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 41  | 61  | 75  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 177   |

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

| Indicator                            |   |   |   |   |   | ( | Grad | e Le | vel |   |    |    |    | Total |
|--------------------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|------|------|-----|---|----|----|----|-------|
| 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 | 48   | 59   | 68  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 175   |

#### The number of students identified as retainees:

| Indicator                           | Grade Level |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |    | Total |       |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|-------|-------|
| 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 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0     | 3     |
| Students retained two or more times | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 4 | 5 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0     | 14    |

#### Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

#### **School Data Review**

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      |        | 2021     |       |        | 2019     |       | 2018   |          |       |  |
|-----------------------------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|--|
| School Grade Component      | School | District | State | School | District | State | School | District | State |  |
| ELA Achievement             |        |          |       | 52%    | 55%      | 54%   | 55%    | 56%      | 53%   |  |
| ELA Learning Gains          |        |          |       | 49%    | 53%      | 54%   | 57%    | 54%      | 54%   |  |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile  |        |          |       | 36%    | 42%      | 47%   | 53%    | 48%      | 47%   |  |
| Math Achievement            |        |          |       | 54%    | 59%      | 58%   | 61%    | 59%      | 58%   |  |
| Math Learning Gains         |        |          |       | 47%    | 58%      | 57%   | 62%    | 59%      | 57%   |  |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile |        |          |       | 36%    | 47%      | 51%   | 50%    | 52%      | 51%   |  |
| Science Achievement         |        |          |       | 50%    | 49%      | 51%   | 49%    | 53%      | 52%   |  |
| Social Studies Achievement  |        |          |       | 68%    | 75%      | 72%   | 69%    | 72%      | 72%   |  |

#### **Grade Level Data Review - State Assessments**

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-<br>District<br>Comparison | State | School-<br>State<br>Comparison |
| 06         | 2021     |        |          |                                   |       |                                |
|            | 2019     | 51%    | 54%      | -3%                               | 54%   | -3%                            |
| Cohort Con | nparison |        |          |                                   |       |                                |
| 07         | 2021     |        |          |                                   |       |                                |
|            | 2019     | 49%    | 56%      | -7%                               | 52%   | -3%                            |
| Cohort Con | nparison | -51%   |          |                                   |       |                                |
| 80         | 2021     |        |          |                                   |       |                                |
|            | 2019     | 54%    | 59%      | -5%                               | 56%   | -2%                            |
| Cohort Con | nparison | -49%   |          |                                   |       |                                |

|            |          |        | MATI     | 1                                 |       |                                |
|------------|----------|--------|----------|-----------------------------------|-------|--------------------------------|
| Grade      | Year     | School | District | School-<br>District<br>Comparison | State | School-<br>State<br>Comparison |
| 06         | 2021     |        |          |                                   |       |                                |
|            | 2019     | 48%    | 53%      | -5%                               | 55%   | -7%                            |
| Cohort Con | nparison |        |          |                                   |       |                                |
| 07         | 2021     |        |          |                                   |       |                                |
|            | 2019     | 54%    | 60%      | -6%                               | 54%   | 0%                             |
| Cohort Con | nparison | -48%   |          |                                   |       |                                |
| 08         | 2021     |        |          |                                   |       |                                |
|            | 2019     | 29%    | 45%      | -16%                              | 46%   | -17%                           |
| Cohort Com | nparison | -54%   |          |                                   | •     |                                |

|            |          |        | SCIEN    | CE                                |       |                                |
|------------|----------|--------|----------|-----------------------------------|-------|--------------------------------|
| Grade      | Year     | School | District | School-<br>District<br>Comparison | State | School-<br>State<br>Comparison |
| 08         | 2021     |        |          |                                   |       |                                |
|            | 2019     | 42%    | 44%      | -2%                               | 48%   | -6%                            |
| Cohort Com | nparison |        |          |                                   |       |                                |

|      |        | BIOLO    | GY EOC                      |       |                          |
|------|--------|----------|-----------------------------|-------|--------------------------|
| Year | School | District | School<br>Minus<br>District | State | School<br>Minus<br>State |
| 2021 |        |          |                             |       |                          |
| 2019 | 91%    | 70%      | 21%                         | 67%   | 24%                      |
|      |        | CIVIC    | S EOC                       |       |                          |
| Year | School | District | School<br>Minus<br>District | State | School<br>Minus<br>State |
| 2021 |        |          |                             |       |                          |
| 2019 | 66%    | 75%      | -9%                         | 71%   | -5%                      |
|      |        | HISTO    | RY EOC                      |       |                          |
| Year | School | District | School<br>Minus<br>District | State | School<br>Minus<br>State |
| 2021 |        |          |                             |       |                          |
| 2019 |        |          |                             |       |                          |
|      |        | ALGEE    | RA EOC                      | •     |                          |
| Year | School | District | School<br>Minus<br>District | State | School<br>Minus<br>State |
| 2021 |        |          |                             |       |                          |
| 2019 | 91%    | 69%      | 22%                         | 61%   | 30%                      |
|      |        | GEOME    | TRY EOC                     |       |                          |
| Year | School | District | School<br>Minus<br>District | State | School<br>Minus<br>State |
| 2021 |        |          |                             |       |                          |
| 2019 | 97%    | 67%      | 30%                         | 57%   | 40%                      |

#### **Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments**

Provide the progress monitoring tool(s) by grade level used to compile the below data.

