

Taylor County School District

Taylor County Middle School



2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	15
Positive Culture & Environment	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Taylor County Middle School

601 E LAFAYETTE ST, Perry, FL 32347

https://www.edline.net/pages/taylor_county_middle_school

Demographics

Principal: Kasey Roberts

Start Date for this Principal: 3/26/2020

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Middle School 6-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2021-22 Title I School	No
2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2021-22 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	2021-22: C (48%) 2018-19: B (58%) 2017-18: B (57%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	ATSI
* 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 Taylor County School Board.

SIP Authority

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

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

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	15
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Taylor County Middle School

601 E LAFAYETTE ST, Perry, FL 32347

https://www.edline.net/pages/taylor_county_middle_school

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2021-22 Title I School	2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Middle School 6-8	No	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	36%

School Grades History

Year	2021-22	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19
Grade	C		B	B

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Taylor 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 Taylor County Middle School is to provide a positive, safe, healthy, nurturing, and respectful environment, in which all students can learn and have the opportunity to become productive members of society.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Our vision is to equip and inspire students to think, create, perform, and advocate.

School Leadership Team

Membership

For each member of the school leadership team, select the employee name and email address from the dropdown. Identify the position title and job duties/responsibilities.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Roberts, Kasey	Principal	Oversee all aspects of the implementation of School Improvement Plan.
Ely, Stuart	Assistant Principal	Monitor all components of the Positive Culture and Climate/Mental Health goal.
Heartsfield, Yvonne	Instructional Coach	Monitor transition to BEST standards for Math and ELA.
Whiddon , Monica	Other	Monitor and analyze EWS and demographic data.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Thursday 3/26/2020, Kasey Roberts

Number of teachers with a 2022 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.*

1

Number of teachers with a 2022 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.*

15

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

36

Total number of students enrolled at the school

624

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

8

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2022-23 school year.

8

Demographic Data**Early Warning Systems**

Using prior year's data, complete the table below with the number of students by current 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	217	199	208	0	0	0	0	624
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	56	65	60	0	0	0	0	181
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	30	30	20	0	0	0	0	80
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	17	14	0	0	0	0	43
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	22	11	17	0	0	0	0	50
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	95	72	62	0	0	0	0	229
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	103	69	55	0	0	0	0	227
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	54	28	40	0	0	0	0	122

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level who have 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	62	59	47	0	0	0	0	168

Using current year data, complete the table below with the number of students identified as being "retained.":

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	2	2	3	0	0	0	0	7
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	17	14	0	0	0	0	38

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 10/6/2022

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	196	210	204	0	0	0	0	610
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	65	68	75	0	0	0	0	208
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	26	23	36	0	0	0	0	85
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	25	44	9	0	0	0	0	78
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	21	14	31	0	0	0	0	66
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	62	62	79	0	0	0	0	203
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	60	54	63	0	0	0	0	177
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	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	0	0	0	0	0	58	60	64	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	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	18	13	14	0	0	0	0	45

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	196	210	204	0	0	0	0	610
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	65	68	75	0	0	0	0	208
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	26	23	36	0	0	0	0	85
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	25	44	9	0	0	0	0	78
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	21	14	31	0	0	0	0	66
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	62	62	79	0	0	0	0	203
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	60	54	63	0	0	0	0	177
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	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	0	0	0	0	0	58	60	64	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	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	18	13	14	0	0	0	0	45

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	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	42%	41%	50%				50%	50%	54%
ELA Learning Gains	39%						55%	55%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	26%						52%	52%	47%
Math Achievement	51%	26%	36%				53%	53%	58%
Math Learning Gains	53%						61%	61%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	54%						52%	52%	51%
Science Achievement	35%	50%	53%				44%	44%	51%
Social Studies Achievement	70%	52%	58%				67%	67%	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	2022					
	2019	43%	42%	1%	54%	-11%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2022					
	2019	49%	48%	1%	52%	-3%
Cohort Comparison		-43%				
08	2022					
	2019	57%	55%	2%	56%	1%
Cohort Comparison		-49%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2022					
	2019	49%	49%	0%	55%	-6%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2022					
	2019	55%	53%	2%	54%	1%
Cohort Comparison		-49%				
08	2022					
	2019	19%	17%	2%	46%	-27%
Cohort Comparison		-55%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
07	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2022					
	2019	44%	42%	2%	48%	-4%
Cohort Comparison		0%				

