

Alachua County Public Schools

Fort Clarke 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	10
Planning for Improvement	18
Positive Culture & Environment	24
Budget to Support Goals	24

Fort Clarke Middle School

9301 NW 23RD AVE, Gainesville, FL 32606

<https://www.sbac.edu/fortclarke>

Demographics

Principal: Jared Taber

Start Date for this Principal: 8/9/2020

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
2020-21 Title I School	No
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	55%
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 Asian Students Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: B (58%) 2017-18: B (56%) 2016-17: B (59%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	

* 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 Alachua County School Board.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F. This plan is also a requirement for Targeted Support and Improvement (TS&I) and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CS&I) schools pursuant to 1008.33 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

To be designated as TS&I, a school must have one or more ESSA subgroup(s) with a Federal Index below 41%. This plan shall be approved by the district. There are three ways a school can be designated as CS&I:

1. have a school grade of D or F
2. have a graduation rate of 67% or lower
3. have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

For these schools, the SIP shall be approved by the district as well as the Bureau of School Improvement.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F, or a graduation rate 67% or less. Districts may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing for schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at www.floridacims.org.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	18
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	24

Fort Clarke Middle School

9301 NW 23RD AVE, Gainesville, FL 32606

<https://www.sbac.edu/fortclarke>

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2020-21 Title I School	2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Middle School 6-8	No	73%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	59%

School Grades History

Year	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18
Grade		B	B	B

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Alachua 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.

We believe that it is the responsibility of the faculty and staff of Fort Clarke Middle School to promote academic and behavioral student success by providing a positive, safe, healthy, respectful and culturally responsive learning environment.

Provide the school's vision statement.

To become an "A" school through continuous progress monitoring and feedback supports of all school-wide data.

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 Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Taber, Jared	Principal	Oversee and direct all aspects of school operation.
Hutchinson, Kessler	Assistant Principal	Students Services, Facilities
Criscione, Bessie	Assistant Principal	Curriculum and ESE
Fairchild, Jeff	Dean	Assists APSS, PBIS, Behavioral Data
Hebert, Judi	Instructional Technology	School Site Tech, Research Instructional Materials, Computer Lab Coordination
Rollins, Tameka	Administrative Support	Behavioral Specialist/Academic Tutor

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Sunday 8/9/2020, Jared Taber

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.*

2

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.*

11

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

54

Total number of students enrolled at the school

942

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

13

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

13

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

2021-22

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	325	306	311	0	0	0	0	942
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	68	55	59	0	0	0	0	182
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	14	11	0	0	0	0	31
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	64	49	54	0	0	0	0	167
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	52	39	50	0	0	0	0	141
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	42	46	47	0	0	0	0	135
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	56	40	50	0	0	0	0	146
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	42	46	47	0	0	0	0	135

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	82	0	0	0	0	225

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	5	3	6	0	0	0	0	14

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 8/25/2021

2020-21 - 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	309	314	293	0	0	0	0	916
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	29	52	31	0	0	0	0	112
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	23	20	0	0	0	0	53
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	12	3	0	0	0	0	17
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	2	0	0	0	0	8
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	50	47	86	0	0	0	0	183
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	34	30	50	0	0	0	0	114

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	44	51	62	0	0	0	0	157

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	19	21	31	0	0	0	0	71
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	2	0	0	0	0	5

2020-21 - 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	309	314	293	0	0	0	0	916	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	29	52	31	0	0	0	0	112	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	23	20	0	0	0	0	53	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	12	3	0	0	0	0	17	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	2	0	0	0	0	8	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	50	47	86	0	0	0	0	183	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	34	30	50	0	0	0	0	114	

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	44	51	62	0	0	0	0	157

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	19	21	31	0	0	0	0	71	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	2	0	0	0	0	5	