ELA: Achieve 3000, STAR Assessment, District Progress Monitoring Assessments

Math: IXL supplemental material

Science: District Progress Monitoring Assessments

Social Studies: District Progress Monitoring Assessments

|                          |  | Grade 6 |        |        |
|--------------------------|--|---------|--------|--------|
|                          | Number/%<br>Proficiency  | Fall    | Winter | Spring |
| English Language<br>Arts | All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners | 40/17%  | 43/18% | 29/12& |
|                          | Number/%<br>Proficiency  | Fall    | Winter | Spring |
| Mathematics              | All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners |         |        |        |
|                          |  | Grade 7 |        |        |
|                          | Number/%<br>Proficiency  | Fall    | Winter | Spring |
| English Language<br>Arts | All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners | 1       | 1      | 2      |
|                          | Number/%<br>Proficiency  | Fall    | Winter | Spring |
| Mathematics              | All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners | 54      | 127    | 120    |
|                          | Number/%<br>Proficiency  | Fall    | Winter | Spring |
| Civics                   | All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners | 47      |        |        |

|                          |  | Grade 8 |        |        |
|--------------------------|--|---------|--------|--------|
|                          | Number/%<br>Proficiency  | Fall    | Winter | Spring |
| English Language<br>Arts | All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners | 1       | 1      | 0      |
|                          | Number/%<br>Proficiency  | Fall    | Winter | Spring |
| Mathematics              | All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners |         |        |        |
|                          | Number/%<br>Proficiency  | Fall    | Winter | Spring |
| Science                  | All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners |         |        |        |

#### Subgroup Data Review

|           |             | 2021      | SCHOO             | DL GRAD      | E COMF     | PONENT             | S BY SU     | JBGRO      | UPS          |                         |                           |
|-----------|-------------|-----------|-------------------|--------------|------------|--------------------|-------------|------------|--------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|
| Subgroups | ELA<br>Ach. | ELA<br>LG | ELA<br>LG<br>L25% | Math<br>Ach. | Math<br>LG | Math<br>LG<br>L25% | Sci<br>Ach. | SS<br>Ach. | MS<br>Accel. | Grad<br>Rate<br>2019-20 | C & C<br>Accel<br>2019-20 |
| SWD       | 21          | 37        | 37                | 21           | 29         | 24                 | 23          | 25         | 57           |                         |                           |
| ELL       | 44          | 69        |                   | 56           | 31         |                    |             |            |              |                         |                           |
| BLK       | 41          | 46        | 40                | 30           | 27         | 25                 | 20          | 58         | 55           |                         |                           |
| HSP       | 44          | 56        | 63                | 42           | 34         | 55                 | 28          | 64         | 60           |                         |                           |
| MUL       | 52          | 53        | 40                | 44           | 39         | 27                 | 33          | 78         | 62           |                         |                           |
| WHT       | 70          | 67        | 48                | 65           | 57         | 42                 | 58          | 85         | 73           |                         |                           |
| FRL       | 38          | 46        | 46                | 29           | 26         | 24                 | 26          | 59         | 57           |                         |                           |
|           |             | 2019      | SCHO              | DL GRAD      | E COMF     | PONENT             | S BY SU     | JBGRO      | UPS          |                         |                           |
| Subgroups | ELA<br>Ach. | ELA<br>LG | ELA<br>LG<br>L25% | Math<br>Ach. | Math<br>LG | Math<br>LG<br>L25% | Sci<br>Ach. | SS<br>Ach. | MS<br>Accel. | Grad<br>Rate<br>2017-18 | C & C<br>Accel<br>2017-18 |
| SWD       | 25          | 40        | 35                | 27           | 48         | 42                 | 11          | 32         |              |                         |                           |
| ELL       | 20          |           |                   | 30           | 27         |                    |             |            |              |                         |                           |
| ASN       | 38          | 25        |                   | 62           | 38         |                    |             |            |              |                         |                           |

