

Sarasota County Schools

# Booker Middle School



## 2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

---

## Table of Contents

---

|   |           |
|---|-----------|
| <b>School Demographics</b>                | <b>3</b>  |
| <b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>     | <b>4</b>  |
| <b>School Information</b>                 | <b>7</b>  |
| <b>Needs Assessment</b>                   | <b>14</b> |
| <b>Planning for Improvement</b>           | <b>18</b> |
| <b>Positive Culture &amp; Environment</b> | <b>0</b>  |
| <b>Budget to Support Goals</b>            | <b>0</b>  |

# Booker Middle School

2250 MYRTLE ST, Sarasota, FL 34234

www.sarasotacountyschools.net/bookermiddle

## Demographics

Principal: Lashawn Frost

Start Date for this Principal: 9/18/2022

|  |  |
|--|--|
| <b>2019-20 Status</b><br>(per MSID File)   | Active   |
| <b>School Type and Grades Served</b><br>(per MSID File)  | Middle School<br>6-8   |
| <b>Primary Service Type</b><br>(per MSID File)   | K-12 General Education   |
| <b>2021-22 Title I School</b>  | Yes  |
| <b>2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b><br>(as reported on Survey 3)  | 82%  |
| <b>2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b><br>(subgroups with 10 or more students)<br>(subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Students With Disabilities*<br>English Language Learners*<br>Black/African American Students<br>Hispanic Students<br>Multiracial Students<br>White Students<br>Economically Disadvantaged Students |
| <b>School Grades History</b>   | 2021-22: C (48%)<br>2018-19: B (57%)<br>2017-18: B (56%)   |
| <b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>  |  |
| <b>SI Region</b>   | Central  |
| <b>Regional Executive Director</b>   | <a href="#">Lucinda Thompson</a>   |
| <b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>   | N/A  |
| <b>Year</b>  |  |
| <b>Support Tier</b>  |  |
| <b>ESSA Status</b>   | ATSI   |
| * As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, <a href="#">click here</a> .   |  |

## School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Sarasota 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](http://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

---

|                                       |           |
|---------------------------------------|-----------|
| <b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b> | <b>4</b>  |
| <b>School Information</b>             | <b>7</b>  |
| <b>Needs Assessment</b>               | <b>14</b> |
| <b>Planning for Improvement</b>       | <b>18</b> |
| <b>Title I Requirements</b>           | <b>0</b>  |
| <b>Budget to Support Goals</b>        | <b>0</b>  |

## Booker Middle School

2250 MYRTLE ST, Sarasota, FL 34234

www.sarasotacountyschools.net/bookermiddle

### School Demographics

| School Type and Grades Served<br>(per MSID File) | 2021-22 Title I School | 2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate<br>(as reported on Survey 3) |
|--|------------------------|--|
| Middle School<br>6-8                             | Yes                    | 82%  |
| Primary Service Type<br>(per MSID File)          | Charter School         | 2018-19 Minority Rate<br>(Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)               |
| K-12 General Education                           | No                     | 80%  |

### 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 Sarasota 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 Booker Middle School is simple: "High Expectation for All"

**Provide the school's vision statement.**

The vision of Booker Middle School is: "Inspiring Tomorrow's Leaders" and Engaging Community and Families.

### 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  |
|-------------------|---------------------|--|
| Frost, LaShawn    | Principal           | Dr. Frost provides strategic direction for the staff, students, and parents of Booker Middle School. Other key roles involve overseeing standardized curricula, assessing teaching methods, monitoring student achievement, encouraging parent involvement, revising policies and procedures, overseeing the school budget, hiring and evaluating staff, and overseeing facilities.  |
| Quintana, Tina    | Assistant Principal | Ms. Quintana serves and the PDAP (Professional Development Assistant Principal). Her role is to oversee professional development for the Booker Middle School staff to maximize student learning, support instruction, manage and analyze data, and support teachers and staff implementing curriculum. She coordinates with the principal to assist in defining and enforcing school policies and guidelines for students, staff, and faculty.  |
| Leal, Daniel      | Assistant Principal | Mr. Leal serves and the PBIS/ESE AP (Positive Behavior and Intervention Support/Exceptional Student Education Assistant Principal). His role is to oversee student and faculty safety/security. oversee the ESE department, coordinate with the behavior and student support staff, as well as provide instructional guidance to teachers and staff. He coordinates with the principal to assist in defining and enforcing school policies and guidelines for students, staff, and faculty.  |
| Ard, Holly        | Other               | Mrs. Ard, the Academic Interventionist, oversees the MTSS System at Booker Middle School. As an academic interventionist, her job duties include monitoring the progress of all the students and identifying those who are having learning issues, academic. attendance, and/or behavior concerns.   |
| Roediger, Charles | Other               | Mr. Roediger, the ESE Liaison, provides services, coaching, and technical assistance to staff members who work with mainstreamed ESE students. He provides assistance and information to parents of ESE students, crisis intervention services to all ESE staff/students as needed, conducts observations for students considered for placement, and conducts the staffing process to ensure that required procedures related to evaluation, eligibility, and service delivery for students with disabilities are fulfilled. Additionally, he supports ESE staff in professional development, writing and implementing IEPs, coordinating with departments, agencies, and families, and maintaining accurate ESE records/timelines to ensure the school is in compliance with laws and procedures. |
| Clark, Tracey     | School Counselor    | Mrs. Clark, the Guidance Counselor, oversees and fulfills a guidance program designed to allow students to voice concerns without fear of punishment or judgment, analyze student performance in class and identify sources of problems by getting to know the students and their unique needs in order to offer specialized solutions. She helps students develop a plan for their academic career that corresponds with their skills and interests, hosts  |



