

District School Board of Madison County

Madison County Central School



2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	12
Planning for Improvement	23
Positive Culture & Environment	26
Budget to Support Goals	26

Madison County Central School

2093 W US 90, Madison, FL 32340

<http://mccs.madison.k12.fl.us/>

Demographics

Principal: Amanda Brown

Start Date for this Principal: 5/21/2020

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School PK-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* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students* White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: C (42%) 2017-18: C (52%) 2016-17: D (38%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
Turnaround Option/Cycle	SIG Cohort 3
Year	N/A
Support Tier	N/A
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 Madison 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	12
Planning for Improvement	23
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	26

Madison County Central School

2093 W US 90, Madison, FL 32340

<http://mccs.madison.k12.fl.us/>

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)
Combination School PK-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	78%

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 Madison County School Board.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a school improvement plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F (see page 4). For schools receiving a grade of A, B, or C, the district may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at

<https://www.floridacims.org>.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

The mission of Madison County Central School (MCCS) is to educate all students in a safe, quality learning environment that is centered around establishing positive relationships and academic growth. Teachers and staff will educate the whole child while empowering students to achieve success.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Madison County Central School will provide a supportive and inclusive environment focused on academic growth, accountability, relationship building, respect for others and perseverance that will inspire students to be lifelong learners and positive contributors to the world. We believe all students can experience success.

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
Williams, Rod	Principal	<p>Each school-based leadership team member is responsible for attending weekly meetings concerning instruction and students in the grade level(s) he/she supervises. In addition, the members are responsible for working with the team to develop solutions for identified system problems and intervention plans for students identified as struggling students. The Leadership Team focuses on curriculum, instruction, assessment, and school-wide behavior. Responsibility for administration/faculty communication rests primarily with the Leadership Team and the lead teachers who disseminate information to their respective grade-level team members.</p>
		<p>Rod Williams - Principal - Responsible for attending meetings involving teachers and/or students in grades 6-8 and The Bridge Alternative center, as schedule permits. Also responsible for attending SIT meetings, as schedule permits, and providing the team with overall guidance while addressing system-level issues. He is also responsible for revisiting and proposing changes to the SIP to ensure the document is ongoing and relevant to the school's operation of programs. Ultimately, the principal is responsible for all aspects of the school's functions and activities.</p>
		<p>Yolanda Davis - Assistant Principal (PK-5) - Responsible for attending meetings involving teachers and/or students in grades PK-5 and other grades, as schedule permits.</p>
		<p>Amy Yarick - MTSS/RtI Facilitator - Responsible for facilitating SIT meetings, gathering system level data for presentation, and maintaining folders for students involved in the SIT process.</p>
		<p>Carol Griffin (Elementary), – MTSS Deans of Discipline – Work with school administrators to carry out the school’s mission by helping to provide students with a safe and secure environment. The Deans address students’ inappropriate behaviors and collaborate with students, family members, and teachers to provide a means to help students to become more academically successful.</p>
		<p>Kara Washington – Instructional Coach – Provide leadership and technical support in the planning, development, and implementation of high-quality instructional programs and services.</p>

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		Paula Kauffman - Curriculum Coordinator - Oversees elementary and middle school curriculum and teaching standards. Develops and/or monitors purchased instructional materials, coordinates its implementation with teachers and administrators, and assess its effectiveness.
		Lawanda Jennings - Liaison between Administration and the Pre-K team Timesha Ealy - Liaison between Administration and the Kindergarten team
		Shanieka Pride-Mitchell - Liaison between Administration and the 1st grade team
		Polly Day - Liaison between Administration and the 2nd grade team
		Amanda Willoughby - Liaison between Administration and the 3rd grade team
		Tracy Barnes - Liaison between Administration and the 4th grade team
		Ruth Ann Gardner - Liaison between Administration and the 5th grade team
		Rachel Brinson - Liaison between Administration and the 6th grade team
		Quasheena Knight - Liaison between Administration and the 7th grade team
		Joi Moyer - Liaison between Administration and the 8th grade team
		Heather Welch - Liaison between Administration and the elective teachers
Davis, Yolanda	Assistant Principal	
Kauffman, paula	Assistant Principal	
Washington, Kara	Reading Coach	
Griffin, Carol	Dean	
Bridges, Kathryn	Assistant Principal	
Yarick, Amy	Administrative Support	
Cherry, Melissa	Staffing Specialist	

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Thursday 5/21/2020, Amanda Brown

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

3

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

10

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

66

Total number of students enrolled at the school

953

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.