|            |             | 2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS |                   |              |            |                    |             |            |              |                         |                           |  |  |  |
|------------|-------------|---|-------------------|--------------|------------|--------------------|-------------|------------|--------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|--|--|--|
| Subgroups  | ELA<br>Ach. | ELA<br>LG                                 | ELA<br>LG<br>L25% | Math<br>Ach. | Math<br>LG | Math<br>LG<br>L25% | Sci<br>Ach. | SS<br>Ach. | MS<br>Accel. | Grad<br>Rate<br>2017-18 | C & C<br>Accel<br>2017-18 |  |  |  |
| BLK        | 41          | 43  | 37                | 42           | 40         | 29                 | 35          | 56         | 52           |                         |                           |  |  |  |
| HSP        | 46          | 44  |                   | 44           | 44         |                    |             | 70         |              |                         |                           |  |  |  |
| MUL        | 59          | 57  |                   | 57           | 59         |                    |             | 92         |              |                         |                           |  |  |  |
| WHT        | 69          | 58  | 39                | 72           | 57         | 51                 | 70          | 80         | 75           |                         |                           |  |  |  |
| FRL        | 43          | 44  | 35                | 46           | 45         | 36                 | 41          | 59         | 54           |                         |                           |  |  |  |
|            |             | 2018                                      | SCHO              | OL GRAD      | E COMF     | ONENT              | S BY SU     | JBGRO      | UPS          |                         |                           |  |  |  |
| Subgroups  | ELA<br>Ach. | ELA<br>LG                                 | ELA<br>LG<br>L25% | Math<br>Ach. | Math<br>LG | Math<br>LG<br>L25% | Sci<br>Ach. | SS<br>Ach. | MS<br>Accel. | Grad<br>Rate<br>2016-17 | C & C<br>Accel<br>2016-17 |  |  |  |
| SWD        | 25          | 46  | 44                | 24           | 45         | 42                 | 20          | 29         |              |                         |                           |  |  |  |
| ELL        | 25          | 47  | 60                | 63           | 73         |                    |             |            |              |                         |                           |  |  |  |
| 140.4      |             |   |                   |              |            |                    |             |            |              |                         |                           |  |  |  |
| ASN        | 60          |   |                   |              |            |                    |             |            |              |                         |                           |  |  |  |
| BLK        | 60<br>43    | 53  | 51                | 48           | 54         | 46                 | 31          | 55         | 58           |                         |                           |  |  |  |
|            |             | 53<br>67                                  | 51<br>80          | 48<br>59     | 54<br>68   | 46<br>64           | 31<br>55    | 55         | 58<br>45     |                         |                           |  |  |  |
| BLK        | 43          |   | _                 |              |            |                    |             | 55         |              |                         |                           |  |  |  |
| BLK<br>HSP | 43<br>71    | 67  | 80                | 59           | 68         |                    | 55          | 55<br>83   |              |                         |                           |  |  |  |

#### **ESSA Data Review**

This data has been updated for the 2021-22 school year as of 10/19/2021.

| ESSA Federal Index  |     |
|---|-----|
| ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)  |     |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students  | 47  |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students                                    | NO  |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target                                    | 3   |
| Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency |     |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index                                       | 423 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index  | 9   |
| Percent Tested  | 95% |
| Subgroup Data   |     |

# Students With Disabilities Federal Index - Students With Disabilities 30 Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? YES Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%

| English Language Learners                 |    |
|---|----|
| Federal Index - English Language Learners | 50 |

| English Language Learners  |     |
|--|-----|
| English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?              | NO  |
| Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%       |     |
| 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%        |     |
| 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%                  |     |
| Black/African American Students  |     |
| Federal Index - Black/African American Students                                | 38  |
| Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?        | YES |
| Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32% |     |
| Hispanic Students  |     |
| Federal Index - Hispanic Students  | 50  |
| Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?                      | NO  |
| Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%               |     |
| Multiracial Students   |     |
| Federal Index - Multiracial Students   | 48  |
| Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?                   | NO  |
| Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%            |     |
| 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%       |     |
| White Students   |     |
| Federal Index - White Students   | 63  |
| White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?                         | NO  |
| Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%                  |     |

| 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% |     |

#### **Analysis**

#### **Data Analysis**

Answer the following analysis questions using the progress monitoring data and state assessment data, if applicable.

#### What trends emerge across grade levels, subgroups and core content areas?

Our lowest data components were ELA Lowest 25th percentile and Math Lowest 25th percentile making learning gains at 43% and 29% each. Contributing factors to these areas include but are not limited to gaps in instructional practices, the need for supplemental resources for Tier 2 and Tier 3 Interventions, number of students taking their appropriate grade level state assessment, and changes in staffing. Additionally, we had a number of students who did not have a conducive learning environment while on digital academy.

## What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

Our data components that showed the greatest decline from the prior year were ELA Lowest 25th percentile and Math Lowest 25th percentile making learning gains at 43% and 29%. Factors contributing to this decline include, but are not limited to gaps in instructional practices, the need for supplemental resources for Tier 2 and Tier 3 Interventions, number of students taking their appropriate grade level state assessment, and changes in staffing.

## What were the contributing factors to this need for improvement? What new actions would need to be taken to address this need for improvement?

The data component that has the greatest gap when compared to the state average was Math Lowest 25th percentile making learning gains at 29% in comparison to the state average. This is a gap of 15 percentage points and contributing factors include but are not limited to gaps in instructional practices, the need for supplemental resources for Tier 2 and Tier 3 Interventions, number of students taking their appropriate grade level state assessment, and changes in staffing.

## What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

The component that showed the most improvement was 8th grade bottom 25% learning gains at 58% in comparison to the prior year of 38%. Actions that contributed to this growth of 20% include but are not limited to changes in scheduling and teaching assignments and collaborative teaching practices.

