

Baker County School District

# Baker County Middle School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

---

## Table of Contents

---

<b>SIP Authority and Purpose</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>I. School Information</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>II. Needs Assessment/Data Review</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>III. Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>VI. Title I Requirements</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus</b>	<b>0</b>

## Baker County Middle School

211 E JONATHAN ST, Macclenny, FL 32063

[www.bakerk12.org](http://www.bakerk12.org)

### School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Baker County School Board on 9/18/2023.

### SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes (F.S.), requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a new, amended, or continuation SIP for each school in the district which has a school grade of D or F; has a significant gap in achievement on statewide, standardized assessments administered pursuant to s. 1008.22 by one or more student subgroups, as defined in the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), 20 U.S.C. s. 6311(b)(2)(C)(v)(II); has not significantly increased the percentage of students passing statewide, standardized assessments; has not significantly increased the percentage of students demonstrating Learning Gains, as defined in s. 1008.34, and as calculated under s. 1008.34(3)(b), who passed statewide, standardized assessments; has been identified as requiring instructional supports under the Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE) program established in s. 1008.365; or has significantly lower graduation rates for a subgroup when compared to the state's graduation rate. Rule 6A-1.098813, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.), requires district school boards to approve a SIP for each Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) school in the district rated as Unsatisfactory.

Below are the criteria for identification of traditional public and public charter schools pursuant to the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) State plan:

#### Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)

A school not identified for CSI or TSI, but has one or more subgroups with a Federal Index below 41%.

#### Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)

A school not identified as CSI that has at least one consistently underperforming subgroup with a Federal Index below 32% for three consecutive years.

#### Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)

A school can be identified as CSI in any of the following four ways:

1. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%;
2. Have a graduation rate at or below 67%;
3. Have a school grade of D or F; or
4. Have a Federal Index below 41% in the same subgroup(s) for 6 consecutive years.

ESEA sections 1111(d) requires that each school identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI develop a support and improvement plan created in partnership with stakeholders (including principals and other school leaders, teachers and parent), is informed by all indicators in the State's accountability system, includes evidence-based interventions, is based on a school-level needs assessment, and identifies resource inequities to be

addressed through implementation of the plan. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as TSI, ATSI and non-Title I CSI must be approved and monitored by the school district. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as Title I, CSI must be approved by the school district and Department. The Department must monitor and periodically review implementation of each CSI plan after approval.

The Department's SIP template in the Florida Continuous Improvement Management System (CIMS), <https://www.floridacims.org>, meets all state and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all ESSA components for a support and improvement plan required for traditional public and public charter schools identified as CSI, TSI and ATSI, and eligible schools applying for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) funds.

Districts may allow schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions to develop a SIP using the template in CIMS.

The responses to the corresponding sections in the Department's SIP template may address the requirements for: 1) Title I schools operating a schoolwide program (SWD), pursuant to ESSA, as amended, Section 1114(b); and 2) charter schools that receive a school grade of D or F or three consecutive grades below C, pursuant to Rule 6A-1.099827, F.A.C. The chart below lists the applicable requirements.

SIP Sections	Title I Schoolwide Program	Charter Schools
I-A: School Mission/Vision		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(1)
I-B-C: School Leadership, Stakeholder Involvement & SIP Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(2-3)	
I-E: Early Warning System	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-A-C: Data Review		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-F: Progress Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(3)	
III-A: Data Analysis/Reflection	ESSA 1114(b)(6)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(4)
III-B: Area(s) of Focus	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(i-iii)	
III-C: Other SI Priorities		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(5-9)
VI: Title I Requirements	ESSA 1114(b)(2, 4-5), (7)(A)(iii)(I-V)-(B) ESSA 1116(b-g)	

Note: Charter schools that are also Title I must comply with the requirements in both columns.

## **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 Department 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.

## I. School Information

### School Mission and Vision

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

The mission of the Baker County Middle School is to build a legacy of excellence, one student at a time.

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

The vision of the Baker County School District is to prepare individuals to be lifelong learners, self-sufficient, and responsible citizens of good character.