11

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	89	87	63	86	74	94	151	142	147	0	0	0	0	933
Attendance below 90 percent	36	57	24	28	36	14	50	52	54	0	0	0	0	351
One or more suspensions	0	4	2	2	2	9	2	9	3	0	0	0	0	33
Course failure in ELA	0	8	20	17	11	4	44	24	29	0	0	0	0	157
Course failure in Math	0	12	18	2	3	9	64	6	45	0	0	0	0	159
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	6	38	39	50	65	67	0	0	0	0	265
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	8	43	58	59	55	65	0	0	0	0	288
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	8	21	27	34	62	79	79	84	0	0	0	0	394

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	14	12	6	25	20	40	27	38	0	0	0	0	182

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	18	22	11	12	9	9	25	16	27	0	0	0	0	149
Students retained two or more times	0	7	4	3	8	17	26	17	16	0	0	0	0	98

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 9/21/2021

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	53	55	57	55	44	37	92	88	99	0	0	0	0	580	
Attendance below 90 percent	15	27	3	16	9	10	20	17	13	0	0	0	0	130	
One or more suspensions	0	3	1	0	0	0	2	3	3	0	0	0	0	12	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		

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

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Students with two or more indicators	0	3	1	0	0	0	2	3	3	0	0	0	0	12

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	53	55	57	55	44	37	92	88	99	0	0	0	0	580	
Attendance below 90 percent	15	27	3	16	9	10	20	17	13	0	0	0	0	130	
One or more suspensions	0	3	1	0	0	0	2	3	3	0	0	0	0	12	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		

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

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Students with two or more indicators	0	3	1	0	0	0	2	3	3	0	0	0	0	12

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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				33%	51%	61%	34%	50%	60%
ELA Learning Gains				44%	53%	59%	48%	50%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				47%	56%	54%	50%	44%	52%
Math Achievement				36%	56%	62%	36%	55%	61%
Math Learning Gains				41%	55%	59%	54%	62%	58%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				39%	46%	52%	60%	60%	52%
Science Achievement				31%	47%	56%	35%	47%	57%
Social Studies Achievement				57%	76%	78%	68%	75%	77%

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
03	2021					
	2019	31%	40%	-9%	58%	-27%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	23%	50%	-27%	58%	-35%
Cohort Comparison		-31%				
05	2021					
	2019	23%	46%	-23%	56%	-33%
Cohort Comparison		-23%				
06	2021					
	2019	35%	41%	-6%	54%	-19%
Cohort Comparison		-23%				
07	2021					
	2019	27%	34%	-7%	52%	-25%
Cohort Comparison		-35%				
08	2021					
	2019	35%	44%	-9%	56%	-21%
Cohort Comparison		-27%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	30%	45%	-15%	62%	-32%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	22%	51%	-29%	64%	-42%
Cohort Comparison		-30%				
05	2021					
	2019	22%	44%	-22%	60%	-38%
Cohort Comparison		-22%				
06	2021					
	2019	37%	45%	-8%	55%	-18%
Cohort Comparison		-22%				
07	2021					
	2019	41%	48%	-7%	54%	-13%
Cohort Comparison		-37%				
08	2021					
	2019	19%	27%	-8%	46%	-27%
Cohort Comparison		-41%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2019	18%	42%	-24%	53%	-35%
Cohort Comparison						
08	2021					
	2019	31%	39%	-8%	48%	-17%
Cohort Comparison		-18%				

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%	61%	-8%	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	79%	37%	42%	61%	18%
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.