| Name                 | Position Title             | Job Duties and Responsibilities  |
|----------------------|----------------------------|--|
|                      |                            | crisis intervention and prevention programs, facilitates communication between parents, teachers, administrators, and students about behavior and academic problems, and assists with school programs and events.  |
| McClintock, Nathalie | Attendance/<br>Social Work | Mrs. McClintock serves as our Home School Liaison and oversees Attendance. Her role is to connect with families and students to provide counseling to individual students at assigned schools having emotional, social, behavioral or attendance problems, to assist in the referral process of students or parents to appropriate agencies for families/students in need, and to provide consultation/collaborative services to teachers, principals, counselors and other school personnel. Additionally, she performs classroom observation for SWST/CARE, makes home visits, and prepares and maintains records. |
| Thomas, Wendy        | Other                      | Ms. Thomas, the Behavior Interventionist, works collaboratively with the staff to implement a school-wide PBIS plan. The PBIS plan is designed to impact the learning culture of our school, while impacting academics, attendance, and behaviors in a positive manner. She works with the Behavior Team to assist students with day to day activities, monitor their behavior, record and collect data on students' progress, and provide ongoing communication with students and parents.  |
| Wise, Jennifer       | Other                      | Ms. Wise, the Instructional Facilitator, is our full-time district support personnel who works with our staff daily. She supports teachers and administrators in using data to improve instruction, provides coaching for teachers with direct impact to their instruction, supports students with intervention, and plans the academic coaching period for all grade levels.  |
| Lee, Stephanie       | Reading Coach              | Ms. Lee, the Reading Coach and Department Chair, supports teachers and administrators in using data to improve instruction on all levels. As a Reading Coach, she assists with the implementation of professional development, supports coaching plans for teachers to ensure student improvement, reviews and analyzes data with the grade level teams to drive instructional decisions, and contributes to the development and systems to improve teacher practice within the school.  |
| Dubose, Deanna       | Science Coach              | Mrs. Dubose, the Science Coach and Department Chair, supports teachers and administrators in using data to improve instruction on all levels. As a Science Coach, she assists with the implementation of professional development, supports coaching plans for teachers to ensure student improvement, reviews and analyzes data with the grade level teams to drive instructional decisions, and contributes to the development and systems to improve teacher practice within the school.  |

| Name              | Position Title      | Job Duties and Responsibilities  |
|-------------------|---------------------|--|
| Cohen, Allison    | Math Coach          | Ms. Cohen, the Math Coach and Department Chair, supports teachers and administrators in using data to improve instruction on all levels. As a Math Coach, she assists with the implementation of professional development, supports coaching plans for teachers to ensure student improvement, reviews and analyzes data with the grade level teams to drive instructional decisions, and contributes to the development and systems to improve teacher practice within the school.  |
| Scherzer, Jessica | Instructional Coach | Mrs. Scherzer, the Social Studies Coach and Department Chair, supports teachers and administrators in using data to improve instruction on all levels. As a Social Studies Coach, she assists with the implementation of professional development, supports coaching plans for teachers to ensure student improvement, reviews and analyzes data with the grade level teams to drive instructional decisions, and contributes to the development and systems to improve teacher practice within the school.  |
| Mills, Carrie     | Other               | Ms. Mills, the VPA Curriculum Leader, supports teachers and administrators with the Visual and Performing Arts programs at Booker Middle School. As a VPA Leader, she assists with the implementation of professional development, supports coaching plans for teachers to ensure student improvement, and contributes to the development and systems to improve teacher practice within the school. Additionally, she connects with local organizations and the VPA Coordinator to inform the community of events, bring organizations into the school, recruit new students, and create a program that is comprehensive and sets students up for success when they move on to the high school VPA program. |
| Ramos, Alba       | Other               | Mrs. Ramos, the ESOL Liaison, provides services. coaching and technical assistance teachers and staff working with ESOL students. She offers engagement opportunities for families to connect with Booker Middle School. Additionally, she coordinates with staff to provide services for ESOL students, provides all required ESOL assessments, maintains records, complies with district and state guidelines, and coordinates translation services for families and staff for communication.  |

