

District School Board of Madison County

Madison County Central School



2022-23 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	17
Positive Culture & Environment	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

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: 7/1/2022

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
2021-22 Title I School	Yes
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: D (37%) 2018-19: C (42%) 2017-18: C (52%)
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	CSI
* 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	17
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

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)	2021-22 Title I School	2021-22 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	81%

School Grades History

Year	2021-22	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19
Grade	D		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.

MCCS Middle will create champions in a safe and caring environment by challenging and inspiring every student to reach their maximum potential.

Elementary -

Our mission is to educate all students in a quality, safe learning environment that ensures student success.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Vision:

MCCS Middle will develop champions with social, academic skills, and confidence to compete in a global society.

Elementary:

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

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
Brown, Amanda	Principal	Principal - Elementary PreK-5th Grades Curriculum Instruction Discipline School Culture and Climate School Safety
Pettiford, Barbara	Principal	The principal is responsible for maintaining a positive and safe environment and ensure that all students receive a quality education.
Anderson, Pamela	Assistant Principal	Assistant Principal - 3rd-5th / Self Contained ESE Curriculum Instruction Discipline
Minor, Christi	Assistant Principal	Assistant Principal - PreK-2nd Curriculum Instruction Discipline
Ward, George	Assistant Principal	The assistant serves as a lead for the science and social studies subject areas. He ensures that the facilities are clean and safe to use. He also assist the principal with curriculum and instruction.
Knight, Quasheena	Teacher, K-12	Mrs. Knight is the team leader for Team Brainy. She disperse information to her other team members that concerns student achievement, attendance, and attitudes. She has also been charged with carrying out the mission and vision for MCCS Middle.
Thomas, Valerie	Teacher, ESE	Mrs. Thomas is the team leader for Team Awesome. She disperse information to her other team members that concerns student achievement, attendance, and attitudes. She has also been charged with carrying out the mission and vision for MCCS Middle.
Bodenstein, Ethel	Teacher, K-12	Mrs. Bodenstein is the team leader for Team Brilliant. She disperse information to her other team members that concerns student achievement, attendance, and attitudes. She has also been charged with carrying out the mission and vision for MCCS Middle.
Brinson, Rachel	Teacher, K-12	Mrs. Brinson is the team leader for Team Bright. She disperse information to her other team members that concerns student achievement, attendance, and attitudes. She has also been charged with carrying out the mission and vision for MCCS Middle.

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Kuntz, Penelope	Teacher, K-12	Mrs. Kuntz is the team leader for Team Amazing. She disperse information to her other team members that concerns student achievement, attendance, and attitudes. She has also been charged with carrying out the mission and vision for MCCS Middle.
Kauffman, paula	Instructional Coach	Reading instructional coach to provide professional development, support to teachers, instructional planning,

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Friday 7/1/2022, Amanda Brown

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.*

0

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.*

1

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

70

Total number of students enrolled at the school

847

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

18

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

18

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	92	81	53	79	71	88	129	135	146	0	0	0	0	874
Attendance below 90 percent	63	50	37	28	49	40	70	74	59	0	0	0	0	470
One or more suspensions	19	22	19	24	23	40	56	39	53	0	0	0	0	295
Course failure in ELA	0	21	12	21	4	5	25	11	1	0	0	0	0	100
Course failure in Math	0	13	12	4	1	7	20	2	14	0	0	0	0	73
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	6	38	40	51	67	67	0	0	0	0	269
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	8	43	59	60	57	65	0	0	0	0	292
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	14	21	21	13	25	26	40	33	49	0	0	0	0	242

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	19	23	11	12	9	10	23	21	27	0	0	0	0	155
Students retained two or more times	0	7	5	3	9	18	24	20	17	0	0	0	0	103

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 7/13/2022

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	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	2	4	2	2	2	9	2	9	3	0	0	0	0	35
Course failure in ELA	51	33	20	17	11	4	44	24	29	0	0	0	0	233
Course failure in Math	3	0	18	2	3	9	64	6	45	0	0	0	0	150
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	1	8	21	27	34	62	79	79	84	0	0	0	0	395

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	2	14	12	6	25	20	40	27	38	0	0	0	0	184

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

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	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	2	4	2	2	2	9	2	9	3	0	0	0	0	35
Course failure in ELA	51	33	20	17	11	4	44	24	29	0	0	0	0	233
Course failure in Math	3	0	18	2	3	9	64	6	45	0	0	0	0	150
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	1	8	21	27	34	62	79	79	84	0	0	0	0	395

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	2	14	12	6	25	20	40	27	38	0	0	0	0	184	