Grades KG - 5 used I Ready for progress monitoring

Grades 6 - 8 used STAR for progress monitoring

Grade 1				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	16%		
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
Grade 2				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	8%		
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			

Grade 3				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	13%		
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
Grade 4				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	20%		
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			

Grade 5				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	5%		
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			

Grade 6				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	25%	21%	27%
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	39%	47%	40%
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			

Grade 7				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	20%	22%	26%
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	38%	30%	46%
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
Civics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			

Grade 8				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	27%	23%	28%
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	42%	40%	40%
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
Science	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			

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	23	32	20	23	44	46	30	31			
ELL	10			30							
BLK	18	24	32	17	25	30	20	34	63		
HSP	43	41		48	59		50				
MUL	50	50		32	23						
WHT	48	46	21	49	49	64	54	58	55		
FRL	26	29	27	23	30	35	28	40	68		
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	24	36	33	26	36	33	29	44			
ELL	36	50		57	58						
BLK	25	41	47	24	36	39	22	41	65		

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
HSP	48	45		54	55		25				
MUL	60			47	50						
WHT	48	49	40	59	48	29	52	76	44		
FRL	30	41	48	33	37	38	28	48	61		
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	21	35	30	20	46	48	39	50			
ELL	44	38		56	50						
BLK	26	44	47	27	51	57	22	63	81		
HSP	49	55		54	52	60	45	70			
WHT	47	58	68	49	62	73	58	76	86		
FRL	30	45	49	31	52	61	29	64	83		

ESSA Data Review

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

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	37
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	YES
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	5
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	40
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	369
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	93%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	31
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	27
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	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	29
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	47
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	39
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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	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?

ELA/Reading Achievement percentage decreased from 33% to 29%. Historical data shows ELA/Reading Achievement level percentage is typically in the low 30s.

Mathematics Achievement percentage decreased from 36% to 28%. Trend data shows Mathematics Achievement percentage is usually in the mid 30s. 2017/2018 and 2018/2019 Mathematics Achievement remained at 36%.

Science Achievement percentage increased from 31% to 32%. Trend data shows Science proficiency rates have been slowly increasing from 2016/2017 school year.

Social Studies Achievement percentage decreased from 57% to 46%. Trend data shows the achievement level percentage has fluctuated (2016- 38%, 2017-62%, 2018-68%, 2019-57%).

Middle School Acceleration increased from 52% to 63%. With the exception of 2018/2019, trend data shows Middle School Acceleration rates range from low 60s to high 70s.

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

The areas of greatest need for improvement are the following:

Based on FSA/Progress monitoring data:

Science (3rd, 4th, 5th, and 8th Grade)

Math (4th, 5th, and 6th grade)

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

High absenteeism for students and Faculty

Lack of High Quality Instruction

New Actions:

Changes in teacher placement

Common planning and assessments

Professional learning communities which include data analysis and data driven instruction

New curriculum (USA Test Prep) to increase standard based, rigorous questioning

Implement of AVID course to assist students with school readiness and preparation skills.

Increased time and focus in Science for grades 3-5.

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

The areas that showed the most improvement are Science and Middle School Acceleration.

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

New Resource (USA Test Prep) used as progress monitoring and instructional tool.

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

Introduce K12 Lift to focus on planning for instruction that will accelerate learning.
In addition, K12 life will assist teachers direct and guide students with ambitious academic goal setting.
Increase of rigorous grade-level instruction.
Use of intervention only for remediation.
Implement new curriculum (Wonders) with intervention components aligned to the curriculum.

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.

Wonders training
BEST Standards training
K12 Lift
Studies Sync training

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

Periodic professional development of USA Test Prep for common assessments.
iReady Professional development.
Early Literacy coach to assist with BEST standards implementation
Professional Learning Communities, focusing on data driven instruction and effective instructional strategies.
Continue to focus on Science in lower grades. (3-5).

