

Escambia County School District

Beulah 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	21
Budget to Support Goals	21

Beulah Middle School

6001 W NINE MILE RD, Pensacola, FL 32526

www.escambiaschools.org

Demographics

Principal: Frank Murphy J

Start Date for this Principal: 7/30/2021

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	Yes
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	89%
2020-21 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (50%) 2017-18: No Grade 2016-17: No Grade
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
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. For more information, [click here](#).

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Escambia 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	21

Beulah Middle School

6001 W NINE MILE RD, Pensacola, FL 32526

www.escambiaschools.org

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	Yes	84%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	54%

School Grades History

Year	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19
Grade		C	C

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Escambia 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.

Our mission is to develop an inclusive community of self-confident, innovative, critical and creative thinkers who practice resiliency, show empathy, and take initiative for learning while embracing technology.

Beulah Middle School believes that all students have the ability to learn and be successful. We believe that we have the responsibility to our students to accept them as individuals, to assess their needs and interests, and to provide a varied, well-organized curriculum which will promote positive academic, social, physical, and emotional growth. Students, staff and the community will work together to help every child realize their potential to become responsible citizens and life-long learners.

Provide the school's vision statement.

We strive to...

Be a safe, caring, nurturing environment in which all students can feel supported emotionally, intellectually, and physically.

Encourage critical thinking, integrity, self-confidence, and a desire for excellence.

Achieve academic excellence by embracing technology and encouraging students to try new things in order for them to reach their highest potential.

Recognize that each student is unique. Build positive personal characteristics such as tolerance, cooperation, honesty, and encourage respect for the individual differences that make each of us unique.

Support creativity, individuality, and innovative thinking; in order to prepare students to become leaders who can meet the challenges facing our world both today and tomorrow.

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
Reynolds, Sandra	Teacher, K-12	MTSS/RTI Coordinator PBIS Coach
Seigle, James	Teacher, K-12	ELA Teachers
Speed, Cindy	Teacher, K-12	Math teacher
Britt McCaskill, Marietta	Assistant Principal	Help support principal, staff and school
	Dean	Behavior support

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Friday 7/30/2021, Frank Murphy J

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

0

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

16

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

64

Total number of students enrolled at the school

980

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

11

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

10

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	308	304	367	0	0	0	0	979
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	106	46	60	0	0	0	0	212
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	29	25	67	0	0	0	0	121
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	21	19	0	0	0	0	54
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	22	11	22	0	0	0	0	55
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	54	94	105	0	0	0	0	253
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	98	122	125	0	0	0	0	345
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	29	50	0	0	0	0	88

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	21	19	37	0	0	0	0	77

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	5	10	9	0	0	0	0	24
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	3	5	0	0	0	0	17

Date this data was collected or last updated

Friday 7/30/2021

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	291	378	379	0	0	0	0	1048
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	64	59	72	0	0	0	0	195
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	53	64	0	0	0	0	133
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	16	2	0	0	0	0	23
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	2	26	0	0	0	0	33
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	62	76	76	0	0	0	0	214
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	65	95	86	0	0	0	0	246

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	12	25	31	0	0	0	0	68

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	1	2	3	0	0	0	0	6
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	6	5	0	0	0	0	16

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	291	378	379	0	0	0	0	1048
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	64	59	72	0	0	0	0	195
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	53	64	0	0	0	0	133
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	16	2	0	0	0	0	23
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	2	26	0	0	0	0	33
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	62	76	76	0	0	0	0	214
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	65	95	86	0	0	0	0	246

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	12	25	31	0	0	0	0	68

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	1	2	3	0	0	0	0	6
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	6	5	0	0	0	0	16