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	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement				57%	59%	54%	60%	60%	53%
ELA Learning Gains				57%	56%	54%	54%	58%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				49%	41%	47%	38%	40%	47%
Math Achievement				60%	60%	58%	58%	60%	58%
Math Learning Gains				53%	56%	57%	55%	62%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				40%	46%	51%	33%	45%	51%
Science Achievement				61%	53%	51%	57%	56%	52%
Social Studies Achievement				68%	73%	72%	72%	73%	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-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2021					
	2019	45%	53%	-8%	54%	-9%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2021					
	2019	57%	54%	3%	52%	5%
Cohort Comparison		-45%				
08	2021					
	2019	62%	61%	1%	56%	6%
Cohort Comparison		-57%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2021					
	2019	51%	52%	-1%	55%	-4%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2021					
	2019	58%	59%	-1%	54%	4%
Cohort Comparison		-51%				
08	2021					
	2019	34%	27%	7%	46%	-12%
Cohort Comparison		-58%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2021					
	2019	59%	54%	5%	48%	11%
Cohort Comparison						

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019					
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	67%	69%	-2%	71%	-4%

HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019					
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	87%	56%	31%	61%	26%
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	0%	48%	-48%	57%	-57%

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

Alachua Instructional Monitoring System (AIMS) Data is utilized to monitor progress throughout the school year.

Grade 6				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	58.2	60.1	59.3
	Economically Disadvantaged	39.4	44.4	34.3
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	5.3
	English Language Learners	22.2	20	40
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	69.6	33.8	34
	Economically Disadvantaged	56.1	31	24.4
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	0
	English Language Learners	75	0	25

Grade 7				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	56.3	42.9	58.7
	Economically Disadvantaged	38.5	27.4	36.8
	Students With Disabilities	0	11.1	12
	English Language Learners	50	42.9	36.4
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	33.3	55.6	26.1
	Economically Disadvantaged	13.5	36.8	18.6
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	0
	English Language Learners	25	50	0
Civics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	52.6	40.2	32.9
	Economically Disadvantaged	29.9	17.3	14.6
	Students With Disabilities	10.5	7.4	13
	English Language Learners	42.9	18.2	18.2

Grade 8				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	54.6	42.3	47.2
	Economically Disadvantaged	36	25.3	30.1
	Students With Disabilities	33	16.7	5.9
	English Language Learners	50	15.8	43.8
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	17.7	7	28.7
	Economically Disadvantaged	10.7	5.7	26.7
	Students With Disabilities	27.3	8.3	27.3
	English Language Learners	6.3	5	10
Science	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	41.1	34.5	56.6
	Economically Disadvantaged	22.2	24.5	36.3
	Students With Disabilities	0	10.5	15.8
	English Language Learners	14.3	31.3	69.2

Subgroup Data Review

2021 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 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
SWD	7	20	18	10	27	27	20	15			
ELL	35	52		48	48		27	50			
ASN	80	68		72	52		83		64		
BLK	23	34	29	18	24	26	20	24	30		
HSP	57	57	41	54	39	25	47	64	57		
MUL	61	60	21	52	35	9	65	64	57		
WHT	71	59	32	71	46	52	69	81	69		
FRL	28	38	27	28	27	25	27	28	33		
2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	15	43	40	18	38	31	14	25			
ELL	42	52		48	45						

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
ASN	89	85		93	73		89	93	90		
BLK	28	43	47	30	40	34	31	49	60		
HSP	54	58	55	63	53	44	59	61	83		
MUL	65	60	35	56	49	40	62	71	69		
WHT	73	63	58	78	61	52	79	78	80		
FRL	31	45	46	35	40	38	34	49	56		
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	18	35	31	16	31	26	19	24			
ELL	53	58		56	56						
ASN	91	67		86	74		76	100	94		
BLK	28	40	36	25	38	34	16	44	65		
HSP	61	59	35	61	63	33	55	71	70		
MUL	63	54	42	53	55	28	58	73	90		
WHT	76	60	47	75	62	29	76	88	77		
FRL	41	46	39	38	46	32	36	55	61		

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	421
Total Components for the Federal Index	9
Percent Tested	92%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	18
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	43
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	70
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	25
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	49
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	47
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	61
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	29
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?

Achievement/proficiency is fairly consistent within content areas.

Both ELA and Math learning gains decreased as well as performance of students within the bottom quartiles for both ELA/Math. Acceleration decreased by 22% points.

Students with Disabilities and African American students continue to score far lower than other peer group

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

Based off 2020-2021 progress monitoring data and 2021 FSA data, the greatest need for improvement is within our bottom quartile learning gains for both ELA/Math. Also, SWD and African American proficiency is far lower than other peer groups. Social Studies achievement decreased from 78% to 60%.