### School Leadership Team, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring

**School Leadership Team**

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 as it relates to SIP implementation for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Anderson, Naomi	Principal	As principal of the school, this individual facilitates both the leadership and management of the delivery of instruction, physical plant, student and staff safety, and stakeholder communication. Specific job duties include: oversight and management of the school mission, general school operations, and employee evaluations. The principal is also the facilitator of the threat assessment team and associated school safety activities. Additionally, the principal is the facilitator of the school advisory council. Another job duty includes leading the multi-tiered system of supports school-based leadership team.
Norman, Ashton	Assistant Principal	As an assistant principal of the school, this individual supports the student behavioral program, delivery of instruction, student and staff safety, and stakeholder communication. Specific areas of responsibility for this position include: student discipline, maintenance of the school website and Facebook page, activities calendar, student organizations, anti-bullying efforts, and school schedule development.
Peterson, Wayne	Assistant Principal	As an assistant principal of the school, this individual supports the student behavioral program, delivery of instruction, student and staff safety, and stakeholder communication. Specific areas of responsibility for this position include: student discipline, staff professional development, facility work orders, and technology needs.
Harris, Pamela	Dean	As a teacher on special assignment, this individual supports the student behavioral program, delivery of instruction, student and staff safety, and stakeholder communication. Specific areas of responsibility for this position include: oversight of the Positive Behavioral Interventions and Support (PBIS) program, homeroom program, property inventory, and student discipline.
Willoughby, Jana	Instructional Coach	As instructional coach of the school, this individual supports both the leadership and management of the delivery of instruction and data collection and dissemination. Specific job duties include: modeling research and evidence-based instructional practices, facilitating data chats, and assisting with the new teacher program. Other areas of responsibility include assisting with progress monitoring administrations and implementation of instructional programs.
Crews, Heather	School Counselor	As a guidance counselor of the school, this individual supports the social and emotional well-being of students. She also supports the effective delivery of instruction along with the associated interventions, accommodations, and modifications. This counselor also oversees the completion of all individual education plans and schedules the accommodations and modifications for those students.

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Elledge, Greta	School Counselor	As a guidance counselor of the school, this individual supports the social and emotional well-being of students. She also supports the effective delivery of instruction along with the associated interventions, accommodations, and modifications. This counselor coordinates the provision of academic services to students in addition to facilitating the implementation of Multi-Tiered System of Supports (MTSS) strategies.
Taylor, Kim	School Counselor	As a guidance counselor of the school, this individual supports the social and emotional well-being of students. She also supports the effective delivery of instruction along with the associated interventions, accommodations, and modifications. This counselor coordinates the provision of mental health services to students in addition to facilitating the implementation of Multi-Tiered System of Supports (MTSS) strategies. This counselor also oversees the completion of all 504 plans and supports students classified as ELL and McKinney Vento.
Davis, Beth	Attendance/ Social Work	As the attendance coordinator, Mrs. Davis tracks student attendance, creates interventions for students with attendance issues, and attends SARB as well as truancy court for those who qualify. In addition to the work associated with being the attendance coordinator, Ms. Davis also serves as our testing coordinator, creates character education lesson plans for homeroom, and takes a lead role in PBIS efforts.

### Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Development

Describe the process for involving stakeholders (including the school leadership team, teachers and school staff, parents, students (mandatory for secondary schools) and families, and business or community leaders) and how their input was used in the SIP development process. (ESSA 1114(b)(2))

Note: If a School Advisory Council is used to fulfill these requirements, it must include all required stakeholders.

The School Advisory Council, which is made up of representatives from our school leadership team, teachers, school staff, parents, students, and business and community leaders review school-wide data as it is available throughout the school year. Department heads discuss data with their team of teachers to compose actions plans based on end of the year assessments as well as progress monitoring efforts throughout the school year. These action plans are the foundation of our School Improvement Plan and its development. After all of the input is compiled, the School Advisory Council, school leadership team, and department heads review a draft of the School Improvement Plan.

### SIP Monitoring

Describe how the SIP will be regularly monitored for effective implementation and impact on increasing the achievement of students in meeting the State's academic standards, particularly for those students with the greatest achievement gap. Describe how the school will revise the plan, as necessary, to ensure continuous improvement. (ESSA 1114(b)(3))

The School Improvement Plan will be reviewed for progress monitoring three times per year after each assessment window. The plan will also be addressed at each monthly department head meeting and each quarterly School Advisory Council meeting. Based on the data from each progress monitoring and



benchmark assessment (for non FAST testing subjects), plans will be revised as necessary to ensure continuous improvement.