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				47%	48%	54%		46%	53%
ELA Learning Gains				58%	52%	54%		48%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				56%	45%	47%		44%	47%
Math Achievement				43%	46%	58%		44%	58%
Math Learning Gains				47%	47%	57%		47%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				46%	43%	51%		44%	51%
Science Achievement				40%	43%	51%		48%	52%
Social Studies Achievement				51%	58%	72%		55%	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	51%	42%	9%	54%	-3%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2021					
	2019	42%	43%	-1%	52%	-10%
Cohort Comparison		-51%				
08	2021					
	2019	42%	50%	-8%	56%	-14%
Cohort Comparison		-42%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2021					
	2019	27%	36%	-9%	55%	-28%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2021					
	2019	57%	50%	7%	54%	3%
Cohort Comparison		-27%				
08	2021					
	2019	30%	21%	9%	46%	-16%
Cohort Comparison		-57%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2021					
	2019	38%	42%	-4%	48%	-10%
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	48%	54%	-6%	71%	-23%

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	68%	52%	16%	61%	7%
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019					

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

We use STAR 360 to monitor ELA and math. Civics and 8th-grade science use Schoolnet for probes and data collections.

Grade 6				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	26.1%	32%	32.9%
	Economically Disadvantaged	21.4%	24.0%	23%
	Students With Disabilities	13.5%	14.8%	10.4%
	English Language Learners	57.1%	80%	50%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	31.9%	43.6%	35.3%
	Economically Disadvantaged	30.8%	41.2%	28.8%
	Students With Disabilities	13.6%	18.9%	6.4%
	English Language Learners	66.7%	80%	80%

Grade 7				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	29.6%	32.1%	33.6%
	Economically Disadvantaged	21.9%	21.3%	25.4%
	Students With Disabilities	6%	14.9%	11.9%
	English Language Learners	66.7%	n/a	n/a
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	39.9%	44.9%	51.9%
	Economically Disadvantaged	31.3%	38.1%	43.9%
	Students With Disabilities	19.6%	14.9%	23.9%
	English Language Learners	100%	100%	100%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Civics	All Students	85.6%	68.2%	64.3%
	Economically Disadvantaged	77.3%	62.2%	55.1%
	Students With Disabilities	62.5%	31.8%	19.1%
	English Language Learners	100%	100%	100%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring

Grade 8				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	28.4%	29%	30.2%
	Economically Disadvantaged	19.5%	21.7%	22.7%
	Students With Disabilities	7.3%	7.5%	2.7%
	English Language Learners	100%	0	0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	39.1%	30.5%	40.6%
	Economically Disadvantaged	36.9%	23.1%	31.9%
	Students With Disabilities	15.2%	8.6%	14.7%
	English Language Learners	n/a	0	0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students	59.2%	66.7%	49.6%
	Economically Disadvantaged	49.2%	58.1%	35.3%
	Students With Disabilities	31.3%	43.6%	17.9%
	English Language Learners	0	100%	0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring

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	22	29	20	21	29	22	23	38	67		
ASN	81	67		69	42						
BLK	29	34	25	21	23	19	26	57	76		
HSP	56	54		42	25		30	82	92		
MUL	55	59	45	46	44	36	53	82	76		
WHT	52	46	32	49	35	27	50	77	77		
FRL	34	37	26	32	29	23	29	63	83		
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	21	56	49	17	35	35	9	29			
ELL	31	58		25	46						
ASN	67	92		60	62						

2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
BLK	29	50	54	24	38	40	24	31	50		
HSP	63	64	64	54	58		38	75			
MUL	51	60		54	63		62	44			
WHT	57	62	52	52	50	51	49	64	67		
FRL	39	53	55	34	42	45	28	39	55		
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

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	44
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	400
Total Components for the Federal Index	9
Percent Tested	96%
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	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
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

Native American Students	
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	65
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	34
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	54
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	55
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	49
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	40
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?

The trend we followed across grade levels and subject areas was our SWD. They have fallen significantly since the last testing cycle. Our African American students stayed close to the same proficiency range as last testing cycle. We do not have enough ELL's for this subgroup this year.

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

The greatest need for improvement is with SWD. With these students coming back on campus for personalized instruction, we can put them in classes and have more ESE support in the ELA and Math classes.

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 attention of the data schoolwide to the teachers, encouraging the use of tutoring by students, encourage remediation by teachers, full ESE staff, and TAS support in the classrooms.

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

Our ELL students showed the most improvement. By the end of 2021, we did not have enough ELL students to count in this area.