### Demographic Information

#### Principal start date

Sunday 9/18/2022, Lashawn Frost

**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.*

21

**Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school**

72

**Total number of students enrolled at the school**

960

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

16

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

14

### 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 | 329 | 316 | 315 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 960   |
| Attendance below 90 percent                              | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 72  | 102 | 122 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 296   |
| One or more suspensions                                  | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 28  | 47  | 53  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 128   |
| Course failure in ELA                                    | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 43  | 26  | 23  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 92    |
| Course failure in Math                                   | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 41  | 22  | 18  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 81    |
| Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment             | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 92  | 80  | 108 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 280   |
| Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment            | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 103 | 91  | 97  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 291   |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 72  | 113 | 114 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 299   |

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 | 157 | 171 | 173 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 501   |

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 | 4 | 4  | 4  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 12 |       |
| Students retained two or more times | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 10 | 19 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 37 |       |

**Date this data was collected or last updated**

Sunday 9/18/2022

**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 | 300 | 313 | 299 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 912 |       |
| Attendance below 90 percent                              | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 23  | 34  | 3   | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 60  |       |
| One or more suspensions                                  | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 20  | 30  | 27  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 77  |       |
| Course failure in ELA                                    | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1   | 1   | 0   | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 2   |       |
| Course failure in Math                                   | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5   | 2   | 1   | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 8   |       |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment             | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 78  | 89  | 90  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 257 |       |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment            | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 119 | 108 | 83  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 310 |       |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 78  | 89  | 90  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 257 |       |
|  | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |     |       |
|  | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |     |       |
|  | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |     |       |
|  | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |     |       |
|  | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |     |       |
|  | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |     |       |
|  | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |     |       |
|  | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |     |       |
|  | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |     |       |
|  | 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 | 68 | 72 | 63 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 203 |       |

**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 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 5     |
| Students retained two or more times | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 7 | 4 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 19    |

**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 | 300 | 313 | 299 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 912   |
| Attendance below 90 percent                              | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 23  | 34  | 3   | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 60    |
| One or more suspensions                                  | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 20  | 30  | 27  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 77    |
| Course failure in ELA                                    | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1   | 1   | 0   | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 2     |
| Course failure in Math                                   | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5   | 2   | 1   | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 8     |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment             | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 78  | 89  | 90  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 257   |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment            | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 119 | 108 | 83  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 310   |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 78  | 89  | 90  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 257   |
|  | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |       |
|  | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |       |
|  | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |       |
|  | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |       |
|  | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |       |
|  | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |       |
|  | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |       |
|  | 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 | 68 | 72 | 63 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 203   |

**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 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 5     |
| Students retained two or more times | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 7 | 4 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 19    |

## 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             | 40%    | 57%      | 50%   |        |          |       | 48%    | 64%      | 54%   |
| ELA Learning Gains          | 43%    |          |       |        |          |       | 53%    | 58%      | 54%   |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile  | 33%    |          |       |        |          |       | 48%    | 50%      | 47%   |
| Math Achievement            | 41%    | 38%      | 36%   |        |          |       | 64%    | 74%      | 58%   |
| Math Learning Gains         | 47%    |          |       |        |          |       | 59%    | 66%      | 57%   |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 52%    |          |       |        |          |       | 63%    | 56%      | 51%   |
| Science Achievement         | 39%    | 64%      | 53%   |        |          |       | 41%    | 61%      | 51%   |
| Social Studies Achievement  | 65%    | 60%      | 58%   |        |          |       | 67%    | 85%      | 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 | 46%    | 63%      | -17%                       | 54%   | -8%                     |
| Cohort Comparison |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| 07                | 2022 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 43%    | 64%      | -21%                       | 52%   | -9%                     |
| Cohort Comparison |      | -46%   |          |                            |       |                         |
| 08                | 2022 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 45%    | 66%      | -21%                       | 56%   | -11%                    |
| Cohort Comparison |      | -43%   |          |                            |       |                         |

| MATH              |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade             | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 06                | 2022 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 55%    | 67%      | -12%                       | 55%   | 0%                      |
| Cohort Comparison |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| 07                | 2022 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 59%    | 73%      | -14%                       | 54%   | 5%                      |
| Cohort Comparison |      | -55%   |          |                            |       |                         |
| 08                | 2022 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 50%    | 65%      | -15%                       | 46%   | 4%                      |
| Cohort Comparison |      | -59%   |          |                            |       |                         |

| 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 | 37%    | 62%      | -25%                       | 48%   | -11%                    |
| Cohort Comparison |      | 0%     |          |                            |       |                         |

| BIOLOGY EOC  |        |          |                       |       |                    |
|--------------|--------|----------|-----------------------|-------|--------------------|
| Year         | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2022         |        |          |                       |       |                    |
| 2019         | 0%     | 77%      | -77%                  | 67%   | -67%               |
| CIVICS EOC   |        |          |                       |       |                    |
| Year         | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2022         |        |          |                       |       |                    |
| 2019         | 65%    | 85%      | -20%                  | 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         | 74%    | 73%      | 1%                    | 61%   | 13%                |
| GEOMETRY EOC |        |          |                       |       |                    |
| Year         | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2022         |        |          |                       |       |                    |
| 2019         | 97%    | 69%      | 28%                   | 57%   | 40%                |