### Demographic Data

Only ESSA identification and school grade history updated 3/11/2024

<b>2023-24 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Middle School 6-8
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2022-23 Title I School Status</b>	No
<b>2022-23 Minority Rate</b>	22%
<b>2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b>	92%
<b>Charter School</b>	No
<b>RAISE School</b>	No
<b>ESSA Identification</b> *updated as of 3/11/2024	N/A
<b>Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)</b>	No
<b>2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD) Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
<b>School Grades History</b> *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: C 2019-20: B 2018-19: B 2017-18: C
<b>School Improvement Rating History</b>	
<b>DJJ Accountability Rating History</b>	

### Early Warning Systems

Using 2022-23 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		
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	154	132	197	483	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	63	51	61	175	
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	12	13	32	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	13	7	24	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	109	105	120	334	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	44	43	74	161	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	7	3	13	

**Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that have two or more early warning indicators:**

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	80	72	87	239

**Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students identified retained:**

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	12	10	27
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	9	15	34

#### **Prior Year (2022-23) As Initially Reported (pre-populated)**

**The number of students by grade level that exhibited each early warning indicator:**

Indicator	Grade Level										Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	111	99	154	364	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	70	44	64	178	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	13	8	24	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	3	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	91	53	112	256	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	89	34	84	207	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	29	14	37	80	

**The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:**

Indicator	Grade Level										Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	100	59	103	262	

**The number of students identified retained:**

Indicator	Grade Level										Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	8	15	33	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	8	15	33	

**Prior Year (2022-23) Updated (pre-populated)**

Section 3 includes data tables that are pre-populated based off information submitted in prior year's SIP.

**The number of students by grade level that exhibited each early warning indicator:**

Indicator	Grade Level										Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	111	99	154	364	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	70	44	64	178	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	13	8	24	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	3	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	91	53	112	256	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	89	34	84	207	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	29	14	37	80	

**The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:**

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	100	59	103	262

**The number of students identified retained:**

Indicator	Grade Level										Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	8	15	33	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	8	15	33	

**II. Needs Assessment/Data Review****ESSA School, District and State Comparison (pre-populated)**

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school or combination schools). Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school.

**On April 9, 2021, FDOE Emergency Order No. 2021-EO-02 made 2020-21 school grades optional. They have been removed from this publication.**

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	48	48	49	49	49	50	42		
ELA Learning Gains				52			44		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				43			35		
Math Achievement*	59	59	56	51	43	36	47		
Math Learning Gains				49			40		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				47			36		
Science Achievement*	44	44	49	46	51	53	51		
Social Studies Achievement*	72	72	68	79	49	58	75		
Middle School Acceleration	64	63	73	62	47	49	51		
Graduation Rate					46	49			
College and Career Acceleration					79	70			
ELP Progress			40		62	76			

\* In cases where a school does not test 95% of students in a subject, the achievement component will be different in the Federal Percent of Points Index (FPPI) than in school grades calculation.

See [Florida School Grades, School Improvement Ratings and DJJ Accountability Ratings](#).

#### ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	57
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	287
Total Components for the Federal Index	5
Percent Tested	97
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	53

**2021-22 ESSA Federal Index**

OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	478
Total Components for the Federal Index	9
Percent Tested	97
Graduation Rate	

**ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)****2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY**

<b>ESSA Subgroup</b>	<b>Federal Percent of Points Index</b>	<b>Subgroup Below 41%</b>	<b>Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%</b>	<b>Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%</b>
SWD	39	Yes	1	
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	41			
HSP	66			
MUL	63			
PAC				
WHT	59			
FRL	49			

**2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY**

<b>ESSA Subgroup</b>	<b>Federal Percent of Points Index</b>	<b>Subgroup Below 41%</b>	<b>Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%</b>	<b>Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%</b>
SWD	42			
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	46			
HSP	57			

**2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY**

<b>ESSA Subgroup</b>	<b>Federal Percent of Points Index</b>	<b>Subgroup Below 41%</b>	<b>Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%</b>	<b>Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%</b>
MUL	54			
PAC				
WHT	54			
FRL	48			

**Accountability Components by Subgroup**

Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school. (pre-populated)

