
Table of Contents

| | |
|---|-----------|
| School Demographics | 3 |
| Purpose and Outline of the SIP | 4 |
| School Information | 7 |
| Needs Assessment | 13 |
| Planning for Improvement | 21 |
| Positive Culture & Environment | 30 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 30 |

Ferry Pass Middle School

8355 YANCEY AVE, Pensacola, FL 32514

www.escambiaschools.org

Demographics

Principal: Adrienne Green J

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2021

| | |
|--|--|
| 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) | 100% |
| 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: C (49%) 2017-18: C (49%) 2016-17: C (48%) |
| 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 | 13 |
| Planning for Improvement | 21 |
| Title I Requirements | 0 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 30 |

Ferry Pass Middle School

8355 YANCEY AVE, Pensacola, FL 32514

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 | 100% |
| Primary Service Type (per MSID File) | Charter School | 2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2) |
| K-12 General Education | No | 64% |

School Grades History

| Year | 2020-21 | 2019-20 | 2018-19 | 2017-18 |
|-------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| Grade | | C | 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.

At Ferry Pass Middle School we believe that all students can learn and be successful. Our purpose is to create an environment which will enable each student to understand that learning is a life-long process. The faculty is committed to providing rigorous academic courses that challenge students in order to prepare and equip them to excel in high school, college, and the workforce.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Ferry Pass Middle School believes we are responsible for accepting all students as individuals, assessing their needs and interests, and providing a varied well-organized curriculum which will promote positive academic, social, physical, and emotional growth. We strive to create a safe middle school environment with meaningful educational opportunities that motivates students at all levels to achieve at their highest potential. We recognize that middle school adolescents are experiencing a transition marked by rapid changes in physical growth, relationships with peers and adults, perception of themselves, and formation of values. In conjunction with the family and community, the ultimate goal of Ferry Pass Middle School is to assist in the development of self-confident, self-disciplined learners who can be productive citizens in a global community.

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 |
|------------------|---------------------|---|
| Brummet, Brent | Principal | <p>To provide leadership necessary to design, develop, implement, and evaluate a comprehensive program of instructional and support services which optimize available resources to establish and maintain a safe, caring, and enriching environment to promote student success.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Professional Development for teachers & staff - Lead weekly leadership team meeting · Daily feedback to Math, Science and special area teachers · School Wide Data Analysis (instructional) · Weekend focus email · Lead Department Chair Meeting - Monthly · Lead Faculty Meeting - Monthly - Support Parent/Teacher Activities - Community Partnerships - School Advisory Council - Member of Threat Assessment Team - Evaluate Social Studies/ 6th-7th Science - 8th grade Promotion Ceremony - 6th grade Orientation - Attendance |
| Jackson, Josh | Assistant Principal | <p>To assist the Principal with administrative and instructional functions to meet the educational needs of students and carry out the mission and goals of the school and the District.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Professional Development for teachers & staff - Lead weekly leadership team meeting - Daily feedback to ELA and Reading - School-Wide Data Analysis (instructional) - Weekend focus email - Lead Department Chair Meeting - Monthly - Lead Faculty Meeting - Monthly -Instructional Coach & Guidance - Support Parent/Teacher Activities - Community Partnerships - Works with SRO officers - Assign Duty Stations - Pull & Monitor ELA/Read - Evaluate ELA/Read - Member of Threat Assessment Team - 8th grade Promotion Ceremony - 6th grade Orientation - Attendance |
| Peoples, Natalee | Assistant Principal | <p>To assist the Principal with administrative and instructional functions to meet the educational needs of students and carry out the mission and goals of the school and the District.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Professional Development for teachers & staff - Lead weekly leadership team meeting |

