Fort Clarke Middle School

2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Fort Clarke Middle School

9301 NW 23RD AVE, Gainesville, FL 32606

https://www.sbac.edu/fortclarke

Demographics

Principal: Jared Taber

Start Date for this Principal: 8/10/2020

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Middle School 6-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2021-22 Title I School	No
2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	55%
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners Asian Students Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2021-22: C (52%) 2018-19: B (58%) 2017-18: B (56%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TSI
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here.	

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Alachua County School Board on 12/6/2022.

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

Fort Clarke Middle School

9301 NW 23RD AVE, Gainesville, FL 32606

https://www.sbac.edu/fortclarke

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2021-22 Title I School	2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Middle School 6-8	No	55%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	60%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Alachua County School Board on 12/6/2022.

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.

We believe that it is the responsibility of the faculty and staff of Fort Clarke Middle School to promote academic and behavioral student success by providing a positive, safe, respectful, engaging and culturally responsive learning environment.

Provide the school's vision statement.

To become an "A" school through continuous progress monitoring and feedback supports of all school-wide data.

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
Taber, Jared	Principal	Oversee and direct all aspects of school operations.
Criscione, Bessie	Assistant Principal	Curriculum, ESE, Testing Coordination
Hutchinson, Kessler	Assistant Principal	Student Services, Facilities
Fairchild, Jeff	Dean	Assists APSS, PBIS, Behavioral data
Hebert, Judi	Instructional Technology	School site tech, Research instructional Materials, Computer lab coordination
Berkelhammer, Shellie		
Welch, Mary	School Counselor	
Lathem, Dan	Dean	Support discipline issues and PBIS.
Pettit, Shannon	School Counselor	

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Monday 8/10/2020, Jared Taber

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.*

2

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.*

19

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

50

Total number of students enrolled at the school

964

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

7

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

4

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	328	307	332	0	0	0	0	967
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	78	87	73	0	0	0	0	238
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	29	64	74	0	0	0	0	167
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	47	35	41	0	0	0	0	123
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	60	45	43	0	0	0	0	148
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	83	86	90	0	0	0	0	259
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	103	106	83	0	0	0	0	292
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	83	86	90	0	0	0	0	259

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	110	125	118	0	0	0	0	353

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	1	2	2	0	0	0	0	5
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	14	0	0	0	0	18

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 9/7/2022

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	325	306	311	0	0	0	0	942
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	68	55	59	0	0	0	0	182
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	14	11	0	0	0	0	31
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	64	49	54	0	0	0	0	167
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	52	39	50	0	0	0	0	141
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	42	46	47	0	0	0	0	135
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	56	40	50	0	0	0	0	146
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	42	46	47	0	0	0	0	135

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	73	70	82	0	0	0	0	225

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	3	6	0	0	0	0	14

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	325	306	311	0	0	0	0	942
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	68	55	59	0	0	0	0	182
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	14	11	0	0	0	0	31
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	64	49	54	0	0	0	0	167
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	52	39	50	0	0	0	0	141
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	42	46	47	0	0	0	0	135
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	56	40	50	0	0	0	0	146
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	42	46	47	0	0	0	0	135

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	73	70	82	0	0	0	0	225

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	3	6	0	0	0	0	14

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	54%	51%	50%				57%	59%	54%
ELA Learning Gains	51%						57%	56%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	37%						49%	41%	47%
Math Achievement	52%	34%	36%				60%	60%	58%
Math Learning Gains	53%						53%	56%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	37%						40%	46%	51%
Science Achievement	48%	51%	53%				61%	53%	51%
Social Studies Achievement	59%	54%	58%				68%	73%	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	45%	53%	-8%	54%	-9%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2022					
	2019	57%	54%	3%	52%	5%
Cohort Comparison		-45%				
08	2022					
	2019	62%	61%	1%	56%	6%
Cohort Comparison		-57%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2022					
	2019	51%	52%	-1%	55%	-4%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2022					
	2019	58%	59%	-1%	54%	4%
Cohort Comparison		-51%				
08	2022					
	2019	34%	27%	7%	46%	-12%
Cohort Comparison		-58%				

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	59%	54%	5%	48%	11%
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	67%	69%	-2%	71%	-4%

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	87%	56%	31%	61%	26%

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	0%	48%	-48%	57%	-57%

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	9	27	28	14	35	37		19			
ELL	53	47	45	58	61		46				
ASN	88	68		83	70		91	79	77		
BLK	26	39	34	17	32	29	11	23	56		
HSP	53	51	43	56	62	57	51	56	85		
MUL	52	53	43	44	46	38	46	57	85		
WHT	71	58	37	73	64	44	66	79	79		
FRL	32	40	32	28	40	33	24	33	51		

2021 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS										
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
SWD	7	20	18	10	27	27	20	15			
ELL	35	52		48	48		27	50			