### 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                                       | 10       | 32     | 33          | 20        | 43      | 55           | 12       | 27      |           |                   |                     |
| ELL                                       | 30       | 41     | 34          | 35        | 43      | 50           | 25       | 59      | 54        |                   |                     |
| BLK                                       | 28       | 35     | 34          | 32        | 47      | 56           | 31       | 56      | 78        |                   |                     |
| HSP                                       | 34       | 41     | 35          | 37        | 43      | 50           | 34       | 60      | 61        |                   |                     |
| MUL                                       | 47       | 45     |             | 41        | 57      |              | 55       | 83      |           |                   |                     |
| WHT                                       | 67       | 58     | 15          | 59        | 53      | 53           | 59       | 84      | 75        |                   |                     |
| FRL                                       | 34       | 39     | 32          | 36        | 45      | 51           | 36       | 62      | 68        |                   |                     |
| 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                                       | 10       | 22     | 22          | 19        | 35      | 44           | 11       | 23      | 53        |                   |                     |
| ELL                                       | 25       | 33     | 27          | 34        | 39      | 54           | 19       | 44      | 50        |                   |                     |
| BLK                                       | 33       | 38     | 24          | 30        | 36      | 37           | 19       | 47      | 61        |                   |                     |
| HSP                                       | 35       | 39     | 30          | 44        | 42      | 56           | 37       | 61      | 71        |                   |                     |
| MUL                                       | 50       | 49     |             | 50        | 44      | 20           | 69       | 69      | 91        |                   |                     |
| WHT                                       | 62       | 58     | 50          | 65        | 51      | 61           | 67       | 78      | 85        |                   |                     |
| FRL                                       | 34       | 39     | 28          | 39        | 40      | 48           | 34       | 54      | 70        |                   |                     |
| 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                                       | 13       | 41     | 43          | 40        | 55      | 49           | 16       | 40      | 43        |                   |                     |
| ELL                                       | 17       | 48     | 54          | 48        | 67      | 63           | 10       | 23      |           |                   |                     |
| ASN                                       | 83       | 58     |             | 100       | 67      |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| BLK                                       | 31       | 44     | 46          | 49        | 56      | 62           | 23       | 62      | 56        |                   |                     |
| HSP                                       | 45       | 52     | 49          | 63        | 59      | 62           | 39       | 61      | 75        |                   |                     |
| MUL                                       | 59       | 53     |             | 76        | 59      |              | 42       | 72      | 75        |                   |                     |
| WHT                                       | 71       | 66     | 40          | 80        | 64      | 64           | 65       | 79      | 77        |                   |                     |
| FRL                                       | 40       | 50     | 47          | 60        | 58      | 60           | 34       | 60      | 67        |                   |                     |

### 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  | 47   |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students                                    | NO   |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target                                    | 1    |
| Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency | 43   |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index                                       | 473  |
| Total Components for the Federal Index  | 10   |



| ESSA Federal Index   |     |
|--|-----|
| Percent Tested   | 98% |
| Subgroup Data  |     |
| Students With Disabilities   |     |
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities                                     | 29  |
| 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                                      | 41  |
| English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?              | NO  |
| 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                                | 44  |
| Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?        | NO  |
| Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0   |
| Hispanic Students  |     |
| Federal Index - Hispanic Students  | 44  |
| 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   | 55  |
| 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   | 58  |
| 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                                | 45  |
| 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?

In ELA, data has remained relatively stagnant as a school with decrease of 1% in overall achievement, no change in ELA learning gains, and an increase of 5% for students in the lowest quartile. However, the ELL subgroup showed a substantial increase in overall achievement the last three assessments, increasing 5% since 2021 and 13% since 2019. Booker Middle is also seeing an increase in achievement for SWD, ELL, BLK, HIS, and FRL in the ELA bottom quartile.

In Math, Booker Middle has seen a greater decline in overall achievement as a school and in subgroups, 4% as a school and ranging from -9% to 2% in subgroups. Although SWD, BLK, and FRL have shown significant growth in learning gains and the lowest quartile, there is still a significant difference in scores as compared to where the school was in 2019.

In Science, there was a decrease from the previous year of 3% with an increase in ELL of 6% and BLK of 12%. FRL and SWD also showed an increase in scores of 2% and 1% respectively.

In Social Studies, Booker Middle increased scores by 3% and significantly increased in all subgroups ranging from 4% to 15%.

Overall, the school is beginning to return to the level of improvement that was occurring prior to the pandemic. Although the scores are not where they were in 2019 in overall, there is a rise in ELA lowest quartile, math learning gains, math lowest quartile, and social studies achievement, representing change.

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

Based on data from 2022 state assessments in relation to the last three years of data, the greatest need for improvement is in math achievement, math learning gains, and math achievement for the bottom quartile. iReady end of year benchmark data in math showed 13% of students placed two grade levels

below in math and 25% of students placed three or more grade levels below in math. Additionally, ELA has also shown a decline in achievement and overall learning gains, as well as achievement for the bottom quartile. iReady data end of year benchmark data in ELA showed a total 9% of students placed at two grade levels below in reading and 38% of students placed at three or more grade levels below in reading.