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019					
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	65%	65%	0%	71%	-6%
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019					
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	82%	52%	30%	61%	21%
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019					

Subgroup Data Review

2022 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 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21
SWD	25	31	19	34	48	44	32	50	64		
BLK	25	36	27	37	47	41	22	65	42		
HSP	50	60		50	80						
MUL	49	46		45	56		43		62		
WHT	49	39	26	57	54	63	39	71	66		
FRL	37	37	21	43	48	50	35	62	51		
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	29	44	40	36	45	43	32	32			
BLK	30	41	33	34	43	43	14	47	62		
HSP	63	63		53	47						
MUL	46	58		57	48		36	44			

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
WHT	51	51	41	54	47	49	44	61	69		
FRL	40	47	39	42	44	43	27	52	59		
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	38	61	56	41	55	50	54	45			
BLK	37	49	35	38	49	37	27	45	90		
HSP	63	79		79	79						
MUL	45	57		34	59		45				
WHT	54	57	61	59	64	58	51	73	87		
FRL	44	54	55	47	58	53	40	61	86		

ESSA Data Review

This data has not been updated for the 2022-23 school year.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	48
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	430
Total Components for the Federal Index	9
Percent Tested	97%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	39
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0

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%	0
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%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	38
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	60
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	50
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
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%	0
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	52
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	43
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Part III: Planning for Improvement

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 has been on the decline for the past three years. Math scores have declined but held steady the past two years. The subgroups of Students with Disabilities and Black/African students are below 41% in the current year.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

The greatest need for improvement are students in the lowest quartile in the tested content area of ELA.

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

Contributing factors were new standards, new curriculum, and 2/3's of ELA teachers were first-year teachers. New actions include increased professional development in the B.E.S.T. standards and Tier 2 students, as determined by the reading plan, will receive supports in the classroom and with an additional course included in the schedule.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

The most improvement occurred in the Civics EOC with an increase of 14% showing proficiency - from 56% to 70%.

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

Civics teacher has participated in professional development over the past two years. Collaborative learning, hands-on activities, and the use of iCivics curriculum have contributed to the increase in student performance.

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

Tier 2 students, as determined by the reading plan, will receive supports in the classroom and with an additional course included in the schedule. The incorporation of ESSA backed programs such as Edmentum's Exact Path in Math and ELA and Read 180/System 44 in Reading will strengthen fundamental skills to help reduce achievement gaps.

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

Professional development in Exact Path for all teachers during pre-planning followed by additional sessions throughout the school year. Read 180/System 44 professional development for Intensive Reading teachers during pre-planning and followed by additional sessions throughout the school year.

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

We are currently in year 2 of Read 180/System 44, which is a 5-year program. Due to continued need, we have expanded the program to serve more students. Professional development will continue for all teachers on implementing and enhancing instruction through the B.E.S.T. standards in both Math and ELA.

Areas of Focus

Identify the key Areas of Focus to address your school's highest priorities based on any/all relevant data sources.

:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to B.E.S.T. Standards

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

Deep Dive into B.E.S.T. standards for ELA and Math.

Measurable Outcome:

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

By the end of 2022/2023 school year, ELA teachers will have fully implemented the B.E.S.T. standards and Math teachers will have shifted from LAFS to B.E.S.T. Success will be determined by a 3% increase in proficiency in both ELA and Math, based on F.A.S.T. progress monitoring data.

Monitoring:

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

Monitored by Instructional Coach and school administrative team.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Yvonne Heartsfield (yvonne.heartsfield@taylor.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

Ensuring that curriculum is aligned to B.E.S.T. standards.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

Will utilize implementation guides for Math and ELA to align our core content to the new B.E.S.T. standards.

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

On-going professional development to analyze changes to the standards, aligned our curriculum to the B.E.S.T. standards, and stacking the standards for effective instruction.

Person Responsible

Yvonne Heartsfield (yvonne.heartsfield@taylor.k12.fl.us)

#2. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Safety and Mental Health

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

Mental health screening shows a significant number of students that can benefit from mental health services.