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
ASN	80	68		72	52		83		64		
BLK	23	34	29	18	24	26	20	24	30		
HSP	57	57	41	54	39	25	47	64	57		
MUL	61	60	21	52	35	9	65	64	57		
WHT	71	59	32	71	46	52	69	81	69		
FRL	28	38	27	28	27	25	27	28	33		

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	15	43	40	18	38	31	14	25			
ELL	42	52		48	45						
ASN	89	85		93	73		89	93	90		
BLK	28	43	47	30	40	34	31	49	60		
HSP	54	58	55	63	53	44	59	61	83		
MUL	65	60	35	56	49	40	62	71	69		
WHT	73	63	58	78	61	52	79	78	80		
FRL	31	45	46	35	40	38	34	49	56		

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)	TSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	48
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	9
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	477
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	97%

Subgroup Data	

Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	21
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	3

English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	46
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	79
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	57
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	52
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	63
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?

Achievement/proficiency is fairly consistent within content areas. ELA learning gains decreased by 1%, while math learning gains increased by 16%. Performance of students in the bottom quartile increased in both ELA and Math. Acceleration increased by 18% points. Students with disabilities, African American Students, and Economically disadvantaged students continue to score far lower than other peer groups.

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

Students with disabilities , economically disadvantaged, and African American proficiency is far lower than the other peer groups. Social Studies achievement decreased by 1%, which marks a 19% decrease in two years.

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

Many of our students were in a face to face learning environment for the first time within two years. Educators worked tirelessly to identify students' current status and provide differentiated instruction to help fill instructional gaps that existed. We had multiple beginning teachers in math, ELA, and Reading classrooms. Many teachers were learning core and supplemental resources for the first time. New actions necessary- laser like focus on progress monitoring, formative assessment data, data chats, high-quality rigorous instruction. Supplementary programs such as iReady and IXL will enhance the standards based direct instruction provided to students.

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

Both Math/ELA learning gains improved 7-8% points from last year. Learning gains in math improved by 16% points. Acceleration increased from 59 to 77%.

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

This was a result of department-wide focus on utilizing progress monitoring data, supplementary program data, and standards based instruction.

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

Laser like focus on formative/progress monitoring data, student-teacher data chats, admin-teacher data chats, implementation of department data analysis protocols. In addition to these strategies, we will also

utilize supplementary programs to increase access to differentiated instruction within Math and Reading. We will utilize IXL for math and iReady for Reading. Data will be reviewed at both the individual and department level. We will also focus on formative assessment within the classroom to ensure all students are held accountable. Professional learning will include best practices within data analysis, multiple response strategies, best practices within lesson planning.

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 will include best practices within data analysis, multiple response strategies, best practices in lesson planning, engagement strategies, and cultural responsive teaching.

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

Laser like focus on formative/progress monitoring data, student-teacher data chats, admin-teacher data chats, implementation of department data analysis protocols. In addition to these strategies, we will also utilize supplementary programs to increase access to differentiated instruction within Math and Reading. We will utilize IXL for math and iReady for Reading. Data will be reviewed at both the individual and department level. We will also focus on formative assessment within the classroom to ensure all students are held accountable. Professional learning will include best practices within data analysis, multiple response strategies, best practices within lesson planning.

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.	Based off 2021-2022 progress monitoring data and 2022 FSA data, a critical need is to increase proficiency in ELA. 54% of our current students are proficient within ELA.
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	Increase ELA proficiency by 9% percentage points from 54 to 63%.
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	Supplemental program data will be reviewed and dis-aggregated (iReady). FAST data will also be analyzed and used to inform instruction ie small group, differentiated instruction and acceleration needs.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Bessie Criscione (criscionebl@gm.sbac.edu)
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.	Professional learning targeting B.E.S.T. Standards, frequent progress monitoring during FAST assessments, reteaching and remediation informed by standards-based assessment data as part of daily instruction. Diagnostic assessment data from iReady, Frequent data chats as department chair meetings occur bi-monthly, and individual interventions as necessary.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.	High impact supplemental progams and effective, research-based strategies.

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.

Facilitate continued professional learning pertaining to the B.E.S.T Benchmarks- department chair collaboration and district office training support.

Person Responsible	Bessie Criscione (criscionebl@gm.sbac.edu)

Facilitate learning walk professional learning with Reading department.

Person Responsible	Bessie Criscione (criscionebl@gm.sbac.edu)

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Black/African-American	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.	Reduce the racial achievement gap and increase ELA and Math achievement to 41%.
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	Increase ELA and Math achievement to 41% thus decreasing the gap between races.
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	Supplemental program assessment data, FAST assessment data.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Bessie Criscione (criscionebl@gm.sbac.edu)
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.	Explicit communication of high expectations, implementation of standards focused board, Increase faculty understanding of culturally relevant practices and engagement strategies, sharing of curriculum/instructional strategies throughout the year at professional learning meetings.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.	Will increase overall achievement rates in ELA and Math as well as support district-wide equity goals.