**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 to the need for improvement in math and ELA would be the minimal level of increase in these core subjects from the prior year's data and the substantial difference from the data prior to the pandemic. Overall math achievement decreased 4% from the 2021 data and is 23% lower than the results of 2019. ELA achievement decreased 1% from the 2021 data and is 8% lower than the results of 2019. iReady shows that 38% of students are below grade level in math and 47% are below grade level in reading. As a school, Booker Middle needs to continue to refine the math and ELA practices, create systems for improvement and data driven decision-making fostered through grade level and department PLCs, and continue working with district curriculum leaders to provide professional development, coaching, and strategic lesson planning to improve student achievement.

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

Based on the 2022 FSA results, there were improvements shown in the school's learning gains for math and for the lowest quartile in math and ELA. Math learning gains and the lowest quartile increased from 2021 by 5% each. ELA lowest quartile increased by 5% as well. ELL made the biggest gains in ELA in all categories (achievement 5%, 8% learning gains, and 7% in lowest quartile). In math, SWD students made considerable gains in all categories (achievement 1%, 8% learning gains, and 11% in lowest quartile). BLK students in math also showed a substantial improvement in all categories (achievement 2%, 11% learning gains, and 19% in lowest quartile). Social studies also showed a 3% increase in achievement with ELL students increasing by 15%, SWD increasing by 4%, and BLK by 9%, and FRL by 8%.

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

Contributing factors to the improvement in subgroups scores would be attributed to the focus on small group intervention within and after the school day, collaboration amongst staff, professional learning and support through monthly strategy workshops, and strategic planning with the master schedule. Additionally, the work of PLCs to focus on instruction, student learning, remediation, and acceleration contributed to the improvement.

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

In order to accelerate learning, this year Booker Middle will focus on the PLC framework with an emphasis on responding to instruction. Staff will engage with the PLC work and the four focus questions to drive instructional decisions, determine additional professional development needs, and intervene for students not progressing, as well as for those who need acceleration. As a staff, teachers will utilize scaffolding, explicit targeted vocabulary instruction, determining essential standards and unpacking those standards to ensure focus, small group instruction in all core content areas, accountable team talk/tasks, diagnosing skill deficits through common assessments and state data, and coaching/modeling through lesson study.

**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 for Booker Middle School staff will be ongoing throughout the year. Monthly, teachers will engage in Snacks for Strats, which will provide focused topics directly related to our school improvement plan. Weekly they will meet in with their PLCs that may include district support, as well as school based support, on utilizing data, lesson planning, intervention, and developing common assessments. New teachers, Intensive Reading teachers, and Social Studies teachers will participate in district professional development 3-4 times over the course of the year. Science teachers will meet monthly for PD with the district middle school science program specialist focused on student engagement, vocabulary, and planning. Our on site district Instructional Facilitator will coach teachers in real time professional development to improve instruction, as well as meet with teams for planning and data chats. Instructional coaches on campus, as well as department chairs, will provide coaching, modeling, and guide teams in lesson study professional development.

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

Additional services that will be implemented to ensure sustainability of improvement will be with the school's Guiding Coalition. This group of instructional leaders will meet twice a month to discuss instruction and school wide practices, analyze data and systems in place, and plan for implementation and revision of new and current practices related to instruction and school operations. The Guiding Coalition will bring information, needs, celebrations, and considerations to the forefront each time they meet in order to build and sustain improvement this year and beyond.

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

ELA achievement has decreased from 48% in 2019 to 41% in 2021 and 40% in 2022. Students must have the reading skills and knowledge necessary to be successful in all content areas, as well as electives. The decline in achievement, as well as the number of students performing below grade level on iReady, demonstrate that there is an imperative need to focus on improving literacy skills at Booker Middle School. By focusing on ELA instruction, BMS should see an impact in student proficiency across all content areas.

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

By the end of the 2022-2023 school year, as measured by the F.A.S.T. assessment, BMS will increase the proficiency level of students scoring at 3 or above by 5%. Additionally, students in subgroups will increase reading proficiency by at least one grade level as measured by the iReady data.

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

Teachers will determine students' current performance on grade level standards using F.A.S.T. and iReady data, as well as classroom assessments. Using the data, teachers will develop plans for improvement or acceleration for students and set goals for each benchmark measure. Academic progress will be monitored multiple times throughout each quarter as measured by student grades, common assessments, and state benchmark assessments. Teachers will conduct student data chats monthly and/or quarterly to inform students of current progress, set goals, and determine interventions. Documentation of student learning will be maintained and communicated with families quarterly and during district benchmark assessments. Intervention plans will be developed and implemented for students not making adequate growth.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

LaShawn Frost (lashawn.frost@sarasotacountyschools.net)

**Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being**

Students are enrolled in a minimum of one ELA class daily, and those performing far below grade level are also enrolled in an Intensive Language Arts course. Teachers will use the following evidence-based strategies to improve instruction: visible learning focused on teacher clarity (learning intentions, success criteria, specific feedback, and explicit vocabulary instruction), small group instruction, targeted interventions, data driven decision making through PLCs, and use of research based curriculum to support students at all reading levels.