## What were the contributing factors to this improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

One area of concern from the EWS data is the number of Level 1 students on statewide assessment. Specifically for 7th grade students this number has increased from 75 students to 114. Contributing factors include but are not limited to gaps in instructional practices, the need for supplemental

resources for Tier 2 and Tier 3 Interventions, number of students taking their appropriate grade level state assessment, and changes in staffing.

#### What strategies will need to be implemented in order to accelerate learning?

To accelerate student learning for all students, the school will utilize the following strategies:

- Student Data Chats each 9 weeks
- Increase Explicit Vocabulary Instruction within Context
- Novel Studies and Advanced Enrichment Activities
- Poetry Series and Increased Public Speaking opportunities for students
- Vertical Team meetings and articulations
- Collections and Common Lit Resources (FLVS Curriculum)
- Language Live Reading Program for Reading Interventions
- Oral Reading Fluency Checks
- STAR Benchmark Testing for Level 1 and Level 2 Students

Based on the contributing factors and strategies identified to accelerate learning, describe the professional development opportunities that will be provided at the school to support teachers and leaders.

The school will heavily use common planning times where teachers can create lessons and common assessments that are aligned to the state benchmarks. Teachers will also participate in learning walks to observe other classrooms to glean ideas on classroom management and quality instruction.

Provide a description of the additional services that will be implemented to ensure sustainability of improvement in the next year and beyond.

The school has implemented a fixed homeroom schedule where teachers work with students on positive academic behaviors:

- \* Organization within the student planners.
- \* Knowing how to check grades and homework assignments in CANVAS
- \* Understanding how to write and email and communicate with their teachers electronically.

#### Part III: Planning for Improvement

#### **Areas of Focus:**

#### #1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

#### Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

This area of focus was chosen based on ELA proficiency data from the 2019-2020 FSA assessment scores. The assessment results were that 50% of our students were a level of 3 of above school-wide while 53% of students made learning gains.. This was a 2 percentage point decrease and a 4 percentage point increase respectively from the previous school year. It is our expectation that the use of various progress monitoring strategies, ongoing, communication based on data points, and revision of processes through our professional learning communities will help to refine and improve student performance and teacher instructional practices related to English Language Arts.

## Measurable Outcome:

57% of students in grades 6-8 will score a level 3 or higher on the English Language Arts FSA Assessment. This will be an increase in proficiency by 7 percentage points. Increase overall English Language Arts FSA Learning Gains 6 percentage points from 53% to 59%.

#### **Monitoring:**

We will utilize district progress monitoring assessments, MobyMax, STAR, and Language Live to use data to drive instructional decision making.

#### Person responsible for monitoring

outcome:

[no one identified]

Below are the strategies we plan to utilize in order to achieve our intended outcome:

- · Literacy Night Events for Parents
- Student Data Chats each 9 weeks with students
- Increase in Explicit Vocabulary Instruction within Context
- Student Data Tracking Sheets / Charts
- Novel Studies and Advanced Enrichment Activities

#### Evidencebased Strategy:

- · Poetry Series and Increased Public Speaking opportunities for students
- Vertical Team meetings and articulations
- · Collections and Common Lit Resources along with FLVS Curriculum
- Language Live Reading Program for Reading Interventions
- STAR Benchmark Testing for Level 1 and Level 2 Students
- · Teaching note-taking and organizational Skills
- Common assessments on skills/standards
- Training other departments on reading strategies (NGCARPD)
- Strategic Instructional Model (SIM) Training for Learning Strategies
- Increased Parental Involvement
- · Common Planning to discuss data

Our rationales for selecting the above strategies each relate to the following concerns and correlations:

- Lack of prior knowledge
- · Rigor of reading lessons

## Rationale for

- Focus needed on inference and reading application skills
- Student Reading Endurance for longer text passages

#### Evidencebased Strategy:

- Keyboarding skills
- Oral Reading Fluency
- Integration of Knowledge and Ideas Evaluate arguments and content in diverse formats

Reading Comprehension versus just looking for answers within the text

- Knowledge and Ideas Citing Text Evidence to support conclusions
- Integration of passages (dual passages)

- English Language Learners and Students with Disabilities struggling to interpret information within the text
- Lack of engagement for Digital Academy students due to inconsistent learning environments.

#### **Action Steps to Implement**

School Administrators will work to monitor the trainings provided throughout the year and implementation of target English Language Arts strategies. Administrators will also provide feedback as needed. The following items will also be used to monitor performance:

- District quarterly assessments
- Reading collections
- Benchmark assessments
- Novel study Assessments
- Common Lit Unit Assessments
- Language Live Reading Program
- STAR Testing
- Instructional Coaching for ELA and non-ELA Teachers

#### Person Responsible

Natalee Harrison (harrisonn1@leonschools.net)

#### #2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

## Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

This area of focus was chosen based on ELA Learning Gains data from the 2019-2020 FSA assessment scores. The assessment results were that 42% of our students identified in the bottom 25% showed learning gains. This was a 6 percentage point increase from the previous school year. Based upon our current data and student needs we have committed ourselves in continuing to close the achievement gap for our students that are performing below grade level in English Language Arts. Additionally, there is a gap between the performance of subgroups (African-Americans, English Language Learners, and Students with Disabilities).