**2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS**

<b>Subgroups</b>	<b>ELA Ach.</b>	<b>ELA LG</b>	<b>ELA LG L25%</b>	<b>Math Ach.</b>	<b>Math LG</b>	<b>Math LG L25%</b>	<b>Sci Ach.</b>	<b>SS Ach.</b>	<b>MS Accel.</b>	<b>Grad Rate 2021-22</b>	<b>C &amp; C Accel 2021-22</b>	<b>ELP Progress</b>
All Students	48			59			44	72	64			
SWD	30			39			33	53			4	
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	30			39			30	57	50		5	
HSP	51			71			54	92	60		5	
MUL	54			62			58	76			4	
PAC												
WHT	50			61			45	73	64		5	
FRL	40			50			34	67	55		5	

**2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS**

<b>Subgroups</b>	<b>ELA Ach.</b>	<b>ELA LG</b>	<b>ELA LG L25%</b>	<b>Math Ach.</b>	<b>Math LG</b>	<b>Math LG L25%</b>	<b>Sci Ach.</b>	<b>SS Ach.</b>	<b>MS Accel.</b>	<b>Grad Rate 2020-21</b>	<b>C &amp; C Accel 2020-21</b>	<b>ELP Progress</b>
All Students	49	52	43	51	49	47	46	79	62			
SWD	30	41	41	35	45	43	30	72				
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
BLK	32	51	45	34	45	42	24	68	70			
HSP	56	55		62	60		50					
MUL	53	56	40	53	53	50	50	87	46			
PAC												
WHT	51	51	43	53	49	48	50	80	62			
FRL	41	49	39	42	48	46	39	71	59			

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	42	44	35	47	40	36	51	75	51			
SWD	27	32	24	37	33	23	25	42				
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	25	35	32	22	25	30	22	54	24			
HSP	59	68		62	31							
MUL	48	52		48	43	38	53	70	46			
PAC												
WHT	45	44	35	51	42	39	56	78	53			
FRL	34	40	33	39	38	36	39	66	40			

### Grade Level Data Review– State Assessments (pre-populated)

The data are raw data and include ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data. The percentages shown here represent ALL students who received a score of 3 or higher on the statewide assessments.

An asterisk (\*) in any cell indicates the data has been suppressed due to fewer than 10 students tested, or all tested students scoring the same.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
07	2023 - Spring	47%	47%	0%	47%	0%
08	2023 - Spring	45%	45%	0%	47%	-2%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
04	2023 - Spring	*	49%	*	58%	*
06	2023 - Spring	47%	47%	0%	47%	0%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	65%	65%	0%	54%	11%
07	2023 - Spring	62%	62%	0%	48%	14%
04	2023 - Spring	*	48%	*	61%	*
08	2023 - Spring	44%	44%	0%	55%	-11%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	44%	44%	0%	44%	0%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	92%	56%	36%	50%	42%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	*	50%	*	48%	*

CIVICS						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	71%	71%	0%	66%	5%

### III. Planning for Improvement

#### Data Analysis/Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources.



**Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year's low performance and discuss any trends.**

The Statewide Science Assessment was the lowest performing component. With that being said, in comparison to the state results, BCMS was even with the state. Both BCMS and statewide data showed 44% of students with proficiency scores for 8th grade science. Last year's 8th graders did not take the 5th grade Statewide Science Assessment due to the COVID closure in the spring of 2020. With the assessment being a 3 year cumulative exam, teachers have been working on filling in the gaps during the 6th, 7th, and 8th grade school year. Statewide data declined as well. BCMS fell 2 percentage points from 46% to 44% proficiency, while the state fell from 47% to 44% proficiency. The state as a whole declined 3% while BCMS only declined 2%. We are working with teachers to identify areas of strengths as well as weaknesses as we create a plan to move forward in helping students master the science content.

**Which data component showed the greatest decline from the prior year? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this decline.**

FAST English Language Arts for 6th grade showed the largest decrease from 2022-2023. Sixth grade has historically been one of our highest performing grades, with the writing component being a boost for students scores. In the fall of 2022 ELA teachers implemented a new set of standards. These standards were assessed through progress monitoring three times during the 2022-2023 school-year. Each PM showed an increase in student proficiency. However, the final ELA scores for 2022-2023 school year no longer include the writing component, an area that 6th grade students have historically performed well on. Factors that contributed to the decline were teacher knowledge and adaptation of the new B.E.S.T. ELA standards and the omission of the writing component.

**Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends.**

The component with the greatest gap when compared to the state average is 7th grade math. The gap shows BCMS being 14 points above state average. However, the component with the greatest gap that is below the state average when compared is 8th grade math. Even though this is an 11 point gap from the state's average, it is a 21 point increase from last year. This improvement is mentioned in the next response.