| Name | Position Title | Job Duties and Responsibilities |
|--------------------|----------------|---|
| | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Daily feedback to ELA and Reading - School-Wide Data Analysis (instructional) - Weekend focus email - Lead Department Chair Meeting - Monthly - Lead Faculty Meeting - Monthly -Instructional Coach & Guidance - Support Parent/Teacher Activities - Community Partnerships - Works with SRO officers - Assign Duty Stations - Pull & Monitor ELA/Read - Evaluate ELA/Read - Member of Threat Assessment Team - 8th grade Promotion Ceremony - 6th grade Orientation - Attendance |
| Wesley, Laura | Other | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Serves as the Local Education Agency -Compliance w/ESE -IEPs Transition -Progression Meetings |
| Branch, Dawn | Teacher, K-12 | To teach students subject matter and/or skills that will contribute to their development as mature, able and responsible men and women. |
| Lee, Trey | Teacher, K-12 | To teach students subject matter and/or skills that will contribute to their development as mature, able and responsible men and women. |
| Tomlin, Michelle | Teacher, K-12 | To teach students subject matter and/or skills that will contribute to their development as mature, able and responsible men and women. |
| Andersen, Michelle | Other | <p>Professional Development for teachers & staff (classroom management & safety)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Classroom walkthroughs for behavior - Provide help and support for behavior intervention strategies (major) - Daily communication of ILR/ISS - Communicates with families for disciplinary actions -Supports family/community activity - Work GenEd referrals within the day - Busing (arrival, dismissal, evacuation drills, etc.) - Cafeteria Duty - Review of Placements - Schoolwide Discipline - Assemblies - Hearings - Safety |

| Name | Position Title | Job Duties and Responsibilities |
|----------------|----------------|--|
| Sanders, Kevin | Dean | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - SWBMP Quarterly Data (w/ LST) - Athletic Events - Hold quarterly School Meetings with students - RR Handbook review with students in August (Safe Harbor) - Professional Development for teachers & staff (classroom management & safety) - Classroom walkthroughs for behavior - Provide help and support for behavior intervention strategies (major) - Daily communication of ILR/ISS - Communicates with families for disciplinary actions - Supports family/community activity - Work GenEd referrals within the day - Busing (arrival, dismissal, evacuation drills, etc.) - Cafeteria Duty - Review of Placements - Schoolwide Discipline - Assemblies - Hearings - Safety - SWBMP Quarterly Data (w/ LST) - Athletic Events - Hold quarterly School Meetings with students - RR Handbook review with students in August (Safe Harbor) |

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Thursday 7/1/2021, Adrienne Green 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.*

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.*

8

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

66

Total number of students enrolled at the school

992

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

14

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

14

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 | 296 | 358 | 338 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 992 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 85 | 73 | 78 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 236 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14 | 64 | 42 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 120 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 23 | 10 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 39 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 30 | 30 | 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 76 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 58 | 119 | 123 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 300 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 101 | 143 | 121 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 365 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 38 | 47 | 65 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 150 |

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 | 28 | 41 | 29 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 98 |

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 | 7 | 5 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 15 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 8 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 19 |

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:

| 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 | 326 | 364 | 405 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1095 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 52 | 67 | 85 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 204 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 27 | 91 | 73 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 191 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 17 | 2 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 24 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 96 | 97 | 124 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 317 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 86 | 114 | 129 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 329 |

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 | 55 | 83 | 90 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 228 |

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 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 3 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 17 |

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 | 326 | 364 | 405 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1095 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 52 | 67 | 85 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 204 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 27 | 91 | 73 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 191 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 17 | 2 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 24 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 96 | 97 | 124 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 317 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 86 | 114 | 129 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 329 |

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 | 55 | 83 | 90 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 228 |

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 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 3 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 17 |

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 | | | | 43% | 48% | 54% | 43% | 46% | 53% |
| ELA Learning Gains | | | | 50% | 52% | 54% | 47% | 48% | 54% |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | 39% | 45% | 47% | 43% | 44% | 47% |
| Math Achievement | | | | 45% | 46% | 58% | 47% | 44% | 58% |
| Math Learning Gains | | | | 46% | 47% | 57% | 49% | 47% | 57% |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | 34% | 43% | 51% | 33% | 44% | 51% |
| Science Achievement | | | | 42% | 43% | 51% | 49% | 48% | 52% |
| Social Studies Achievement | | | | 54% | 58% | 72% | 55% | 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 | 40% | 42% | -2% | 54% | -14% |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 07 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 39% | 43% | -4% | 52% | -13% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -40% | | | | |
| 08 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 49% | 50% | -1% | 56% | -7% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -39% | | | | |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 06 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 36% | 36% | 0% | 55% | -19% |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 07 | 2021 | | | | | |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|-------------------|-------------|---------------|-----------------|-----------------------------------|--------------|--------------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| | 2019 | 48% | 50% | -2% | 54% | -6% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -36% | | | | |
| 08 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 25% | 21% | 4% | 46% | -21% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -48% | | | | |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
|-------------------|-------------|---------------|-----------------|-----------------------------------|--------------|--------------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 08 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 40% | 42% | -2% | 48% | -8% |
| 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 | 53% | 54% | -1% | 71% | -18% |