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

Many of our students were enrolled in Digital learning and did not have access to direct and or differentiated instruction. Other possible factors include: lack of progress monitoring data, standards based instruction, high-quality culturally responsive teaching. Also, not all students chose to take assessments.

New actions necessary- laser like focus on progress monitoring, formative assessment data, data chats, and high quality, rigorous instruction. Supplementary programs will enhance the standards based direct instruction provided to students.

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

In 2019, ELA lowest quartile increased by 11%.
However, no components improved from 2019-2021.

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

This was a result of department-wide focus on utilizing progress monitoring assessment data, common planning, and standards based instruction.

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

Laser-like focus on formative/progress monitoring data, student-teacher data chats, admin-teacher data chats, implementation of department data analysis protocols. In addition to these strategies, we will also utilize supplementary programs to increase access to differentiated instruction within Math and Reading. We will utilize IXL for math and iReady for Reading. Data will be reviewed at both the individual and department level.

We will focus on formative assessment within the classroom and ensure all students are held accountable. Professional learning will include best practices within data analysis, multiple response strategies, and best practices in lesson planning.

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.

Professional learning will include best practices within data analysis, multiple response strategies, and best practices in lesson planning.

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

Laser-like focus on formative/progress monitoring data, student-teacher data chats, admin-teacher data chats, implementation of department data analysis protocols. In addition to these strategies, we will also utilize supplementary programs to increase access to differentiated instruction within Math and Reading. We will utilize IXL for math and iReady for Reading. Data will be reviewed at both the individual and department level.

We will focus on formative assessment within the classroom and ensure all students are held accountable. Professional learning will include best practices within data analysis, multiple response strategies, and best practices in lesson planning.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

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

Area of Focus	
Description and Rationale:	Based off 2020-2021 progress monitoring data and 2021 FSA data, the greatest need for improvement is within our bottom quartile learning gains for both ELA/Math. Increase gains of LQ in ELA and Math. Current Status: ELA LQ Gains 31% , Math 29%.
Measurable Outcome:	Increase ELA LQ gains to 52%. Increase Math LQ gains to 47%.
Monitoring:	Supplemental program data will be reviewed and dis-aggregated (IXL, iReady) Quarterly AIMS data.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Bessie Criscione (criscionebl@gm.sbac.edu)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Frequent progress monitoring during AIMS cycles, reteaching and remediation informed by standards-based assessment data as part of daily instruction. Diagnostic assessment data from IXL and iReady. Frequent data chats as department chair meetings occur bi-monthly, individual interventions as necessary.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	High impact supplemental programs and effective, research based strategies.

Action Steps to Implement

Identify target group. Plan for improvement. Set meeting dates. Share feedback with teams. Provide remediation to targeted groups based on assessment data.

Person Responsible Bessie Criscione (criscionebl@gm.sbac.edu)

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Black/African-American**Area of Focus**

Description and Rationale: Closing the racial achievement gap. Currently, these are approximately 40% points apart.

Measurable Outcome: Increase ELA and math achievement to 41% thus decreasing the gap between races.

Monitoring: Supplemental program assessment data
Quarterly AIMS assessment data

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Bessie Criscione (criscionebl@gm.sbac.edu)

Evidence-based Strategy: Explicit communication of high expectations, common board planning format focus on standards-based lessons. Increase faculty awareness of culturally relevant practices, via African American mentor on campus. Sharing of curriculum and strategies throughout the year at team/faculty meetings.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Will increase overall achievement rates in ELA and Math as well as meet district-wide equity goals.

Action Steps to Implement

Identify target groups, plan for monitoring, Monitor during AIMS cycle, share results with department chairs, data conversations and analysis.

Person Responsible: Bessie Criscione (criscionebl@gm.sbac.edu)

#3. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Equity & Diversity**Area of Focus
Description and
Rationale:**

Reducing OSS for African American students.

**Measurable
Outcome:**

Reduce OSS of AA students by 15%, goal of 85 or less.

Monitoring:

Tracking of OSS data, offer viable alternatives (RESTART Room, ISS), Implement tier 2 and tier 3 interventions, create disproportionate discipline cohort to review data once a month with student services team.