**implemented  
for this Area  
of Focus.**

**Rationale for  
Evidence-  
based**

**Strategy:**

**Explain the**

**rationale for  
selecting**

**this specific  
strategy.**

**Describe the  
resources/**

**criteria used**

**for selecting  
this**

**strategy.**

John Hattie's work on Visible Learning and DuFour's work on PLC are both guiding factors in the work on improving ELA instruction through teacher clarity, data driven decision making, and the use of a viable curriculum. Students at all subgroups, but specifically SWD, BLK, and FRL have demonstrated minimal growth in ELA and need targeted instruction to accelerate their learning.

### **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 participate in monthly professional development focused on the core strategies - small group instruction, shared reading, think aloud, explicit vocabulary instruction, quick writes, summarizing, data driven decision making, and developing interventions.

**Person**

**Responsible**

Tina Quintana (tina.quintana@sarasotacountyschools.net)

ILA teachers will participate in three full day professional development sessions focused on instruction in the intensive reading classes.

**Person**

**Responsible**

Sue Meckler (sue.meckler@sarasotacountyschools.net)

ILA Walkthroughs will be conducted weekly to observe program implementation.

**Person**

**Responsible**

Tina Quintana (tina.quintana@sarasotacountyschools.net)

Teachers will develop highly effective PLCs designed around data-driven decision making, common formative assessments, and essential standards for learning.

**Person**

**Responsible**

LaShawn Frost (lashawn.frost@sarasotacountyschools.net)

Coaching and PLC rounds quarterly to enhance teaching and instruction, build student engagement, and data discussions.

**Person**

**Responsible**

Stephanie Lee (stephanie.lee@sarasotacountyschools.net)

Select teachers and students will be working with USF trained tutors/mentors every Friday. Tutors will support students academically, and assist teachers in meeting students' instructional needs by providing small group and 1-1 support.

**Person**

**Responsible**

Holly Ard (holly.ard@sarasotacountyschools.net)

**#2. 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 achievement has decreased from 64% in 2019 to 45% in 2021 and 41% in 2022. Students must have the math skills and knowledge necessary to be successful with problem solving, critical thinking, and in multi-disciplinary courses, such as science and technology. The decline in achievement, as well as the number of students performing below grade level on iReady, demonstrate that there is an imperative need to focus on improving math skills at Booker Middle School. By focusing on math instruction, BMS should see an impact in student proficiency across content areas.

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

By the end of the 2022-2023 school year, as measured by the F.A.S.T. assessment, BMS will increase the proficiency level of students scoring at 3 or above by 5%. Additionally, students in subgroups, specifically FRL, HISP, and MUL will increase math proficiency by at least an additional 2%.

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

Teachers will determine students' current performance on grade level standards using F.A.S.T. and classroom assessment data. Using the data, teachers will develop plans for improvement or acceleration for students and set goals for each benchmark measure. Academic progress will be monitored multiple times throughout each quarter as measured by student grades, common assessments, and state benchmark assessments. Teachers will conduct student data chats monthly and/or quarterly to inform students of current progress, set goals, and determine interventions. Documentation of student learning will be maintained and communicated with families quarterly and during district benchmark assessments. Intervention plans will be developed and implemented for students not making adequate growth.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

LaShawn Frost (lashawn.frost@sarasotacountyschools.net)

**Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being**

Booker Middle School math teachers will use focused math instruction and implement the new math curriculum in order to improve instruction. Focused instruction will include visible learning (teacher clarity, modeling, class discussion, specific feedback, classroom discussion, collaboration, and use of instructional strategies to enhance learning), daily spiral review, use of the math IFG, problem solving strategies, visuals, and small group instruction. Additionally, PLCs will focus on data driven decision making, designing interventions, and providing acceleration.



**implemented  
for this Area  
of Focus.**

**Rationale for  
Evidence-  
based**

**Strategy:**

**Explain the**

**rationale for  
selecting**

**this specific  
strategy.**

**Describe the  
resources/**

**criteria used**

**for selecting  
this**

**strategy.**

John Hattie's work on Visible Learning and DuFour's work on PLC are both guiding factors in the work on improving math instruction through teacher clarity, data driven decision making, and the use of a viable curriculum. Students at all subgroups have demonstrated minimal growth or a decline in math and need targeted instruction to accelerate their learning.

### **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 develop highly effective PLCs focused on planning, data-driven decision making, and interventions to improve instruction and learning.

**Person**

**Responsible**

LaShawn Frost (lashawn.frost@sarasotacountyschools.net)

Teachers will participate in monthly professional development focused on the core strategies - small group instruction, shared reading, think aloud, explicit vocabulary instruction, quick writes, summarizing, data driven decision making, and developing interventions.

**Person**

**Responsible**

Tina Quintana (tina.quintana@sarasotacountyschools.net)

District support will be provided to the math department to assist with coaching, modeling, data driven lesson planning and intervention, math strategies, and best practice.

**Person**

**Responsible**

Sue Meckler (sue.meckler@sarasotacountyschools.net)

Teachers will provide small group instruction to support students in need of intervention or acceleration.