| 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 | 88% | 52% | 36% | 61% | 27% |

| GEOMETRY EOC | | | | | |
|---------------------|---------------|-----------------|------------------------------|--------------|---------------------------|
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2021 | | | | | |
| 2019 | 0% | 47% | -47% | 57% | -57% |

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

STAR was utilized for Fall, Winter, and Spring ELA progress monitoring for 6th, 7th, and 8th grade. The district quarterly assessments were used for math, science, and social studies progress monitoring. The numbers reflect the membership, students tied to the school during both survey 2 and 3.

| Grade 6 | | | | |
|------------------------------|-----------------------------|-------------|---------------|---------------|
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| English Language Arts | All Students | 68/21.4% | 67/21.0% | 59/19.1% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 30/15.8% | 32/16.8% | 30/15.2% |
| | Students With Disabilities | 4/7.1% | 4/7.0% | 6/10.0% |
| | English Language Learners | 3/23.1% | 3/25.0% | 2/20.0% |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Mathematics | All Students | 99/29.6% | 116/35.2% | 100/31.3% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 53/26.2% | 58/29.0% | 55/26.6% |
| | Students With Disabilities | 6/10.0% | 10/16.7% | 8/13.3% |
| | English Language Learners | 5/38.5% | 9/75.0% | 9/90.0% |

| Grade 7 | | | | |
|----------------------------------|---------------------------------|-------------|---------------|---------------|
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| English Language Arts | All Students | 55/20.4% | 45/16.9% | 47/17.6% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 20/13.4% | 13/8.6% | 15/9.8% |
| | Students With Disabilities | 4/9.1% | 3/7.1% | 3/7.1% |
| | English Language Learners | 1/12.5% | 0/0.0% | 1/12.5% |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Mathematics | All Students | 98/35.6% | 92/33.6% | 107/39.5% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 52/29.4% | 55/30.9% | 46/29.7% |
| | Students With Disabilities | 7/15.6% | 7/15.9% | 77/16.3% |
| | English Language Learners | 2/25.0% | 2/22.2% | 3/37.5% |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Civics | All Students | 142/62.6% | 83/29.9% | 57/25.1% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 60/50.4% | 35/23.5% | 21/16.2% |
| | Students With Disabilities | 11/30.6% | 6/16.2% | 2/5.6% |
| | English Language Learners | 5/62.5% | 2/25.0% | 1/14.3% |

| Grade 8 | | | | |
|-----------------------|----------------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| English Language Arts | All Students | 69/22.6% | 62/20.5% | 69/23.9% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 29/17.9% | 21/13.1% | 23/14.8% |
| | Students With Disabilities | 3/7.1% | 4/9.5% | 1/2.6% |
| | English Language Learners | 0/0.0% | 0/0.0% | 0/0.0% |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Mathematics | All Students | 108/34.8% | 102/32.8% | 134/46.4% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 38/25.3% | 29/19.7% | 71/43.0% |
| | Students With Disabilities | 3/6.8% | 7/16.7% | 10/27.8% |
| | English Language Learners | 2/66.7% | 1/25.0% | 1/33.3% |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Science | All Students | 150/52.4% | 170/55.7% | 114/57.0% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 64/42.7% | 79/48.5% | 50/48.5% |
| | Students With Disabilities | 8/21.6% | 12/27.3% | 10/37.0% |
| | English Language Learners | 0/0.0% | 1/33.3% | N/A |

