

The School District of Palm Beach County

Christa Mcauliffe Middle School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

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

Christa McAuliffe Middle School

6500 LE CHALET BLVD, Boynton Beach, FL 33472

<https://cmms.palmbeachschools.org>

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Palm Beach County School Board on 10/18/2023.

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 Christa McAuliffe Middle School is to Educate, Affirm, and Inspire each student in an equity-embedded school setting.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Christa McAuliffe Middle School along with the entire School District of Palm Beach County envisions a dynamic collaborative multi-cultural community where education and lifelong learning are valued and supported, and all learners reach their highest potential and succeed in the global economy.

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 |
|--------------------|---------------------|---|
| Graydon, Dwight | Principal | The Principal is the educational leader of the school and assumes the responsibility of promoting safety, providing equity and access to the curriculum, expecting academic success for all students, and allocating and managing resources to support instruction. He oversees all aspects of the school's operational and instructional processes, people, and technology. The principal deepens understanding of standards and engages faculty, students, parents, and community members to understand the standards and the vision of academic success aligned to high school, college, and career readiness. He directly supervises the Assistant Principals, Math Department, Electives Department, and Front Office Staff. |
| Taylor, Shaundrika | Assistant Principal | The school assistant principal supports the principal as educational leader of the school in all aspects of administration, including promoting safety, providing equity and access to the curriculum, and expecting academic success for all students. Helps to deepen understanding of standards and engages faculty, students, parents, and community members to understand the standards and the vision of academic success aligned to high school, college, and career readiness. Directly supervises the ELA / Reading Department, ESE Department, as well as assumes the roles of Testing Coordinator and Transportation contact. |
| Hoffman, Keith | Assistant Principal | The school assistant principal supports the principal as educational leader of the school in all aspects of administration, including promoting safety, providing equity and access to the curriculum, and expecting academic success for all students. Helps to deepen understanding of standards and engages faculty, students, parents, and community members to understand the standards and the vision of academic success aligned to high school, college, and career readiness. Directly supervises the Math department and Custodians as well as assumes the roles of Facilities Contact. |
| Martin, Warren | Assistant Principal | The Assistant Principal supports the Principal as educational leader of the school in all aspects of administration, including promoting safety, providing equity and access to the curriculum, and expecting academic success for all students. Mr. Martin helps to deepen understanding of standards and engages faculty, students, parents, and community members to understand the standards and the vision of academic success aligned to high school, college, and career readiness. Mr. Martin directly supervises Science department, Athletics and Academy program. |

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 leadership team will meet to discuss the School Improvement Plan to include the role of the stakeholder, data and school needs. The various stakeholders will have input in their respective roles. School guidance counselors work in partnership with families to ensure family and student needs are met. This includes student with special educational needs such as McKinney-Vento, family Empowerment, ESE, ESOL, and Multicultural. Parents will have various trainings and workshops based on their needs with the Behavior Health Professional, Co-located Counsellors, Guidance, department chairs for ELA and or Math.

School Resource Officers are on campus daily for the safety and security of all students and staff. The school leadership team has a designated single point of entry when entering the campus and when on campus. All students and parents are aware of the Fortify Florida App to report any concerns that may effect student safety. The Raptor system is used to sign in visitors before they can enter campus and go to any locations.

The ESOL Coordinator and School Counselor work with District multicultural to ensure the implementation of programs and services to include testing and best outcomes for English Language Learners

ESE Coordinator works with District ESE department to ensure student with exceptional needs are met

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 is living document that demonstrates the improvement that the school does. The School Improvement Plan is updated throughout the year to ensure the plan is being implemented and documentation updated of what is being done. Christa McAuliffe school leadership team works collaboratively to review and analyze data. The leadership team works on the following student achievement goals:

Strategic planning

Develop action steps towards student improvement

Identify the problem

Develop, create and maintain a culture of collaborating and decision making

Support professional learning and improvement

Monitor will be ongoing throughout the year. Each core subject area will monitored by the school leaders to monitor grade level benchmarks that demonstrate mastery. The assessments to be monitored will include Districts Diagnostic: FSQ, USA, Midterms, Reading Plus Diagnostics, PM 1,2,and 3 for ELA and Math. BEST Algebra and Geometry.

The Teachers will follow the scope and sequence provided by the Palm Beach School District Christa McAuliffe is also now an approved Cambridge school and use the 8th grade level ELA curriculum in collaboration with the District curriculum. Teacher will plan together during common planning meeting.

ELL students will be administered WIDA. WIDA is used to assess ELL students proficiency in the areas, listening, speaking, reading and writing. ESOL Coordinator is trained by the District which then trains the Teacher to implement the curriculum, assess data, and develop lessons with differentiated instruction based on the data.

ESE students will be administered FSAA. FSAA is used to assess students proficiency in all content areas to include English, Math, Science and Social Studies. Teachers are trained by the District and ESE Coordinator on assessing data, implementing differentiated instruction based on students needs and data.

On going monitoring is doing weekly, by weekly and monthly in the with following monitoring tools: Review lesson plans, data analysis, classroom walkthroughs, data chats, formal and informal observations, common planning (PLC), student attendance, and teacher attendance.