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

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	29%	39%	55%				33%	51%	61%
ELA Learning Gains	44%						44%	53%	59%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	40%						47%	56%	54%
Math Achievement	21%	38%	42%				36%	56%	62%
Math Learning Gains	39%						41%	55%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	42%						39%	46%	52%
Science Achievement	26%	35%	54%				31%	47%	56%
Social Studies Achievement	39%	46%	59%				57%	76%	78%

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
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019	31%	40%	-9%	58%	-27%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	23%	50%	-27%	58%	-35%
Cohort Comparison		-31%				

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	23%	46%	-23%	56%	-33%
Cohort Comparison		-23%				
06	2022					
	2019	35%	41%	-6%	54%	-19%
Cohort Comparison		-23%				
07	2022					
	2019	27%	34%	-7%	52%	-25%
Cohort Comparison		-35%				
08	2022					
	2019	35%	44%	-9%	56%	-21%
Cohort Comparison		-27%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019	30%	45%	-15%	62%	-32%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	22%	51%	-29%	64%	-42%
Cohort Comparison		-30%				
05	2022					
	2019	22%	44%	-22%	60%	-38%
Cohort Comparison		-22%				
06	2022					
	2019	37%	45%	-8%	55%	-18%
Cohort Comparison		-22%				
07	2022					
	2019	41%	48%	-7%	54%	-13%
Cohort Comparison		-37%				
08	2022					
	2019	19%	27%	-8%	46%	-27%
Cohort Comparison		-41%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2019	18%	42%	-24%	53%	-35%
Cohort Comparison						
06	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		-18%				
07	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2022					
	2019	31%	39%	-8%	48%	-17%
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	53%	61%	-8%	71%	-18%
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	79%	37%	42%	61%	18%
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	17	32	28	18	29	35	22	33			
BLK	21	39	39	13	36	40	11	27	40		
HSP	46	61		44	52		46				
MUL	35	47		29	38		45				
WHT	43	50	43	37	44	54	47	58	58		
FRL	27	43	40	19	37	39	20	38	48		
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		
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		

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)	CSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	37
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	334
Total Components for the Federal Index	9
Percent Tested	98%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	27
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	1
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	30
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	1
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	50
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	39
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	

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	48
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	35
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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?

African American students ELA proficiency ranges were 16%-23% over the course of 5 years, in comparison to White students whose ELA proficiency ranges were 47-49%.

Economically disadvantaged students Math proficiency ranges were 22%-30% over the course of 5 years, in comparison to Non-Economically disadvantaged students whose Math proficiency ranges were 34%-50%.

Students With Disabilities Math proficiency ranges were 7%-13% is lower than Students Without Disabilities (34%-39%).

Elementary School data trends

Math 3rd Grade proficiency decreased from 21% to 12% over the past two years.

Math 5th Grade proficiency decreased from 15% to 10% over the past two years.

5th Grade Science proficiency decreased from 22% to 18% over the past two years.

ELA 3rd grade proficiency decreased from 26% to 24% over the past two years.

ELA 5th grade proficiency decreased from 31% to 29% over the past two years.

Middle School data trends

ELA 6th Grade proficiency has varied over the course of 5 years between 21%-35%.

ELA 7th Grade proficiency has varied over the course of 5 years between 24-32%.

ELA 8th Grade proficiency has varied over the course of 5 years between 28%-49%.

Math 6th Grade proficiency has varied over the course of 5 years between 16%-37%.

Math 7th Grade proficiency has varied over the course of 5 years between 25%-41%.

Math 8th Grade proficiency has varied over the course of 5 years between 12%-36%.

Science proficiency has varied over the course of 5 years between 15%-27%

Civics proficiency has varied over 5 years between 35%-67%

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

The Math proficiency on 2022 FSA was 21%. Only 10% of current 6th graders scored proficiency in Math based on 2022 FSA. Only 18% of current 7th graders scored proficiency in Math based on 2022 FSA. Only 25% of current 8th graders scored proficiency in Math based on 2022 FSA. According to Star Progress Monitoring Assessment 13% of current 6th grade students were proficient in Math, 28% of current 7th grade students were proficient, and 31% of current 8th grade students were proficient in Math.

The Math proficiency on 2022 FSA was 12% (3rd-5th). The ELA proficiency on 2022 FSA was 26% (3rd-5th).

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

The following factors contributed to the need for improvement in the area of Math: Retirement of a veteran Math teacher and inability to staff current 8th grade students with a certified Math teacher, inexperienced 2nd year Math teacher, and teacher turn overs for current 6th grade teachers.

Due to teacher shortage and turnover, there were inconsistencies in the both 3rd and 5th grade. Students in 3rd grade were serviced by 3 different teachers during the course of the year. Students in 5th grade also changed teachers 3 times during the school year. Veteran teachers have been transitioned to 3rd and 5th grades in math and ELA.