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 | 14 | 28 | 29 | 16 | 22 | 27 | 18 | 19 | | | |
| ELL | 27 | 45 | | 35 | 35 | | | | | | |
| ASN | 57 | 70 | | 57 | 48 | | | 58 | 90 | | |
| BLK | 20 | 29 | 31 | 17 | 24 | 27 | 19 | 21 | 67 | | |
| HSP | 37 | 35 | 21 | 39 | 39 | 57 | 41 | 44 | 58 | | |
| MUL | 39 | 41 | 54 | 39 | 30 | 42 | 53 | 48 | 74 | | |
| WHT | 43 | 41 | 31 | 46 | 38 | 36 | 51 | 45 | 76 | | |
| FRL | 25 | 33 | 33 | 26 | 28 | 28 | 31 | 24 | 74 | | |
| 2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Subgroups | ELA Ach. | ELA LG | ELA LG L25% | Math Ach. | Math LG | Math LG L25% | Sci Ach. | SS Ach. | MS Accel. | Grad Rate 2017-18 | C & C Accel 2017-18 |
| SWD | 18 | 40 | 32 | 18 | 37 | 32 | 25 | 29 | | | |
| ELL | 15 | 41 | | 45 | 32 | | | | | | |

| 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 | 71 | 59 | | 86 | 79 | | 71 | 81 | 89 | | |
| BLK | 28 | 45 | 37 | 28 | 36 | 29 | 21 | 43 | 91 | | |
| HSP | 51 | 59 | 59 | 48 | 45 | 39 | 50 | 63 | 81 | | |
| MUL | 40 | 48 | 36 | 39 | 46 | 37 | 31 | 59 | 80 | | |
| WHT | 54 | 53 | 39 | 58 | 53 | 38 | 59 | 58 | 81 | | |
| FRL | 36 | 47 | 39 | 37 | 38 | 30 | 31 | 48 | 83 | | |
| 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 | 15 | 35 | 30 | 19 | 35 | 24 | 20 | 26 | | | |
| ASN | 70 | 77 | | 82 | 70 | | | 90 | 89 | | |
| BLK | 26 | 44 | 43 | 31 | 43 | 32 | 31 | 42 | 70 | | |
| HSP | 44 | 46 | 31 | 47 | 49 | 44 | 50 | 71 | 67 | | |
| MUL | 53 | 53 | 38 | 48 | 54 | 36 | 64 | 39 | 80 | | |
| WHT | 52 | 47 | 44 | 57 | 52 | 32 | 57 | 62 | 75 | | |
| FRL | 36 | 45 | 43 | 40 | 46 | 29 | 41 | 43 | 79 | | |

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 | 38 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students | YES |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 4 |
| Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency | |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 345 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 9 |
| Percent Tested | 97% |
| Subgroup Data | |
| Students With Disabilities | |
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities | 22 |
| 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 | 36 |

| English Language Learners | |
|--|-----|
| English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | YES |
| 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 | 63 |
| 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 | 28 |
| 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 | 41 |
| 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 | 45 |
| 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 | 34 |
| 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?

According to the Federal Index, our students with disabilities (SWD) are at 29% proficiency, which is 12 percentage points below the Federal Index score of proficiency (41%). According to our STAR data Progress Monitoring projection, 25% of students with disabilities are projected to be proficient. We know that our African American student population is 1 percentage point below the Federal Index as well, primarily in the area of ELA/Reading. Due to the cross-curricular needs of our students in ELA/Reading abilities, this is a primary area of focus. Math achievement for SWD is at 18 percentage points. This presents another critical focus area.

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

According to our data components, the greatest area of need for our school pertains to SWDs in the areas of ELA and math. In 2018-2019 our school was 43% (ELA). In 2018-2019 our math was 45%. Our ESSA projection for ELA is at 29% and our Math projection is at 33%, which presents a downward trend. We see an increase in proficiency in science. Our data shows that in 2019, proficiency was at 42%. It is projected for 57%.

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

Support for SWDs has revealed a need for an adjustment with the scheduled support. We have established an ELA certified ESE department chair to ensure that there is good Tier 1 instruction for all students and accommodations and support are all being provided with the new curriculum in place.

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

We saw an increase in proficiency in science. Our data shows that in 2019, proficiency was at 42%. It is projected for 57%. Current Algebra data shows 95% proficiency.