**Which data component showed the most improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?**

Math as a whole was the data component that showed the most improvement. Seventh grade math showed an 11 point increase, 8th grade math (non Algebra 1 students) showed a 21 percent increase, and Algebra 1 EOC data showed a 22 point increase from the 2021-2022 school year. Our school adopted the SAVVAS curriculum with rigorous examples aligned with the B.E.S.T. standards. In addition, we created a Professional Learning Community (PLC) with all of the math teachers. The PLCs were separated into grade-level groups to plan, discuss, and evaluate progress monitoring throughout the year. The majority of our math teachers also attended a series of B.E.S.T. math standards workshops provided by NEFEC, focusing on the Mathematical Thinking & Reasoning standards (MTRs). BCMS teachers also focused on teaching students the routine of writing down math problems and working them out on paper. In addition, the administration team at BCMS restructured the master schedule to assign the two teachers with the highest Algebra 1 EOC scores from the previous year as the only Algebra 1 teachers. The other math teachers taught 8th grade math only. This streamlined the curriculum planning and collaboration effort. In previous years, all 8th grade teachers had taught one to two sections of Algebra 1, and the rest of their day they taught 8th grade math (pre-algebra). By allowing the teachers to solely focus on one set of standards, they were able to help students master the content at a higher level.

**Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I, identify one or two potential areas of concern.**

After reviewing the Early Warning System data, the two areas of most concern are:

- Students with 10% or more absences
- Students scoring Level 1 ELA achievement

**Rank your highest priorities (maximum of 5) for school improvement in the upcoming school year.**

Positive School Culture (includes attendance and behavior)

ELA Achievement

Science Achievement

**Area of Focus**

(Identified key Area of Focus that addresses the school's highest priority based on any/all relevant data sources)

**#1. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Early Warning System****Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

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

One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

In 2020, a team of counselors, teachers, and administrators met over the course of several months to create a plan for the implementation of a homeroom period. The purpose of the homeroom, as defined by this group, is to give teachers time to cultivate a loving and nurturing relationship with a group of students that will enable them to thrive in the optimal learning environment.

For the 2023 - 2024 school year, the homeroom program began with three consecutive days of instruction. The homeroom periods were 30 minutes each of these days. Throughout the remaining weeks of the school year, homeroom will meet on Mondays for 30 minutes. The curriculum developed by the team of stakeholders will focus on three main areas: promotion of good attendance, positive behavior, and academic achievement. Other areas of focus include: cyber safety, mental health, and goal planning. The school's character education program includes lessons from the Florida Department of Education's Resiliency Toolkit in CPALMS. The homeroom program is critical to the school's efforts to promote a positive school culture and healthy environment.

In addition to the homeroom program, the school has implemented a "house system" as part of our Positive Behavior and Interventions and Supports (PBIS) program. Students were randomly assigned to six houses: Apollo, Athena, Demeter, Hephaestus, Hermes, and Poseidon. Teachers and staff award points in a digital spreadsheet based on students exhibiting positive behavior and academic achievement. Houses are recognized at the end of each day during a schoolwide announcement. Approximately every three weeks, the house with the most points will receive an award.

In the 2023-2024 school year, a new attendance coordinator has been added to the school leadership team. Mrs. Davis will focus on interventions and positive culture impacts related to encouraging improving student attendance.

**Measurable Outcome:**

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

Students with absences to school totaling 18 days or more (10% or more) will decrease by 10%.  
Students with one or more suspensions from school will decrease by 10%.

**Monitoring:**

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

The attendance coordinator, Mrs. Beth Davis, will monitor student absences monthly. Students with absence trends will be placed into a Tier II attendance intervention, and monitoring will increase to weekly.

Mrs. Harris, Teacher of Special Assignment/Dean, will monitor behavioral data as a part of the PBIS team. This team meets monthly to discuss trends.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Pamela Harris (pamela.harris@bakerk12.org)

**Evidence-based Intervention:**

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

**Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:**

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

### **Tier of Evidence-based Intervention**

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

### **Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?**

No

### **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.

The homeroom committee will revise the character education program to include FLDOE's Resiliency Toolkit.

**Person Responsible:** Beth Davis (beth.davis@bakerk12.org)

**By When:** August 25, 2023

Positive postcards will be sent to chronically absent students from the 2022-2023 school year.