#### Measurable Outcome:

53% of students in grades 6-8 classified as being in our lowest 25th percentile will make a learning gain on the English Language Arts FSA Assessment.

#### **Monitoring:**

We will utilize district progress monitoring assessments, MobyMax, STAR, and Language Live to use data to drive instructional decision making.

## Person responsible

for monitoring outcome:

[no one identified]

In addition to the core Tier I strategies that will be used school wide for English Language Arts Courses, the following additional strategies will be used to assist with our Lowest 25th percentile:

- Student Data Chats each 9 weeks
- Increase Explicit Vocabulary Instruction within Context
- Novel Studies and Advanced Enrichment Activities
- Poetry Series and Increased Public Speaking opportunities for students

#### Evidencebased Strategy:

- Vertical Team meetings and articulations
- Collections and Common Lit Resources (FLVS Curriculum)
- Language Live Reading Program for Reading Interventions
- Oral Reading Fluency Checks
- STAR Benchmark Testing for Level 1 and Level 2 Students
- · Teaching note-taking and organizational Skills
- Common assessments on skills/standards
- Training other departments on reading strategies (NGCARPD)
- Strategic Instructional Model (SIM) Training for Learning Strategies
- Increased Parental Involvement
- · Common Planning to discuss Data

Our rationales for selecting the above strategies each relate to the following concerns and correlations:

- Students lack of prior knowledge
- Rigor of reading lessons

## Rationale for

- Focus needed on inference and reading application skills
- Student Reading Endurance for longer text passages

#### Evidencebased

- Reading Comprehension versus just looking for answers within the textKeyboarding skills
- Strategy: Oral Reading Fluency
  - Integration of Knowledge and Ideas Evaluate arguments and content in diverse formats
  - Knowledge and Ideas Citing Text Evidence to support conclusions
  - Integration of passages (dual passages)

- English Language Learners and Students with Disabilities struggling to interpret information within the text
- Lack of engagement for Digital Academy students due to inconsistent learning environments

#### **Action Steps to Implement**

School Administrators will work to monitor the trainings provided throughout the year and implementation of target English Language Arts strategies. Administrators will also provide feedback as needed. The following action step items will also be used to monitor performance:

- District quarterly assessments
- Reading collections
- Benchmark assessments
- Novel study Assessments
- Common Lit Unit Assessments
- Language Live Reading Program
- STAR Testing
- Instructional Coaching for ELA and non-ELA teachers

#### Person Responsible

Natalee Harrison (harrisonn1@leonschools.net)

#### #3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

#### Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

This area of focus was chosen based on Math proficiency data from the 2019-2020 FSA assessment scores. The assessment results were that 37% of our students were a level of 3 of above school-wide while 37% of students made learning gains. This was a 17 and 10 percentage point decrease respectively from the previous school year. It is our expectation that the use of various progress monitoring strategies, ongoing communication based upon data points, and revision of processes through our professional learning communities will help to refine and improve student performance and teacher instructional practices related to Mathematics.

## Measurable Outcome:

Increase overall Math proficiency 17 percentage points from 37% to 54%. Increase overall Math Learning Gains 10 percentage points from 37% to 47%.

#### Monitoring:

We will increase critical thinking skills through the use of problem solving strategies; as a result, students' proficiency rate will increase from 37% to 54% on the FSA Math Assessment.

## Person responsible

for monitoring outcome:

[no one identified]

Below are the strategies we plan to utilize in order to achieve our intended outcome:

- Additional use of higher order thinking questions based upon Webb's Depth of Knowledge
- 3rd quarter morning small group sessions with digital academy students for 60 min
- Use of iXL Math Program school-wide for mastery of 2 curriculum aligned skills per week
- Use of small groups for mastery
- · Use of enrichment and review activities from Go Math Curriculum

#### Evidencebased Strategy:

- Before/ after-school tutorials
- Student Data Chats each 9 weeks with students
- Increase use of Word Problems and literacy/vocabulary strategies
- Celebration of student success/foster a growth mindset for students grappling with challenging content
- Frequent assessments and opportunities to re-assess same skills for mastery
- FSA/EOC Saturday School Sessions
- Professional Learning Communities to analyze student data and plan instructional strategies
- Incorporate Universal Design for Learning

Increased Involvement Strategies

Our rationales for selecting the above strategies each relate to the following concerns and correlations:

Students lack of prior knowledge

#### Rationale

Number Sense learning gaps

for Evidence-

Rigor of Math lessons

#### Evidencebased Strategy:

- · Students lack of math fluency
- Student Motivation/Interest through increase in fluency of basic math fundamentals
- Need for additional Intervention Supports
- Expressions and Equations Solving real-life math problems using equations
- Geometric Concepts Angles, Area, Surface Area and Volume