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

8th grade students showed the most improvement of Star Diagnostic 3: 46% of students were proficient.

4th grade math proficiency increased from 9% to 14% from 2021-2022.

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

Implementation of AVID in 8th grade contributed to improvement in ELA.

Consistency in 4th grade instructional position contributed to the increase in Math.

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

Hire and sustain highly qualified teachers.

Hire a Math Instructional Coach (consultant).

Utilize Professional Learning Communities for data analysis, discussion, and professional development.

Provide professional development for newly hired teachers and current teachers on BEST standards.

Consistency in the instructional positions at each grade level.

Kagan Instructional Strategies being implemented.

New Math curriculum adopted - adequate training needed

Utilization of STEM coach, Instructional Math coach, Early Literacy Coach
Dedicated intervention blocks for math and reading - master schedule

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.

ELA BEST Standards training, Rural Connect Training, Culturally Responsive Teaching Training, Kagan Training, and Teacher Delivery Process and Use of Researched-Based Strategies, Savaas Math Training

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

We will continue to execute professional development in areas of instructional focus. Teachers will peer teach during their professional learning communities which will sustained the teacher delivery process. To provide the necessary support to develop master teachers in each core area.

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 Math

Area of Focus

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

Math has been identified as an area of Focus due to the low percentages of students scoring at proficiency on the 2022 Mathematics FSA and historically. The 2022 Math proficiency on the FSA was 21%. Within grade levels, the proficiency scores are even lower: 10%, and 14%.

Elementary - Math has been identified as an area of Focus due to the low percentages of students scoring proficient on the 2022 FSA Math Assessment. 3rd grade scores 12%, 4th grade scored 14%, and 5th grade scored 10%.

Measurable Outcome:

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

We will increase the Math proficiency on the Progress Monitoring Assessment AP3 from 28% to 33% in 6th grade. We will increase the Math proficiency on the Progress Monitoring Assessment AP3 from 24% to 29% in 7th grade. We will increase the Math proficiency on the Progress Monitoring Assessment AP3 from 35% to 40% in 8th grade.

Elementary - 3rd-5th grade will score at least 25% proficiency on the 2023 AP3 F.A.S.T. Assessment.

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

Review progress monitoring data after each progress monitoring assessment.
Conduct classroom walk-throughs to ensure standard-based instruction is occurring.
Monitor the use of 10 adopted researched-based strategies throughout all core areas
Data chats with teachers and students after each progress monitoring assessment.
Reviewing early warning data monthly.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Barbara Pettiford (barbara.pettiford@mcsbfl.us)

Evidence-based

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

Implementation of Professional Learning Communities in which teachers are engaging in data disaggregation, analysis, and participating in professional development focused on Tier I instruction(10 adopted researched-based strategies).

Elementary- Small group instruction to include Reflex Math and Foundations curriculum during intervention time to address student's Math deficiencies.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the

Our rationale for selecting this strategy is because it has been proven to close the learning gap with similar subgroups that we serve. We used the trend data over a 3 year period for mathematics as the criteria for the selection of this strategy. Providing teachers the opportunity to engage in Professional Learning Communities will allow teachers to learn new strategies to implement with fidelity. During these Professional

rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Learning Communities teachers will work collaboratively to implement research based strategies that will improve core instruction. As Tier I instruction improves, remediation needs of students will decline and student proficiency will improve.

Describe the resources/ criteria used for selecting this strategy.

Elementary-Small group instruction is a researched based strategy that provides teachers with the opportunities to work with students on their individual needs. In addition, teachers have the opportunity to engage students better and correct student thinking concerning subject area content.

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.

Teachers will be introduce to the 10 most effective researched strategies to increase math achievement

Person

Responsible

Barbara Pettiford (barbara.pettiford@mcsbfl.us)

Teachers will participate in a professional development that will trained them how to execute each of the ten strategies effectively during a lesson.

Person

Responsible

Barbara Pettiford (barbara.pettiford@mcsbfl.us)

Elementary - Review PM data after each assessment.

Learning walks to ensure high quality, Tier 1 instruction is occurring.

Bi-monthly PLCs - data review

Person

Responsible

Amanda Brown (amanda.brown@mcsbfl.us)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Student Engagement

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

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

The low performance scores indicated poor student engagement. The data reviewed was the FSA math data for 2022.

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

Math proficiency scores will increase to 25% in all three grade levels (3rd-5th) on the F.A.S.T. Assessment PM3 at the end of the 2023 school year.

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

Data review during bi-monthly PLCs. Learning walks to observe student engagement. Growth in proficiency from PM1, PM2, and PM3.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Amanda Brown (amanda.brown@mcsbfl.us)

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

Kagan structures utilized to increase student engagement.