**Person**

**Responsible**

Allison Cohen (allison.cohen@sarasotacountyschools.net)

Coaching and PLC rounds quarterly to enhance teaching and instruction, build student engagement, and data discussions.

**Person**

**Responsible**

Allison Cohen (allison.cohen@sarasotacountyschools.net)

Select teachers and students will be working with USF trained tutors/mentors every Friday. Tutors will support students academically, and assist teachers in meeting students' instructional needs by providing small group and 1-1 support.

**Person**

**Responsible**

Holly Ard (holly.ard@sarasotacountyschools.net)



**#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science****Area of Focus  
Description and****Rationale:  
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.**

Science achievement has shown minimal improvement over the last three data points (41% in 2019, 42% in 2021, and 39% in 2022). Science instruction is vital to developing students into critical thinkers and problem solvers. Over the course of the last few years, students are not demonstrating their ability to tackle problems, read for information, and think critically in science.

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

By the end of the 2022-2023 school year, as measured by the FSSA assessment, BMS will increase the proficiency level of students scoring at 3 or above by 5%. Additionally, students in subgroups, specifically SWD, HISP, WHT, MUL, and FRL will increase science proficiency by at least an additional 2%.

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

Teachers will determine students' current performance on grade level standards using classroom assessment data. Using the data, teachers will develop plans for improvement or acceleration for students and set goals for each benchmark measure. Academic progress will be monitored multiple times throughout each quarter as measured by student grades, common assessments, and state benchmark assessments. Teachers will conduct student data chats monthly and/or quarterly to inform students of current progress, set goals, and determine interventions. Documentation of student learning will be maintained and communicated with families quarterly and during district benchmark assessments. Intervention plans will be developed and implemented for students not making adequate growth.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

LaShawn Frost (lashawn.frost@sarasotacountyschools.net)

**Evidence-based Strategy:  
Describe the evidence-based strategy being**

Booker Middle School math teachers will use focused science instruction, increase hands-on learning opportunities, explicitly teach vocabulary, utilize IFG materials with an emphasis on charts/graphs/visuals for discussion and analysis with students, spiral review of skills using PENDA, and student engagement strategies. Focused instruction will include visible learning (teacher clarity, modeling, class discussion, specific feedback, classroom discussion, collaboration, and use of instructional strategies to enhance learning). Additionally, PLCs will focus on data driven decision making, designing interventions, and providing acceleration.

**implemented  
for this Area  
of Focus.**

**Rationale for  
Evidence-  
based**

**Strategy:**

**Explain the**

**rationale for  
selecting**

**this specific  
strategy.**

**Describe the  
resources/**

**criteria used**

**for selecting**

**this**

**strategy.**

John Hattie's work on Visible Learning and DuFour's work on PLC are both guiding factors in the work on improving science instruction through teacher clarity, data driven decision making, and the use of a viable curriculum. Students in subgroups of SWD, HISP, MUL, WHT, and FRL have demonstrated minimal growth or a decline in science and need targeted instruction to accelerate their learning.

### **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 develop highly effective PLCs focused on planning, data-driven decision making, and interventions to improve instruction and learning.

**Person**

**Responsible**

LaShawn Frost (lashawn.frost@sarasotacountyschools.net)

Science teachers will meet monthly with the district science program specialist to focus specifically on hands-on science instruction, student engagement, explicit vocabulary instruction, nature of science, utilizing IFG for spiral review, and use of PENDA.

**Person**

**Responsible**

Sue Meckler (sue.meckler@sarasotacountyschools.net)

Teachers will participate in monthly professional development focused on the core strategies - small group instruction, shared reading, think aloud, explicit vocabulary instruction, quick writes, summarizing, data driven decision making, and developing interventions.

**Person**

**Responsible**

Tina Quintana (tina.quintana@sarasotacountyschools.net)

Coaching and PLC rounds quarterly to enhance teaching and instruction, build student engagement, and data discussions.

**Person**

**Responsible**

Deanna Dubose (deanna.dubose@sarasotacountyschools.net)

Select teachers and students will be working with USF trained tutors/mentors every Friday. Tutors will support students academically, and assist teachers in meeting students' instructional needs by providing small group and 1-1 support.

**Person**

**Responsible**

Holly Ard (holly.ard@sarasotacountyschools.net)