- Familiarity with online testing platform and online testing strategies
- Students Taking multiple math classes due to missing quality points (PLATO)
- Standards-aligned formative assessments
- English Language Learners and Students with Disabilities struggling to interpret word problems and multi-step procedures

#### **Action Steps to Implement**

School Administrators will work to monitor the trainings provided throughout the year and implementation of target Math strategies. Administrators will also provide feedback as needed. The following action step items will also be used to monitor performance:

- FOCUS grades and comments/Progress alerts for parents
- Review teacher lesson plans for instructional strategies to engage all learners
- Go Math and IXL data reports
- Baseline, Midyear, and End of Year District Course Assessments
- Standards-based assessments by module or quarter
- Student-teacher progress monitoring discussions

Person Responsible

[no one identified]

#### #4. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

#### Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

This area of focus was chosen based on Math Learning Gains data from the 2019-2020 FSA assessment scores. The assessment results were that 29% of our students identified in the bottom 25% showed learning gains. This was a 7 percentage point decrease from the previous school year. Based upon our current data and student needs we have committed ourselves to helping to close the achievement gap for our students that are performing below grade level in Math. Additionally, there is a gap between the performance of subgroups (African-Americans, English Language Learners, and Students with Disabilities).

#### Measurable Outcome:

36% of students in grades 6-8 classified as being in our lowest 25th percentile will make a learning gain on the Math FSA Assessment.

#### Monitoring:

Students in the lowest 25% for Math will increase critical thinking skills through the use of problem solving strategies; as a result, these students' proficiency rate will increase from 29% to 36% on the FSA Math Assessment.

#### Person responsible for monitoring

outcome:

[no one identified]

Below are the strategies we plan to utilize in order to achieve our intended outcome:

- Additional use of higher order thinking questions based upon Webb's Depth of Knowledge
- 3rd quarter morning small group sessions with digital academy students for 60 min
- Use of iXL Math Program school-wide for mastery of 2 curriculum aligned skills per week
- Use of small groups for mastery
- Use of enrichment and review activities from Go Math Curriculum

#### Evidencebased Strategy:

- Before/ after-school tutorials
- Student Data Chats each 9 weeks with students
- Increase use of Word Problems and literacy/vocabulary strategies
- Celebration of student success/foster a growth mindset for students grappling with challenging content
- Frequent assessments and opportunities to re-assess same skills for mastery
- FSA/EOC Saturday School Sessions
- Professional Learning Communities to analyze student data and plan instructional strategies
- Incorporate Universal Design for Learning Increased Involvement Strategies

Our rationales for selecting the above strategies each relate to the following concerns and correlations:

- Students lack of prior knowledge
- Number Sense learning gaps
- · Rigor of Math lessons

#### Rationale for

- Students lack of math fluency
- Student Motivation/Interest through increase in fluency of basic math fundamentals

Evidencebased

 Need for additional Intervention Supports Expressions and Equations – Solving real-life math problems using equations

## Strategy:

- Geometric Concepts Angles, Area, Surface Area and Volume
- Familiarity with online testing platform and online testing strategies
- Students Taking multiple math classes due to missing quality points (PLATO)
- Standards-aligned formative assessments
- English Language Learners and Students with Disabilities struggling to interpret word problems and multi-step procedures

#### **Action Steps to Implement**

School Administrators will work to monitor the trainings provided throughout the year and implementation of target Math strategies. Administrators will also provide feedback as needed. The following action step items will also be used to monitor performance:

- FOCUS grades and comments/Progress alerts for parents
- · Review teacher lesson plans for instructional strategies to engage all learners
- · Go Math and IXL data reports
- Baseline, Midyear, and End of Year District Course Assessments
- Standards-based assessments by module or quarter
- Student-teacher progress monitoring discussions

Person Responsible

[no one identified]

#### #5. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Social Studies

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: This area of focus was chosen based on Social Studies proficiency data from the 2019-2020 FSA assessment scores. The assessment results were that 67% of our students were a level of 3 of above school-wide. This was a 1 percentage point decrease from the previous school year. It is our expectation that the use of various progress monitoring strategies, ongoing, communication based on data points, and revision of processes through our professional learning communities will help to refine and improve student performance and teacher instructional practices related to reading strategies through Social Studies content.

Measurable Outcome:

80% of students will score a level 3 or higher on the Social Studies FSA Assessment. This

will be an increase in proficiency by 13 percentage points.