Measurable Outcome:
State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

Reduce the number of counseling referrals by 5% during the 22/23 school year as compared to the 21/22 school year.

Monitoring:
Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

Mental health professionals will share current data during monthly safety team meeting.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Stuart Ely (benjamin.ely@taylor.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy:
Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

FLDOE mental health curriculum will be utilized for all students across all grade levels.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

State-mandated resource selected by district-level mental health team.

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Assess student need through screener.

Person Responsible

Stuart Ely (benjamin.ely@taylor.k12.fl.us)

Monitor responses to assessment and address identified issues by the mental health professionals.

Person Responsible

Stuart Ely (benjamin.ely@taylor.k12.fl.us)

RAISE

The RAISE program established criteria for identifying schools for additional support. The criteria for the 2022-23 school year includes schools with students in grades Kindergarten through fifth, where 50 percent or more of its students, for any grade level, score below a level 3 on the most recent statewide English Language Arts (ELA) assessment.

Area of Focus Description and Rationale

Include a description of your Area of Focus (Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA) for each grade below, how it affects student learning in literacy, and a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed. Data that should be used to determine the critical need should include, at a minimum:

- The percentage of students below Level 3 on the 2022 statewide, standardized ELA assessment. Identification criteria must include each grade that has 50 percent or more students scoring below level 3 in grades 3-5 on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.
- The percentage of students in kindergarten through grade 3, based on 2021-2022 end of year screening and progress monitoring data, who are not on track to score Level 3 or above on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.
- Other forms of data that should be considered: formative, progress monitoring and diagnostic assessment data.

Grades K-2: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

N/A

Grades 3-5: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

N/A

Measurable Outcomes:

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each grade below. This should be a data based, objective outcome. Include prior year data and a measurable outcome for each of the following:

- Each grade K-3, using the new coordinated screening and progress monitoring system, where 50 percent or more of the students are not on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment.
- Each grade 3-5 where 50 percent or more of its students scored below a level 3 on the most recent statewide, standardized ELA assessment and
- Grade 6 measurable outcomes may be included, as applicable.

Grades K-2: Measureable Outcome(s)

N/A

Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

N/A

Monitoring:

Describe how the school's Area(s) of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcomes. Include a description of how ongoing monitoring will take place with evaluating impact at the end of the year.

N/A

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Evidence-based Practices/Programs:

Describe the evidence-based practices/programs being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each grade and describe how the identified practices/programs will be monitored. The term "evidence-based" means demonstrating a statistically significant effect on improving student outcomes or other relevant outcomes as provided in 20 U.S.C. Â§7801(21)(A)(i). Florida's definition limits evidence-based practices/programs to only those with strong, moderate or promising levels of evidence.

- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs meet Florida's definition of evidence-based (strong, moderate or promising)?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align with the district's K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align to the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards?

N/A

Rationale for Evidence-based Practices/Programs:

Explain the rationale for selecting the specific practices/programs. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting the practices/programs.

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs address the identified need?
- Do the identified practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

N/A

Action Steps to Implement:

List the action steps that will be taken to address the school's Area(s) of Focus. To address the area of focus, identify 2 to 3 action steps and explain in detail for each of the categories below:

- Literacy Leadership
- Literacy Coaching
- Assessment
- Professional Learning

Action Step

Person Responsible for Monitoring

N/A

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 is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies that impact the school culture and environment. 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.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment.

Parents are encouraged to attend special days such as Open House, Band performances, and sporting events, etc. During Open House, we will provide refreshments and set up photo booths to document their participation. We also upload these pictures to social media as a way to encourage others to attend. Homework and class assignments are published through Canvas. Student grades and school activities are posted in Focus for parental viewing. TCMS holds Parent Conference Nights once per nine weeks grading period for those parents who work and have a difficult time meeting during the work day. Parent/Teacher conferences are held weekly for students who may be having academic/behavioral/attendance issues. The ConnectEd phone system is utilized to notify parents of student absences as well as important information concerning school and their student. A Positive Behavioral Support System is in place to reward students for good behavior. All meetings and written notices are provided in a format that all families can understand.

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

Faculty and staff award dog bones to students who are caught doing good, often provide treats and other incentives for the PBS team to use as rewards for our students, and model appropriate behavior and professionalism at all times.