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

We are not sure of any contributing factors. Our ELLs are still considered ELL 3 years after they test out of the program. These students were identified through downtown but not at school.

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

In the classroom, we need to teach grade-level skills at grade-level, and scaffold as needed. Since we are now to full ESE support teacher staff, we need to make sure these teachers are in the math and ELA classes to support our SWD.

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.

Our ELA and reading teachers have gone through extensive training on their new curriculum which includes acceleration and scaffolding options. ELA coaches will also be coming around to do walk-throughs.

Math teachers will have a PLC on visual representations and how to use them in the classroom.

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

District coaching and training for ELA will continue this year. The company that has provided the ELA curriculum will also hold pieces of training throughout the year. Our district math coaches will be available to train when needed.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of

Focus

Achievement in Math has not reached 41% proficiency in the following sub groups:

Description and

Economically Disadvantaged (31%), Students with Disabilities (13%), and African American (20%).

Rationale:

Measurable Outcome:

Math proficiency will go from 37% on the 2021 FSA to 41% or higher on the 2022 FSA school wide and for the ESSA subgroups: SWD, African American/Black, and Economically Disadvantaged. The achievement gap in proficiency between SWD and overall students will decrease by 50%, going from 13% on the 2021 Math FSA to 27% or higher on the 2022 Math FSA.

Monitoring:

The data metrics that will be utilized to monitor the Math goal will be district created probes and quarterly progress monitoring, including STAR360. The leadership team will conduct walkthroughs to monitor the implementation of planning, professional development, and remediation. The leadership team will also review school wide data. The team will meet with the teachers to discuss the data and determine future instructional practices and identify needs for remediation or reteaching opportunities.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Wilson Taylor (wtaylor@ecsdfi.us)

Evidence-based Strategy:

1. Teach students how to use visual representations.
2. Expose students to multiple problem-solving strategies

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

1. According to Improving Mathematical Problem-Solving in Grades 4-8 from What Works ClearingHouse, teaching students how to use visual representations shows a positive impact on student achievement.
2. According to Improving Mathematical Problem-Solving in Grades 4-8 from What Works ClearingHouse, exposing students to multiple problem-solving strategies shows a positive impact on student achievement.

Action Steps to Implement

1. The leadership team will meet with teachers to discuss prior year FSA data for overall population and specific subgroups. The leadership team will analyze data metrics from Schoolnet probes and quarterly district tests for progress monitoring, and meet with teachers for data chats.
2. The leadership team will conduct classroom walkthroughs to monitor the implementation of the professional development and planning outcomes. The leadership team will provide feedback to teachers and determine support based on the data metrics and walkthroughs. The team will determine future instructional practices and identify needs for remediation or reteaching opportunities based on the qualitative and quantitative data.

Person Responsible

Wilson Taylor (wtaylor@ecsdfi.us)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA**Area of****Focus**

Achievement in ELA has not reached 41% proficiency in the following sub groups:

Description and Rationale:

Economically Disadvantaged (34%), Students with Disabilities (12%), and African American (28%).

Measurable Outcome:

ELA proficiency will go from 44% on the 2021 FSA to 50% or higher on the 2022 FSA. A long range goal of 41% or higher will be used for the ESSA subgroups including SWD, African American/Black, and Economically Disadvantaged. This year, the achievement gap in proficiency between SWD and overall students will decrease by 50%, going from 12% on the 2021 ELA FSA to 27% or higher on the 2022 ELA FSA. African American students' proficiency goals will be to increase proficiency by 6% to 34%. Finally, Economically Disadvantaged students will increase proficiency to 41% in the 21-22 school year.