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.

Professional learning pertaining to High Expectations, Common Board/standards focus board planning, engagement strategies, and Culturally Relevant pedagogy.

Person Responsible	Bessie Criscione (criscionebl@gm.sbac.edu)

Facilitate/coordinate administrator walkthroughs around the areas of focus (high expectations, culturally relevant teaching, learning goals, engagement strategies).

Person Responsible	Jared Taber (taberjc@gm.sbac.edu)

#3. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: **Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.**	SWD performance is below federal target index of 41%. Students with disabilities require supports that ensure success in the classroom and statewide assessments.
Measurable Outcome: **State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.**	SWD achievement will meet or exceed 41%.
Monitoring: **Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.**	Diagnostic data, consultation logs, progress toward goals meetings/collaborative conversations, FAST assessment data.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Bessie Criscione (criscionebl@gm.sbac.edu)
Evidence-based Strategy: **Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.**	Continue to decrease least restrictive environment, focus on collaborative planning with general education teachers, targeted use of IXL and iReady, and UDL supports (engagement focus).
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: **Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.**	These strategies will allow for a multi-tiered approach depending on specific student needs.

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.

Review all services for students to ensure they are appropriate placed and in the least restrictive environment possible.

Person Responsible	Bessie Criscione (criscionebl@gm.sbac.edu)

Review and analyze supplemental program data (IXL, iReady) to identify if programs are being utilized with fidelity. Coach teachers in understanding how to utilize data to inform instruction.

Person Responsible	[no one identified]

Support instructional staff with understanding best practices within scaffolding and identifying what that looks like in each content area/clasroom.

Person Responsible	Jared Taber (taberjc@gm.sbac.edu)

#4. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: **Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.**	Increased participation of African American students in accelerated coursework. This will allow for an increase in other school-wide African American and economically disadvantaged goals.
Measurable Outcome: **State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.**	African American enrollment in advanced coursework will increase by 2% points (REACH, advanced/Honors level courses).
Monitoring: **Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.**	Number of enrolled African American students in advanced coursework / courses. Recruitment efforts.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Jared Taber (taberjc@gm.sbac.edu)
Evidence-based Strategy: **Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.**	Removing barriers to access in advanced coursework. Creating an advanced mindset of all students as they prepare for high school.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: **Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.**	This will allow students to make independent choices based on their goals instead of past achievement data.

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.

Identify and recruit students for advanced courses - work with teachers to help them understand specific criteria/look-fors.

Person Responsible	Bessie Criscione (criscionebl@gm.sbac.edu)

Coordinate tutoring and acceleration programs to ensure students have access to high quality instruction.

Person Responsible	Bessie Criscione (criscionebl@gm.sbac.edu)

#5. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Social Studies	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: **Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.**	Social Studies achievement has decreased 19% points over the course of the last two years.
Measurable Outcome: **State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.**	Increase Social Studies achievement from 59 to 78%.
Monitoring: **Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.**	Quarterly AIMS Data, Data Base Question results.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Jared Taber (taberjc@gm.sbac.edu)
Evidence-based Strategy: **Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.**	Scaffolding and Document Based Questions.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: **Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.**	Scaffolding learning through the use of guided notes, graphic organizers, and utilizing a variety of levels of questions will help increase student self efficacy and directly impact achievement.

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.

Department chair will support teachers' understanding of Document Based Questions and provide professional learning in the area of scaffolding for student achievement.

Person Responsible	Bessie Criscione (criscionebl@gm.sbac.edu)

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.

At FCMS, we understand how impactful collective teacher efficacy is and how beneficial it can be to increase student achievement and staff morale. Meeting bi-monthly with grade level teams and departments helps increase collaboration, build a common language, and cultivate collective teacher efficacy. Teachers are acknowledged on both the individual and team level for positive acts of leadership and excellence.
As a PBIS model school, students are recognized/rewarded for good behavior. FC has redesigned the PBIS framework to include all areas of the school community. Representation is part of the PTA, SAC in addition to all grade level teams. An increased effort is underway to build business/community involvement that has been historically low. This is solicited from weekly parent emails, website posts, and marquee advertisements.

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

Principal- leading by example, development and coordination of scheduling meetings/collaborations.
Assistant Principals- acknowledging/recognizing acts of leadership/excellence within teachers and students.
Deans- coordinating our PBIS system, training teachers, students, and all school staff on proper implementation. Identifying and rewarding positive behaviors via positive referrals.
Teachers-recognizing and rewarding good behavior, collaborative conversations among peers.
Students/Parents- we will seek to gain input from both groups as we continue to improve our methods of communication and positive feedback supports. We invite both groups to collaborate with our PBIS, SAC, and PTA teams to provide input.