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

The teachers in these departments purposefully planned together and brought a strong knowledge of the subject matter to their classrooms. Additionally, the Tier 1 instruction supported all learners with mastering the content in these content areas.

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

We now have a strong ELA curriculum as well as supporting Tier 1 instruction. Professional development will also be implemented to support Tier 1 instruction. Remediation is focused and individualized based upon student needs. Screeners will also be used in Tier 1 to develop whole group and small group instruction to support gaps in learning.

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.

Weekly content planning and professional development will be provided from District and school-based instructional staff to support acceleration of learning.

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

Professional development will continue to be provided based upon teacher observation along with quarterly data analysis of student work and student progress monitoring data.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Achievement in ELA has not reached 41% proficiency and learning gains in the following sub groups: Economically Disadvantaged (24%), Students with Disabilities (10%), African American/Black (20%) and ELL (27%).

Measurable Outcome: ELA proficiency will go from 33% and learning gains will go from 36% on the 2021 FSA to 41% or higher on the 2022 FSA school wide and for all ESSA subgroups including, African American/Black, Economically Disadvantaged, ELL, Multiracial, and Hispanic students. The achievement gap in proficiency between SWD and overall students will decrease by 50%, going from 23% on the 2021 ELA FSA to 10% or lower on the 2022 ELA FSA. Students with disabilities will perform at or above the learning gain percentage of overall students.

Monitoring: The data metrics utilized to monitor the goal will be STAR, district quarterly ELA assessments, and school-based assessments. The leadership team will conduct weekly walkthroughs to monitor the implementation of planning, professional development, and remediation. The leadership team will also review schoolwide data twice a month. 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: Natalee Peoples (npeoples1@ecsdfl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy:

1. Provide explicit vocabulary instruction. (strong evidence)
2. Provide direct and explicit comprehension strategy instruction. (strong evidence)
3. Provide opportunities for extended discussion of text meaning and interpretation. (moderate evidence)
4. Integrate writing and reading to emphasize key writing features. (moderate evidence)

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

1. According to Adolescent Literacy: Effective Classroom and Intervention Practices from What Works Clearing House, providing direct and explicit comprehension strategies, and opportunities for extended discussion shows positive impact on student achievement.
2. According to the Teaching Secondary Students to Write Effectively from What Works Clearing House, utilizing writing for a variety of purposes shows positive impact on student achievement.
3. According to 10 Key Vocabulary Strategies For All Students from The University of Texas at Austin/The Meadows Center for Preventing Educational Risk, giving multiple opportunities to encounter and use academic vocabulary shows a positive impact on student achievement.

Action Steps to Implement

The literacy leadership team will meet with teachers to discuss FSA and prior year data for overall population and specific subgroups. The leadership team will analyze data metrics from STAR, district progress monitoring, My Perspectives, and iLit 45 and meet with teachers and students for data chats.

Person Responsible Trey Lee (mlee5@ecsdfl.us)

The literacy leadership team will develop an independent reading plan including metrics and frequency of data collection to support independent student reading. Feedback on reading progress will be given to students on a weekly basis.

Person Responsible Trey Lee (mlee5@ecsdfl.us)

Professional development will include the following: implementation of the new ELA curriculum which includes comprehension strategies, vocabulary, writing, and student discourse. PD will also include a co-teaching model for ESE teachers and data analysis to support MTSS.

Person Responsible Natalee Peoples (npeoples1@ecsdf1.us)

Planning will occur with Gen-Ed teachers, ESE inclusion, and Reading teachers on a weekly basis. District and school-based leadership team will utilize a planning protocol to align Tier 1 instruction to the explicit intent of the standards.

Person Responsible Trey Lee (mlee5@ecsdf1.us)

The leadership team will conduct classroom walks on a weekly basis during the ELA block to monitor the implementation of the professional development and planning outcomes. The leadership team will provide feedback to teachers and determine coaching support based on the data metrics and classwalks. The team will determine future instructional practices and identify needs for remediation or reteaching opportunities based on the qualitative and quantitative data.

Person Responsible Natalee Peoples (npeoples1@ecsdf1.us)

In-depth coaching will be provided to teachers based on qualitative and quantitative data points. The coaching will be focused around content knowledge, comprehension strategies, writing integration, and student discourse. The coaching will be monitored by the School Leadership Team and District Content Specialist to determine the on-going coaching cycle.