**Monitoring:** We will use the District Progress Monitoring Assessment.

Person responsible

for [no one identified]

monitoring outcome:

Below are the strategies we plan to utilize in order to achieve our intended outcome:

- Progress Monitoring through Baseline, Midterm, and Diagnostic assessments.
- Student Data Chats each 9 weeks with students
- Evidencebased Strategy:
- Review (Blitz) of content material leading up to FSA assessment.
- Student Data Tracking Sheets / ChartssVertical Team meetings and articulations
- Increased reading and vocabulary comprehension through content
- Teaching note-taking and organizational Skills
- Training other departments on reading strategies (NGCARPD)
- Common Planning to discuss data (where possible)

Our rationales for selecting the above strategies each relate to the following concerns and correlations:

Rationale for

- Lack of prior knowledge
- Rigor of content lesson with and emphasis on reading strategies
- Evidencebased Strategy:
- Focus needed on inference and reading application skills
  Student Reading Endurance for longer text passages
- Reading Comprehension versus just looking for answers within the text
- Oral Reading Fluency
- Integration of Knowledge and Ideas Evaluate arguments and content in diverse formats
- Knowledge and Ideas Citing Text Evidence to support conclusions

#### **Action Steps to Implement**

Administrators will also provide feedback as needed. The following items will also be used to monitor performance:

- · District progress monitoring assessments
- Reading collections
- Benchmark assessments
- Language Live Reading Program for Intensive Reading

Person Responsible

[no one identified]

#### #6. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science

Area of Focus Description and

As one of our top five lowest performing areas in the previous school year it is our expectation that the use of various progress monitoring strategies, ongoing communication based upon data points, and revision of processes will help to refine and improve student performance in science. Building background knowledge in lower grades will also be helpful.

Measurable Outcome:

Rationale:

50% of students in grades 6-8 will score a level three or higher on the State Science or Biology EOC Assessment. This will be a 26 percentage point increase from the previous year of 24%.

Monitoring:

We will use the District Progress Monitoring Assessment.

Person responsible

for [no one identified]

monitoring outcome:

Below are the strategies we plan to utilize in order to achieve our intended outcome:

- Increased attention to the scientific process
- Vertical team meetings
- · Purchase of additional sets of science resources
- Additional incorporation of science labs and literacy strategies

Evidencebased Strategy: • Use of real world science experiments

· Hands-on inquiry based lessons

• Use of instructional computer software and Pearson Textbooks resources

- · Increased use of informational text and reading comprehension strategies
- Teacher training in science teaching and learning
- · Test retake to help show mastery of curriculum
- · Before school tutorials
- Science Field trips and Saturday Sessions
- Increased Parental Involvement

Our rationales for selecting the above strategies each relate to the following concerns and correlations:

Gaps in scientific knowledge

Rationale

Moderate understanding of scientific process

for

Vocabulary and word recognition

Evidence-

Rigor of Science Lessons

based

• Life Science

Strategy:

Nature of Science Concepts
 Deading common Skill

Reading comprehension Skills

• Inability to make connections with abstract content (graphs, charts, variable identification, data analysis)

#### **Action Steps to Implement**

School Administrators will work to monitor the trainings provided throughout the year and implementation of target Science strategies. Administrators will also provide feedback as needed. The following items will also be used to monitor performance:

- County tests: baseline, mid-year, end-of-year exams
- Progress reports
- Performance Matters/ Unify

- Chapter/unit tests
- Standards Based Assessments

Person Responsible

[no one identified]

#### #7. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Discipline

#### Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Based upon previous school data related to academic performance, attendance, discipline, and other Early Warning Systems there is a need for additional attention to be given to designing programs to meet the

psycho-social, emotional, and economic needs of our student population

## Measurable Outcome:

Maintain a safe and orderly school environment by integrating school wide discipline plan through assemblies, incentives, and visual reinforcement of the school wide behavior expectations throughout the campus. Reduce

number of referrals for minority students and reduce number of students with multiple referrals and/or suspensions. Increase the percent of students with attendance rates above 90%.

#### Monitoring:

The MTSS and Discipline team will meet monthly to monitor referrals and talk about student needs

#### Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

[no one identified]

Below are the strategies we plan to utilize in order to achieve our intended outcomes:

- Guidance, parents and student conferences
- Full-time dean of students
- PBIS Committee Chair
- School-wide PBIS Committee
- Increase signage around campus with behavior expectations
- Faculty/staff mentor program for students needing additional support

## Evidence-based Strategy:

- Initiate attendance incentives and recognition each 9 weeks
- Hiring of School Safety Monitor
- Continuation of New Horizons Program targeting character building and conflict resolution
- School PBIS Committee will continue to meet monthly to discuss and plan schoolwide initiatives.
- Continue to disaggregate data by subgroups, times of day, pre-existing conditions, etc in order to fine tune intervention strategies and programs being used.
- Increased Parental Involvement

Our rationales for selecting the above strategies each relate to the following concerns and correlations:

Teacher professional development needed

#### Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

- · Consistent implementation of PBIS goals/incentives is needed
- Reinforces that are based on student interest
- Use of Common language with adults and students
- School-wide discipline data
- School-wide attendance data
- · Early Warning System Data

#### **Action Steps to Implement**

School Administrators will work to monitor the training provided throughout the year and implementation of target Discipline/Attendance/PBIS strategies. Administrators will also provide feedback as needed. The following items will also be used to monitor performance:

- Monthly meetings with PBIS team- PBIS representatives review discipline data with grade level teams
- · Feedback from student mentors- set behavior goals with mentors and monitor progress
- Review of behavior guidelines on a regular basis with students and teachers to ensure appropriate practices are being followed