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

Kagan is a research-based instructional strategy used to increase student engagement which will increase student proficiency. Kagan encourages team building in the classroom which increases the positive culture and climate of the learning environment. We believe if we can authentically engage our students during the learning process they will improve in all content areas and proficiency will simply be a by-product.

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.

All teachers will receive Kagan training during PLCs and Early Release Days. Some teachers received the formal Kagan training during the summer and those classrooms will be utilized for peer observations by those that were not in attendance.

Person Responsible Amanda Brown (amanda.brown@mcsbfl.us)

Learning walks will focus on student engagement. A monthly school-wide Kagan strategy will be focused on during classroom lessons. Feedback will be provided to the teacher after the learning walk.

Person Responsible Amanda Brown (amanda.brown@mcsbfl.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

Instruction in K-2 will place a heavy emphasis on Phonics Instruction and Oral Language. All ELA classrooms will use the UFLI (University of Florida Literacy Institute) Phonics program to improve literacy outcomes for children learning to read. UFLI Foundations is an explicit and systematic program that introduces students to the foundational reading skills necessary for proficient reading.

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

Instruction in 3-5 will focus on filling the gaps for those students with reading deficiencies. LLI (Leveled Literacy Intervention) will be utilized to work with students during their reading intervention block of designated time (TEAM time) and will be specifically assigned to groups of students with the same skill set deficiency. The LLI program provides high-interest reading for the upper grade students to ensure student engagement while working on below level reading skills.

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)

Students in grades K-2 will increase 5% points from PM1 to PM3 on the F.A.S.T.

Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

Students in grades 3-5 will increase 5% points from PM1 to PM3 on the F.A.S.T.

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.

Data will be reviewed after each PM F.A.S.T Data will be utilized to monitor student growth and mastery of grade level standards. Instruction will be driven by each set of data. Intervention groups will be formed and adjusted based on the specific outcomes of each PM F.A.S.T.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Brown, Amanda, amanda.brown@mcsbfl.us

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?

UFLI Foundations - Evidence based program designed by the University of Florida. UFLI incorporated findings from research on word reading development and effective instruction to build an explicit and systematic program for teaching children to read and spell words. UFLI spent two full years developing and piloting each component. After assessing student progress, UFLI found that students who received instruction using UFLI Foundations made significant gains in phonemic awareness, decoding, and oral

reading fluency.

LLI - Fountas and Pinnell's Leveled Literacy Intervention turns struggling readers into successful readers. The What Works Clearinghouse found LLI to have a positive effect on general reading achievement based on a comprehensive review of available evidence. LLI is a supplemental, small group literacy intervention to help achieve grade level competency.

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?

UFLI Foundations - a district-wide need for K-5 has been the low performance of phonics on reading diagnostic assessments; UFLI research shows significant gains in this area.

LLI - Reading achievement in grades 3-5 has been consistently underperforming over the past 3-5 years. Research shows that LLI has a significant impact on reading achievement.

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
Literacy Coaching - The district literacy coach will assist with classroom observations and feedback to determine areas of strength and weakness in ELA instruction K-5. Model classroom visits will be arranged by the literacy coach, with specific lookfors for those teachers observing in those classrooms. The literacy coach will attend bimonthly PLCs to ensure proper planning and data driven instruction is evident in instruction.	Kauffman, paula, paula.kauffman@mcsbfl.us
Professional Learning	
The State Regional Literacy Director will be utilized to provide professional learning in the area of strong Tier 1 instruction. The literacy director will assist administration with learning walks to ensure that the administration is consistently looking for those components of strong Tier 1 instruction.	Brown, Amanda, amanda.brown@mcsbfl.us

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.

Elementary School -

Administrative support to all staff members - Everyone feels valued and supported by administration including office staff, custodial staff, food service staff, health services, student services, paraprofessionals, and teachers.

Expectations for all students - We created the Bronco Beliefs that are in every classroom and repeated every morning on the morning announcements. These are the core beliefs of the MCCS Elementary Broncos.

Physical Environment - clean campus, expectations of everyone helping to keep the campus clean, creation of wall murals to bring the school to life, along with positive saying banners placed throughout the hallways

Parent Involvement - we are encouraging parent/family involvement

Pick 5 - Teachers are picking 5 students each week to make a phone call home with something positive to say about that student.

Bronco Bucks - students can earn Bronco Bucks for displaying good behavior and character

Placement of Administrative Offices in the hallways - this provides instant support to the staff and allows admin to be fully immersed in the daily routines of the school and classrooms.

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

Elementary School

Administration - support to all staff members

Staff - Pick 5

Students - ensuring the campus is clean and respecting the property

Parents - supportive to students and staff

School Volunteers - assisting with supporting students, staff, and assisting with campus beautification

Community members - providing assistance within the schools with academics and staff morale