Person Responsible Trey Lee (mlee5@ecsdf1.us)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Achievement in Mathematics has not reached 41% proficiency and learning gains in the following sub groups: Economically Disadvantaged (25%), Students with Disabilities (13%), African American/Black (16%) and ELL (35%).

Measurable Outcome: Math proficiency will go from 33% and learning gains will go from 32% on the 2021 FSA to 41% or higher on the 2022 FSA school wide and for all ESSA subgroups including, Economically Disadvantaged, ELL, Multiracial, and Hispanic students. The achievement gap in proficiency between African American/Black and SWD and overall students will decrease by 50%, going from 17% for African Americans/Black on the 2021 Math FSA to 8% or lower on the 2022 Math FSA and from 20% for SWD to 10% or lower on the 2022 Math FSA. Students with disabilities and African American/Black will perform at or above the learning gain percentage of overall students.

Data from STAR360 and core math unit assessments will be collected, analyzed, and reviewed and broken down by teacher and ESSA groups.

Monitoring: The leadership team will conduct weekly walkthroughs to monitor the implementation of planning, professional development, and remediation. The leadership team will also review school wide data twice a month. 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: Josh Jackson (jjackson5@ecsdfi.us)

1. Expose students to multiple problem-solving strategies.

Evidence-based Strategy: 2. Teach students how to use visual representations.

3. Mathematical Language: Teach clear and concise mathematical language and support students' use of the language to help students effectively communicate their understanding of mathematical concepts.

In analyzing the 2019 FSA data and the current 2020 progress monitoring data:
1. lack of mathematical understanding in order to solve word problems appears to be a hindrance to math proficiency. According to Improving Mathematical Problem Solving in Grades 4 Through 8 found on What Works Clearinghouse, explicit word problem instruction proved to have a moderate positive effect size on student performance.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: 2. the inability to use and understand mathematical representation appears to be a hindrance to math proficiency. According to Improving Mathematical Problem Solving in Grades 4 Through 8 found on What Works Clearinghouse found on What Works Clearinghouse, explicit mathematical representation proved to have a strong positive effect size on student performance.

3. lack of precise mathematical language and understanding appears to be a hindrance to math proficiency. According to Assisting Students Struggling with Mathematics: Intervention in the Elementary Grades found on What Works Clearinghouse, explicit mathematical language proved to have a strong positive effect size on student performance.

Action Steps to Implement

Planning will occur w/Gen-Ed teachers and ESE inclusion on a weekly basis. The District and school-based leadership team will utilize a planning protocol to align Tier 1 instruction to the explicit intent of the standards.

Person Responsible Dawn Branch (dbranch@ecsdfl.us)

Professional Development will be provided by the School Leadership Team, District Content Specialist and TSAs. The Professional Development that will be provided will include: Multiple problem solving strategies, use of visual representations, and mathematical language.

Person Responsible Dawn Branch (dbranch@ecsdfl.us)

Following Professional Development and planning, the School Leadership team and/or District Mathematics Specialist/TSA will do class walk-throughs to look for implementation of the professional development and planning and provide feedback to the teachers.

Person Responsible Josh Jackson (jjackson5@ecsdfl.us)

In-depth coaching will be provided to teachers based on qualitative and quantitative data points. The coaching will be focused around content knowledge, word problems and student discourse. The coaching will be monitored by the School Leadership Team and District Content Specialist to determine the on-going coaching cycle.

Person Responsible Dawn Branch (dbranch@ecsdfl.us)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Social Studies