**#4. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities**

|  |  |
|--|--|
| <b>Area of Focus</b><br><b>Description and Rationale:</b><br><b>Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.</b> | <p>For SWD, they have shown minimal growth in ELA, math, science, and social studies achievement overall. Although, learning gains in ELA and math increased from the previous year's data, as well as increased in the lowest quartile for this sub group. However, there is still more work to be done to move SWD to proficiency levels in both content areas. Students must have solid ELA and math skills to succeed in all content and multi-disciplinary subjects. Currently 10% of students are proficient in ELA, 20% in math, 12% in science, and 27% in social studies.</p>   |
| <b>Measurable Outcome:</b><br><b>State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve.</b><br><b>This should be a data based, objective outcome.</b>      | <p>By the end of the 2022-2023 school year, as measured by the F.A.S.T. assessment, SWD will increase their proficiency in math and ELA by at least 5%.</p>  |
| <b>Monitoring:</b><br><b>Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.</b>  | <p>Teachers will determine students' current performance on grade level standards using F.A.S.T. and iReady data, as well as classroom assessments. Using the data, teachers will develop plans for improvement or acceleration for students and set goals for each benchmark measure. Academic progress will be monitored multiple times throughout each quarter as measured by student grades, common assessments, and state benchmark assessments. Teachers will conduct student data chats monthly and/or quarterly to inform students of current progress, set goals, and determine interventions. Documentation of student learning will be maintained and communicated with families quarterly and during district benchmark assessments. Intervention plans will be developed and implemented for students not making adequate growth.</p> |
| <b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome:</b>  | <p>Daniel Leal (daniel.leal@sarasotacountyschools.net)</p>   |
| <b>Evidence-based Strategy:</b><br><b>Describe the evidence-based strategy being</b>   | <p>Students will be instructed in their IRL courses using Just Words, Rewards, and Common lit as the curriculum intervention materials providing students with foundational and target specific instruction to increase ELA proficiency. In ELA, math classes, and content area courses, students will learn in a co-teaching environment with the support of an ESE teacher to provide targeted interventions and strategies, and assist with target instruction based on visible learning (teacher clarity, modeling, class discussion, specific feedback, classroom discussion, collaboration, and use of instructional strategies to enhance</p>   |

**implemented for this Area of Focus.**

learning). Additionally, PLCs will focus on data driven decision making, and designing interventions that will support SWD.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:****Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.**

SWD need targeted direct instruction in content areas they are deficient, as well as exposure to grade level curriculum in order to make instructional gains. Through co-teaching, small group instruction, specific targeted intervention curriculum, and support for students within the core classes by ESE teachers and paraprofessionals, students can access the curriculum and increase their ELA and math proficiency.

**Describe the resources/ criteria used for selecting this strategy.****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 develop highly effective PLCs designed around data-driven decision making, common formative assessments, and essential standards for learning.

**Person****Responsible**

LaShawn Frost (lashawn.frost@sarasotacountyschools.net)

Teachers will participate in monthly professional development focused on the core strategies - small group instruction, shared reading, think aloud, explicit vocabulary instruction, quick writes, summarizing, data driven decision making, and developing interventions.

**Person****Responsible**

Tina Quintana (tina.quintana@sarasotacountyschools.net)

ILA teachers will participate in three full day professional development sessions focused on instruction in the intensive reading classes.

**Person****Responsible**

Sue Meckler (sue.meckler@sarasotacountyschools.net)

ILA Walkthroughs will be conducted weekly to observe program implementation.

**Person****Responsible**

Tina Quintana (tina.quintana@sarasotacountyschools.net)

Continued use of the reading programs: Just Words. Rewards, and Common Lit with emphasis on applying reading skills to text.

**Person****Responsible**

Stephanie Lee (stephanie.lee@sarasotacountyschools.net)

Coaching and PLC rounds quarterly to enhance teaching and instruction, build student engagement, and data discussions.

**Person****Responsible**

Stephanie Lee (stephanie.lee@sarasotacountyschools.net)

Select teachers and students will be working with USF trained tutors/mentors every Friday. Tutors will support students academically, and assist teachers in meeting students' instructional needs by providing small group and 1-1 support.

**Person Responsible** Holly Ard (holly.ard@sarasotacountyschools.net)

## 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.**

Booker Middle School makes a concerted effort to create a positive school climate where individuals feel valued, cared for and respected. Such an atmosphere contributes to effective teaching and learning and to genuine communication, both within and outside the school. Some of the ways in which we work collectively to create a positive school climate and atmosphere include:

Building effective communication within the school  
 Working to meet the needs of all stakeholders  
 Creating a healthy school environment  
 Creating collaborative processes  
 Enhancing self efficacy  
 Fostering respect for diversity  
 Fostering inclusive and a culture of belonging  
 Developing appropriate communication between home and school

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

To foster parent involvement in an organized, ongoing and timely manner Booker Middle School will assess present practices of parent involvement through pre and post surveys to establish baseline data. Booker Middle will hold its annual meeting in which all parents will be informed of the school's participation in the Title I program, the requirements and their right to be involved. We will produce and distribute a Parent Involvement brochure to be given to Booker Middle School parents (in both English and Spanish). The school-wide Parent Involvement Committee will continue to meet monthly to provide information about the

program, share strategies for success and offer time for parents to ask questions and give feedback. Additionally, parent teams will be formed within each Booker Middle Learning Community to increase communication among parents, students and teachers within the same team. Booker Middle will ensure that parents understand all policies, rules, notices, parent compacts, notices, etc. by having them printed in both English and Spanish as well as conducting meetings in a language that the parents can understand. Booker Middle will also have a mid-year Parent Extravaganza that will allow the Parent Involvement Committee to obtain parent feedback from surveys and parent input regarding school-wide data. Finally, the school will provide a regular schedule of useful notices, memos, phone calls, newsletters, emails and other communications. Training sessions will be provided for parents.