**Person
responsible for
monitoring
outcome:**

Kessler Hutchinson (hutchikl@gm.sbac.edu)

**Evidence-based
Strategy:**

Tracking of OSS data, offer viable alternatives (RESTART Room, ISS), Implement tier 2 and tier 3 interventions, create disproportionate discipline cohort to review data once a month with student services team.

**Rationale for
Evidence-based
Strategy:**

These strategies will allow our student services team to focus on restorative practices that have been shown to reduce future disciplinary incidences. Selected by our District office as highly effective strategies.

Action Steps to Implement

Identify at-risk students, share school-wide plan with staff, monitor OSS incidences, provide restorative opportunities.

**Person
Responsible**

Kessler Hutchinson (hutchikl@gm.sbac.edu)

#4. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	SWD performance is below federal target index of 41% (28%). SWD require supports that ensure success in the classroom and statewide assessment.
Measurable Outcome:	SWD Achievement will meet or exceed 41%.
Monitoring:	Diagnostic data Consult Logs Progress Toward Goals collaborative conversations Quarterly AIMS assessment data
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Bessie Criscione (criscionebl@gm.sbac.edu)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Continue to decrease least restrictive environment, focus on collaborative planning with general education teachers, targeted use of IXL and iReady, and UDL supports.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	These strategies will allow for a multi-tiered approach depending on specific student needs.
Action Steps to Implement	
Identify target group. Plan for instruction. Plan for training of best practices to staff, share plan, monitor assessment data. Remediate as needed.	
Person Responsible	Bessie Criscione (criscionebl@gm.sbac.edu)

#5. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Equity & Diversity

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Increased participation of African American students in accelerated coursework. Levels have not increased over the last three years, additional opportunities needed. This will allow for an increase in other school wide African American goals (ELA/MA) while supporting our district's Equity Plan.
Measurable Outcome:	African American enrollment in advanced coursework will increase by 2% points.
Monitoring:	Number of enrolled African American students in advanced coursework / course. Recruitment Efforts.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Jared Taber (taberjc@gm.sbac.edu)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Removing barriers to access in advanced coursework. Creating an "advanced mindset" of all students as they prepare for high school.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	This will allow students to make independent choices based on their goals instead of past achievement data.

Action Steps to Implement

Review course registrations, analyze minority enrollment. Plan to support current students via mentoring and data chats. Include parents in conversations, planning options. Identify areas of growth, student potential from grades, recommendations and student feedback. PSAT data will be reviewed and analyzed.

Person Responsible Jared Taber (taberjc@gm.sbac.edu)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the [SafeSchoolsforAlex.org](https://www.floridacims.org), 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.

Our school has adopted a school-wide data assessment calendar for team leaders and department chairs and faculty meetings. Common agendas will be used to track the SIP goals at each interval. All departments will create a common PDP that relates to SIP goals. All teachers are trained in Skyward, Illuminate (AIMS) data reporting and will be required to provide interventions for area of focus students identified in the SIP.

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.

At Fort Clarke Middle School, we understand how impactful collective teacher efficacy is and how beneficial it can be to increase student achievement.

Meeting bi-monthly with grade level teams and departments helps increase collaboration, build a common language, and cultivate collective teacher efficacy.

Teachers are acknowledged on both the individual and team level for positive acts of leadership and/or excellence.

As a PBIS model school, students are recognized/rewarded for good behavior. Fort Clarke has redesigned the PBIS Framework to include all areas of the school community. Representation is part of the PTA, SAC in addition to all grade-level teams. An increased effort is underway to build business/community involvement that has been historically low. This is solicited from weekly parent emails, website posts, and marquee advertisements.

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

Principal- Leading by example, development and coordination of scheduling meetings/collaborations.

Assistant Principals- acknowledging/recognizing acts of leadership/excellence within teachers and students.

Deans- Coordinating our PBIS system, training teachers, students, and all school staff on proper implementation. Identifying and rewarding positive behaviors via positive referrals.

Teachers- recognizing and rewarding good behavior, collaborative conversations among peers.

Students/Parents- we will seek to gain input from both groups as we continue to improve our methods of communication and positive feedback supports. We invite both groups to collaborate with our PBIS, SAC and PTA teams to provide input.

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	\$0.00
---	--------	---	--------

2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Black/African-American	\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Equity & Diversity	\$0.00
4	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities	\$0.00
5	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Equity & Diversity	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00