| | |
|---|---|
| Area of Focus Description and Rationale: | Achievement in Civics has been historically below the district and state average in proficiency for the following sub groups: Economically Disadvantaged (24%), Students with Disabilities to include access (19%), and African American/Black (20%). |
| Measurable Outcome: | <p>Civics proficiency will go from 36% on the 2021 Civics EOC to 41% or higher on the 2022 Civics EOC school wide and for all ESSA subgroups including, Economically Disadvantaged, ELL, Multiracial, and Hispanic students. The achievement gap in proficiency between SWD and overall students will decrease by 50%, going from 17% on the 2021 Civics EOC to 8% or lower on the 2022 Civics EOC. The achievement gap in proficiency between African American/Black and overall students will decrease by 50%, going from 16% on the 2021 Civics EOC to 8% or lower on the 2022 Civics EOC.</p> <p>The data metrics that will be utilized to monitor the Civics goal will be district created probes, unit tests, and quarterly progress monitoring.</p> |
| Monitoring: | The leadership team will conduct weekly walkthroughs to monitor the implementation of planning, professional development, and remediation. The leadership team will also review school wide data twice a month. 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: | Brent Brummet (bbrummet@ecsdf.us) |
| Evidence-based Strategy: | <p>Provide direct and explicit comprehension strategy instruction with Civics text. (strong evidence)</p> <p>Provide opportunities for extended discussion of text meaning and interpretation. (moderate evidence)</p> <p>Connect and integrate abstract and concrete representations of concepts in Civics. (Organizing instruction and study)</p> |
| Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: | <p>Students are given multiple opportunities to encounter and use academic vocabulary in natural contexts through listening, reading, speaking, and writing. (Vocabulary for all)</p> <p>According to Adolescent Literacy: Effective Classroom and Intervention Practices from What Works ClearingHouse, providing direct and explicit comprehension strategies, and opportunities for extended discussion shows positive impact on student achievement.</p> <p>According to Organizing Instruction and Study to Improve Student Behavior from What Works Clearinghouse, connecting and integrating abstract and concrete representations shows positive impact on student achievement.</p> <p>According to 10 Key Vocabulary Strategies For All Students from The University of Texas at Austin/The Meadows Center for Preventing Educational Risk, giving multiple opportunities to encounter and use academic vocabulary shows a positive impact on student achievement.</p> |

Action Steps to Implement

The leadership team will meet with teachers to discuss Civics EOC and prior year data for overall population and specific subgroups. The leadership team will analyze data metrics from progress monitoring, and meet with teachers for data chats.

Person Responsible Brent Brummet (bbrummet@ecsdfl.us)

Professional development will include the following: implementation of the Social Studies curriculum which includes comprehension strategies, vocabulary, writing, abstract to concrete representations of concepts in Civics, and student discourse.

Person Responsible Brent Brummet (bbrummet@ecsdfl.us)

Planning with teachers on a weekly basis. The district and school-based leadership team will utilize a planning protocol to align Tier 1 instruction to the explicit intent of the standards.

Person Responsible Brent Brummet (bbrummet@ecsdfl.us)

The leadership team will conduct classroom walks on a weekly basis to monitor the implementation of the professional development and planning outcomes. The leadership team will provide feedback to teachers and determine coaching support based on the data metrics and classwalks. The team will determine future instructional practices and identify needs for remediation or reteaching opportunities based on the qualitative and quantitative data.

Person Responsible Brent Brummet (bbrummet@ecsdfl.us)

In-depth coaching will be provided to teachers based on qualitative and quantitative data points. The coaching will be focused around content knowledge, abstract to concrete representations of civics concepts, primary and secondary source analysis, academic language, and student discourse. The coaching will be monitored by the School Leadership Team and District Content Specialist to determine the on-going coaching cycle.

Person Responsible Brent Brummet (bbrummet@ecsdfl.us)

#4. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science

Area of Focus
Focus Description and Rationale: Achievement in Science has not reached 41% proficiency in the following sub groups: Economically Disadvantaged (30%), Students with Disabilities to include Access(17%), and African American/Black (18%).

Measurable Outcome: Science proficiency will go from 37% on the 2021 SSA to 41% or higher on the 2022 SSA school wide and for all ESSA subgroups including, Economically Disadvantaged, ELL, Multiracial, and Hispanic students. The achievement gap in proficiency between SWD and overall students will decrease by 50%, going from 20% on the 2021 Science SSA to 10% or lower on the 2022 Science SSA. The achievement gap in proficiency between African American/Black and overall students will decrease by 50%, going from 19% on the 2021 Science SSA to 10% or lower on the 2022 Science SSA.
 The data metrics that will be utilized to monitor the Science goal will be district created probes, unit tests, and quarterly progress monitoring.