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	<p>Based on iReady and FSA: With the exception of 5th and 8th grade, FSA ELA proficiency rates were in the low twenties. There was some discrepancy between iReady data and FSA scores. For example: 5th grade iReady scores reported 29% of students meeting proficiency. While the FSA ELA proficiency rate was 31%. According to our progress monitoring tool, iReady, 100% of our Kindergarten students were on target to score level 3 or higher on FSA/ELA assessment. iReady showed that 7% of our 1st grade students were not on target to score level 3 or higher on FSA/ELA and 4% of our 2nd grade students were not on target to score level 3 or higher on FSA/ELA assessment. Finally, iReady shows 2% of our 3rd grade students were not on target to score level 3 or higher on FSA/ELA assessment.</p>
Measurable Outcome:	<p>Maintain proficiency rate of 100% on 2022 iReady Diagnostic 3# for Grade KG. Increase proficiency on 2022 iReady Diagnostic 3# for Grade 1 by 2 percentage points. Maintain proficiency rate of 96% on 2022 iReady Diagnostic 3# for Grade 2. Maintain proficiency rate of 98% on 2022 iReady Diagnostic 3# for Grade 3. Maintain proficiency rate of 100% on 2022 iReady Diagnostic 3# for Grade KG. Increase proficiency on 2022 FSA ELA for Grade 3 by 4 percentage points. Increase proficiency on 2022 FSA ELA for Grade 4 by 6 percentage points. Increase proficiency on 2022 FSA ELA for Grade 5 by 4 percentage points. Increase proficiency on 2022 FSA ELA for Grade 6 by 7 percentage points. Increase proficiency on 2022 FSA ELA for Grade 7 by 4 percentage points. Increase proficiency on 2022 FSA ELA for Grade 8 by 6 percentage points.</p>
Monitoring:	<p>Professional Learning Communities in which teachers will receive professional development. Development of common lessons through common planning. Administer progress monitoring assessments and analyze data. Classroom walk-throughs to insure common lessons and targeted interventions are being carried out.</p>
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	<p>Rod Williams (roderick.williams@mcsbfl.us)</p>
Evidence-based Strategy:	<p>We will implement Standards based instruction during ELA instructional time. In addition, we will utilize small group instruction during Bronco Time using Level Literacy Intervention.</p>
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	<p>Small group instruction is a researched based strategy proven to enhance academic achievement and peer relationships. It also provides teachers with the opportunity to provide interventions that will close gaps in students' academic skills. Specifically, the Leveled Literacy Intervention curriculum will be used to supplement ELA instruction in the areas of Reading and Writing for students. It is an intensive, ELA intervention that identifies, and addresses the areas of weakness in Reading and Writing for every student.</p>

Action Steps to Implement

All teachers and paraprofessionals will be trained on the Leveled Literacy Intervention

Person Responsible Latishia Williams (latishia.williams@mcsbfl.us)

Student data (FSA, iReady) will be analyzed using the partnership with K12 Lift and presented to teachers.

Person Responsible Yolanda Davis (yolanda.davis@mcsbfl.us)

Teachers will continue to be provided with professional development for BEST Standards and Expectations and lesson plan development.

Person Responsible paula Kauffman (paula.kauffman@mcsbfl.us)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Mathematics Achievement percentage decreased from 36% to 28%. Trend data shows
Description and Rationale: Mathematics Achievement percentage is usually in the mid 30s. 2017/2018 and 2018/2019 Mathematics Achievement remained at 36%.

Measurable Outcome: Increase school wide proficiency for Mathematics by 5 percentage points.

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.

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.

Implementation of Restorative Justice Initiative.

Focus on full implementation of PBIS Model.

Work to engage parents in PTO/SAC.

Post school level and student accomplishments in local paper and on social media.

Bronco Pride Celebrations every quarter to celebrate student academic accomplishments and positive behavior.

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

Administration:

Principal-promulgate the vision and mission of the school

Assistant Principals-oversee implementation of Restorative Justice initiative and PBIS

Dean-Implementation of Restorative Justice

Guidance Counselor-serve as PBIS School coordinator, teach classroom lessons to reinforce positive behavior.

MTSS Facilitators-offer strategies and opportunities for Restorative Justice

Mental Health Counselors- provide one-on-one and small group sessions for Restorative Justice and counseling

Teachers- Facilitate building relationships in the classroom; provide Sanford Harmony (K-5) and LEAPS(6-8) lessons

Parents-

Staff-

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
Total:			\$0.00