**Person Responsible:** Beth Davis (beth.davis@bakerk12.org)

**By When:** August 10, 2023

The house system for PBIS will be restructured to add two additional groups (going from 4 groups to 6 groups for the 2023-2024 school year). Positive messaging will be posted around the school with house banners that include positive action words associated with character education and resiliency.

**Person Responsible:** Pamela Harris (pamela.harris@bakerk12.org)

**By When:** The restructure will be completed by August 3, 2023. The school signage will be posted by September 30, 2023.

The MTSS Tier II team will meet and discuss students with attendance and behavior concerns as needed throughout the year. The formal MTSS Tier II referral process will be followed. Students with one or more behavior referrals and students who had more than 15 absences during 2022-2023 school year will be met on during weekly MTSS Tier II meetings.

**Person Responsible:** Greta Elledge (gretchen.elledge@bakerk12.org)

**By When:** September 30, 2023

**#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA****Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

A focus area for BCMS during the 2023-2024 school year is ELA achievement. Sixth and seventh grade students performed at the same percentage rate as the state average while eighth grade performed two percentage points below the state. Although sixth grade ELA meets state average, historically sixth grade ELA has performed much higher.

**Measurable Outcome:**

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

ELA achievement levels of proficiency at BCMS will increase by five percentage points on the FAST ELA PM3 assessment in the spring of 2024.

**Monitoring:**

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

Using a new school-wide curriculum aligned with the B.E.S.T. standards, students will take unit and benchmark assessments throughout the year to monitor progress. In addition, that data will be compared to FAST Progress Monitoring (PM1 and PM2). Adjustments will be made to instruction based on data analysis of student performance.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Naomi Anderson (naomi.anderson@bakerk12.org)

**Evidence-based Intervention:**

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

**Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:**

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

**Tier of Evidence-based Intervention**

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

**Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?**

No

**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 review the B.E.S.T. standards and map the CommonLit 360 curriculum for the 2023-2024 school year.

**Person Responsible:** Naomi Anderson (naomi.anderson@bakerk12.org)

**By When:** Summer of 2023

Teachers will attend a series of professional development on explicit instruction.

**Person Responsible:** Jana Willoughby (jana.willoughby@bakerk12.org)

**By When:** August 4, 2023 September 20, 2023 October 16, 2023 December 6, 2023 February 28, 2023

Teachers will attend a professional development on questioning strategies and instructional pedagogy. They will receive feedback from observations associated with the implementation of the strategies learned.

**Person Responsible:** Naomi Anderson (naomi.anderson@bakerk12.org)

**By When:** The training took place on June 20th and 21st of 2023. Observations based on strategy implementation will be conducted in the fall semester of 2023.

**#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science****Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

An area of focus for BCMS during the 2023-2024 is science achievement. During the 2022-2023 school year, 44% of 8th grade students showed proficiency on the NGSS Statewide Science Assessment. Although this proficiency rate is even with the state proficiency rate, it is the lowest performing category for BCMS.

**Measurable Outcome:**

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

Eighth grade student proficiency scores will increase by 6 percentage points on the spring 2024 NGSS SSA.

**Monitoring:**

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

Teachers will be using unit and benchmark assessments through Study Island and Houghton Mifflin Harcourt (HMH) curriculum. Through the 8th grade science Professional Learning Community (PLC), teachers will analyze their data at the end of each unit (approximately monthly) to look for trends and adjust instruction based on student performance.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Ashton Norman (ashton.norman@bakerk12.org)

**Evidence-based Intervention:**

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

**Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:**

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

**Tier of Evidence-based Intervention**

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

**Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?**

No

**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.

8th grade teachers will implement Study Island as a supplemental curriculum

**Person Responsible:** Ashton Norman (ashton.norman@bakerk12.org)

**By When:** September 5, 2023

Teachers will attend a series of professional development on explicit instruction.

**Person Responsible:** Jana Willoughby (jana.willoughby@bakerk12.org)

**By When:** August 4, 2023 September 20, 2023 October 16, 2023 December 6, 2023 February 28, 2023

Teachers will attend a professional development on questioning strategies and instructional pedagogy. They will receive feedback from observations associated with the implementation of the strategies learned.

**Person Responsible:** Naomi Anderson (naomi.anderson@bakerk12.org)

**By When:** The training took place on June 20th and 21st of 2023. Observations based on strategy implementation will be conducted in the fall semester of 2023.