Monitoring: The leadership team will conduct weekly walkthroughs to monitor the implementation of planning, professional development, and remediation. The leadership team will also review school wide data twice a month. 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: Brent Brummet (bbrummet@ecsdf.us)

Provide direct and explicit comprehension strategy instruction with Science text. (strong evidence)
 Provide opportunities for extended discussion of text meaning and interpretation. (moderate evidence)

Evidence-based Strategy: Connect and integrate abstract and concrete representations of concepts in Science. (Organizing instruction and study)
 Utilizing writing for a variety of purposes including conveying scientific information, making a scientific argument, enhancing understanding of scientific reading, or to share a scientific experience (Writing practice guide)

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Students are given multiple opportunities to encounter and use academic vocabulary in natural contexts through listening, reading, speaking, and writing. (Vocabulary for all)
 According to Adolescent Literacy: Effective Classroom and Intervention Practices from What Works ClearingHouse, providing direct and explicit comprehension strategies, and opportunities for extended discussion shows positive impact on student achievement.
 According to Organizing Instruction and Study to Improve Student Behavior from What Works Clearinghouse, connecting and integrating abstract and concrete representations shows positive impact on student achievement.
 According to the Teaching Secondary Students to Write Effectively from What Works

ClearingHouse, utilizing writing for a variety of purposes shows positive impact on student achievement.

According to 10 Key Vocabulary Strategies For All Students from The University of Texas at Austin/The Meadows Center for Preventing Educational Risk, giving multiple opportunities to encounter and use academic vocabulary shows a positive impact on student achievement.

Action Steps to Implement

The leadership team will meet with teachers to discuss SSA and prior year 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.

Person Responsible Brent Brummet (bbrummet@ecsdfi.us)

Professional development will include the following: implementation of the Science curriculum which includes comprehension strategies, vocabulary, writing, abstract to concrete through labs, and student discourse.

Person Responsible Brent Brummet (bbrummet@ecsdfi.us)

Planning with teachers on a weekly basis. The district and school-based leadership team will utilize a planning protocol to align Tier 1 instruction to the explicit intent of the standards.

Person Responsible Brent Brummet (bbrummet@ecsdfi.us)

The leadership team will conduct classroom walks on a weekly basis during the block to monitor the implementation of the professional development and planning outcomes. The leadership team will provide feedback to teachers and determine coaching support based on the data metrics and classwalks. The team will determine future instructional practices and identify needs for remediation or reteaching opportunities based on the qualitative and quantitative data.

Person Responsible Brent Brummet (bbrummet@ecsdfi.us)

In-depth coaching will be provided to teachers based on qualitative and quantitative data points. The coaching will be focused around content knowledge, labs, writing, and student discourse. The coaching will be monitored by the School Leadership Team and District Content Specialist to determine the on-going coaching cycle.

Person Responsible Brent Brummet (bbrummet@ecsdfi.us)

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.

Based on the SafeSchoolsforAlex report our primary concern for this school year is vandalism, specifically school property vandalism. Our secondary area of concern is out-of-school suspension. The school-based Behavior Team will monitor discipline data through our student information system (FOCUS). District quarterly Progress Monitoring Data Review (PMDR) data will be utilized to focus on office referrals broken down by ESSA subgroups .

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 using the FOCUS Rewards and we have set three school-wide expectations for staff and students (Be Ready, Respectful and Responsible). These 3 school-wide expectations were suggested by faculty and voted on by the faculty. They are being implemented school-wide. Every morning one of these expectations is highlighted and a practical application is shared with the student body. The SGA is working to beautify the school by painting positive, encouraging and inspiring quotes throughout the campus. We are also working to become a PBIS school.

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

- Brent Brummet, Principal
- Joshua Jackson, Assistant Principal
- Natalee Peoples, Assistant Principal
- Kevin Sanders, Dean
- Michelle Andersen, Positive Behavior Coach & RTI/MTSS Coordinator
- Kanika Blankenship, ESE Behavior Coach
- Kaye Worley, School Guidance Counselor
- Officer Kay Shreves, SRO

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: Math | \$0.00 |
| 3 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Social Studies | \$0.00 |
| 4 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Science | \$0.00 |
| Total: | | | \$0.00 |