- Develop behavior checklists/contracts for students needing additional support
- Quarterly review of behavior data (look for trends/implement changes as needed)
- Behavior expectation assemblies will be used to discuss issues and provide avenues for guest speakers to educate our students and staff on social issues, conflict resolution, and respect for diversity.
- Daily attendance checks and Compulsive attendance assessments will be conducted to intervene with students missing more than 10 days in a month or 15 days within a semester
- Perfect Attendance Incentives offered each 9 weeks
- Leaders In Training group will be sponsored and supported monthly to increase student awareness of leadership and career readiness

Person Responsible

[no one identified]

#### #8. Other specifically relating to Arts Magnet Program Development

#### Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

As the premier Middle School Arts Magnet Program, our goal is to provide our Magnet Students with an opportunity to be active participants in their learning process, to engage them in opportunities to explore their individual interests and talents, and to build future consumers and producers of the Arts.

#### Measurable Outcome:

Our Intended Outcome for our Magnet Students include: Initiating the process of producing and managing Arts Magnet Student Portfolios based upon student interests and magnet track initiatives; Increasing the promotion of Arts Magnet Program throughout our community and increase participation in community showcase and outreach areas for Tallahassee; Matching 25% of our Arts Magnet students with an arts mentor; and Hosting one targeted field trip a year for each magnet discipline/school.

#### **Monitoring:**

## Person responsible for

monitoring outcome:

[no one identified]

Below are the strategies we plan to utilize in order to achieve our intended outcomes above:

- Build foundational understandings of the arts through various media sources (i.e. textbook, powerpoint, classroom demonstration)
- Allocate and Solicit additional resources and funding from community partners to build additional program enhancements and bring opportunities to students

#### Evidencebased Strategy:

- Adjust classes as programming enhances from semester to yearlong courses to increase student proficiency.
- Host additional recruitment and interest events to showcase student talents
- Participate in additional community outreach activities to showcase Arts Magnet Program
- Visit local feeder schools throughout the year to highlight course offerings
- Retrofit and/or modify existing spaces to meet the needs of Arts Program.
- Identify additional point(s) of contact to help with development of portfolio rubrics, submission process, and tracking
- Increased Parental Involvement

Our rationales for selecting the above strategies each relate to the following concerns and correlations:

## Rationale for

· Lack of prior knowledge within various Arts Programs

#### Evidencebased

Strategy:

- Lack of specific program based technology
- Need for updated Music Equipment and Materials
- Need for additional Performing and Visual Arts Spaces (i.e. Art Gallery and Auditorium)
- Expenses of Guest Artists
- Impacts on student contact time due to behavior and mentoring pull-outs

#### **Action Steps to Implement**

School Administrators will work to monitor the training provided throughout the year and implementation of target Arts Magnet strategies. Administrators will also provide feedback as needed. The following items will also be used as action steps to monitor performance:

- · Continued use of student performance assessments
- Provide evidence of resource use through additional programming arts showcases
- Tracking skill progression by semester versus yearlong
- Host more arts events on campus and throughout the community

- Continued partnership with Florida State University Opening Nights Program
- · Host more arts events on campus and throughout the community

Person Responsible

Katharine Aylward (aylwardk@leonschools.net)

#### **Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities**

Using the <u>SafeSchoolsforAlex.org</u>, compare the discipline data of the school to discipline data across the state and provide primary or secondary areas of concern that the school will monitor during the upcoming school year. Include how the school culture and environment will be monitored through the lens of behavior or discipline data.

All school needs are addressed through school-wide goals and areas of focus.

#### 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.

Raa would like to see the number of parents that are active in our school grow. Parents are encouraged to help with organizational tasks as well as tasks that involve building positive relationships with students. At this time our parent organization has parents that volunteer for specific organization events. We would like parents to become active members in the mentoring process as well as keep records of parents volunteering in all school wide events.

- •Soliciting feedback from parents regarding their comfort level in contacting teachers and administrators with questions or problems;
- •During Orientation, Open House, grade level nights, etc. introduce parents to teachers and administrators;
- Communicate classroom and school news to parents;
- Positive notes, letters, phone calls home
- Use of social media outlets and text alert systems for parent notifications
- Weekly postings of student performance data on Parent Portal Grading System
- Bi-weekly Rams Connect Newsletter

## Identify the stakeholders and their role in promoting a positive culture and environment at the school.

Marcus Scott - Principal Kelly Lynch - Assistant Principal Kathy Kerrigan - Guidance Counselor Karen Inglett - Media Specialist

#### Part V: Budget

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

| 1 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA            | \$0.00 |
|---|--------|--|--------|
| 2 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA            | \$0.00 |
| 3 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math           | \$0.00 |
| 4 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math           | \$0.00 |
| 5 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Social Studies | \$0.00 |
| 6 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Science        | \$0.00 |
| 7 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Discipline      | \$0.00 |
| 8 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Other: Arts Magnet Program Development | \$0.00 |
|   |        | Total:   | \$0.00 |