Monitoring:

The data metrics that will be utilized to monitor the ELA goal will be district initiated benchmark testing, including STAR360, USATestPrep and quarterly progress monitoring through MyPerspectives SAVVAS (test prep workbooks). The leadership team will conduct walkthroughs to monitor the implementation of planning, professional development, remediation, and acceleration. As the Escambia County School District has adopted a new ELA curriculum for the 21-22 school year, the leadership team will work closely with ELA district personnel to conduct additional walkthroughs to ensure alignment with district curriculum and to plan professional development, as needed. The leadership team will also review school wide data. The team will meet with the teachers to discuss the data and determine future instructional practices and identify needs for remediation, acceleration and reteaching opportunities.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Wilson Taylor (wtaylor@ecsdfi.us)

Evidence-based Strategy:

1. Integrate writing and reading to emphasize key writing features in all subjects, including electives.
2. Provide explicit vocabulary instruction in all subjects, including electives.
3. Intensive creative writing for high level 2s.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

1. According to Teaching Secondary Students to Write Effectively from What Works ClearingHouse (2016), "combining reading and writing together in an activity or assignment helps students learn about important text features" (p. 31).
2. According to Improving Adolescent Literacy: Effective Classroom and Intervention Practices from What Works ClearingHouse (2008), "giving students explicit instruction in vocabulary, teachers help [students] learn the meaning of new words and strengthen their independent skills of constructing the meaning of text" (p. 11).

Action Steps to Implement

1. The leadership team will meet with teachers to discuss prior year FSA data for overall population and specific subgroups. The leadership team will analyze data metrics from SAVVAS probes and quarterly district test, such as STAR360 and USATestPrep, for progress monitoring, and meet with teachers for data chats.
2. The leadership team will conduct classroom walkthroughs to monitor the implementation of the professional development and planning outcomes. The leadership team will provide feedback to teachers and determine support based on the data metrics and walkthroughs. The team will determine future

instructional practices and identify needs for remediation, acceleration or reteaching opportunities based on the qualitative and quantitative data.

Person Responsible Wilson Taylor (wtaylor@ecsdfl.us)

#3. -- Select below -- specifically relating to

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Measurable Outcome:

Monitoring:

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: [no one identified]

Evidence-based Strategy:

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Action Steps to Implement

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

#4. -- Select below -- specifically relating to

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Measurable Outcome:

Monitoring:

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: [no one identified]

Evidence-based Strategy:

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Action Steps to Implement

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

The data from the SafeschoolsforAlex.org is old data. We have since hired a new dean. Our processes are to suspend for major issues such as violent fighting, drugs, or weapons. We also have an MTSS/RTI coordinator on campus who works with RTIb. We have systems in place for Check-in and Check-out. We also have many counselors on campus who help with anger management, trauma, and self-esteem classes and a social worker to help the student and family meet basic needs. We are also utilizing ISS and ILR as much as possible. We use restorative justice procedures to help students transition back into regular class participation without being targeted. Our school is also a PBIS and CKH school and we use a minor referral system before things escalate to a major referral.

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.

We are a Capturing Kids Hearts school. Each year we do a refresher with the whole staff on CKH. We also hold a weekend workshop for all new teachers and anyone who wants in-depth training. We are also a PBIS school and we institute the use of badges through our FOCUS system to award badges for following our school-wide expectations. By using these supports our teachers tend to write fewer referrals. We also use ISS and ILR instead of OSS when it comes to school discipline. Our goal is to keep students in school and learning while serving the consequences of their choices. We believe in using restorative practices in our discipline as well. We use all of our guidance counselors to hold different groups to encourage students to develop tools to use in their toolbox. These groups include anger management, self-esteem, and dealing with trauma. (this includes death in the family) This year we also have a leadership class. This class is led by our CKH coordinator. She has all the high fliers on referrals last year in a class to help develop their leadership in a more positive way and to help them realize the choices they make. Our PBIS committee also uses check-in/ check-out (CICO) for students starting to rise on our radar for behavior. Our PBIS coordinator also follows RTIb and looks in-depth to our incoming 6th graders to see what supports need to be put into place to help students be successful when entering middle school.

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

Administration
 Capturing Kids Hearts Committee
 PBIS Committee
 All Teachers
 School Guidance Counselors
 Navigator- school social worker
 CDAC Counselor
 Children's Home Society counselor
 Children's Home Society psychologist
 MFLAC Counselor- military counselor

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: -- Select below --:	\$0.00
4	III.A.	Areas of Focus: -- Select below --:	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00