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

| | |
|--|--|
| 2023-24 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 |
| 2022-23 Title I School Status | No |
| 2022-23 Minority Rate | 56% |
| 2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate | 57% |
| Charter School | No |
| RAISE School | No |
| ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024 | N/A |
| Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) | No |
| 2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Students With Disabilities (SWD) English Language Learners (ELL) Asian Students (ASN) Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL) |
| School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline. | 2021-22: A 2019-20: A 2018-19: A 2017-18: A |
| School Improvement Rating History | |
| DJJ Accountability Rating History | |

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 | 56 | 68 | 59 | 183 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 41 | 79 | 59 | 179 |
| Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 46 | 66 | 60 | 172 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 47 | 65 | 85 | 197 |
| Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 90 | 99 | 98 | 287 |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 70 | 84 | 88 | 242 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C. | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 46 | 66 | 60 | 172 |

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 | 95 | 126 | 119 | 340 |

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 | 8 | 20 | 17 | 45 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

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 | 54 | 53 | 61 | 168 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 43 | 50 | 40 | 133 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 39 | 35 | 88 | 162 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 26 | 55 | 70 | 151 |
| Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 59 | 72 | 72 | 203 |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 107 | 97 | 59 | 263 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C. | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 103 | 99 | 0 | 302 |

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 | 93 | 70 | 66 | 229 |

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 | 24 | 21 | 18 | 63 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |

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 | 54 | 53 | 61 | 168 | |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 43 | 50 | 40 | 133 | |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 39 | 35 | 88 | 162 | |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 26 | 55 | 70 | 151 | |
| Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 59 | 72 | 72 | 203 | |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 107 | 97 | 59 | 263 | |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C. | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 103 | 99 | 0 | 202 | |

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 | 93 | 70 | 66 | 229 |

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 | 24 | 21 | 18 | 63 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |

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* | 62 | 51 | 49 | 62 | 53 | 50 | 63 | | |
| ELA Learning Gains | | | | 52 | | | 51 | | |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | 37 | | | 32 | | |
| Math Achievement* | 66 | 59 | 56 | 68 | 35 | 36 | 64 | | |
| Math Learning Gains | | | | 69 | | | 45 | | |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | 65 | | | 30 | | |
| Science Achievement* | 61 | 50 | 49 | 58 | 56 | 53 | 68 | | |
| Social Studies Achievement* | 69 | 68 | 68 | 74 | 64 | 58 | 72 | | |
| Middle School Acceleration | 72 | 76 | 73 | 84 | 52 | 49 | 77 | | |
| Graduation Rate | | | | | 50 | 49 | | | |
| College and Career Acceleration | | | | | 70 | 70 | | | |
| ELP Progress | 49 | 37 | 40 | 33 | 85 | 76 | 52 | | |

* 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 | 63 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students | No |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 1 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 379 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 6 |
| Percent Tested | 99 |
| Graduation Rate | |

| 2021-22 ESSA Federal Index | |
|--------------------------------------|-----|
| ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI) | N/A |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students | 60 |

| 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 | 602 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 10 |
| Percent Tested | 98 |
| Graduation Rate | |

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

| 2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY | | | | |
|------------------------------------|---------------------------------|--------------------|---|---|
| ESSA Subgroup | Federal Percent of Points Index | Subgroup Below 41% | Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41% | Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32% |
| SWD | 42 | | | |
| ELL | 38 | Yes | 1 | |
| AMI | | | | |
| ASN | 88 | | | |
| BLK | 47 | | | |
| HSP | 64 | | | |
| MUL | 71 | | | |
| PAC | | | | |
| WHT | 68 | | | |
| FRL | 52 | | | |

| 2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY | | | | |
|------------------------------------|---------------------------------|--------------------|---|---|
| ESSA Subgroup | Federal Percent of Points Index | Subgroup Below 41% | Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41% | Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32% |
| SWD | 42 | | | |
| ELL | 48 | | | |
| AMI | | | | |
| ASN | 87 | | | |
| BLK | 45 | | | |
| HSP | 58 | | | |

| 2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY | | | | |
|------------------------------------|---------------------------------|--------------------|---|---|
| ESSA Subgroup | Federal Percent of Points Index | Subgroup Below 41% | Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41% | Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32% |
| MUL | 66 | | | |
| PAC | | | | |
| WHT | 67 | | | |
| FRL | 54 | | | |

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 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|----------|--------|-------------|-----------|---------|--------------|----------|---------|-----------|-------------------|---------------------|--------------|
| Subgroups | ELA Ach. | ELA LG | ELA LG L25% | Math Ach. | Math LG | Math LG L25% | Sci Ach. | SS Ach. | MS Accel. | Grad Rate 2021-22 | C & C Accel 2021-22 | ELP Progress |
| All Students | 62 | | | 66 | | | 61 | 69 | 72 | | | 49 |
| SWD | 38 | | | 39 | | | 32 | 51 | 63 | | 6 | 31 |
| ELL | 37 | | | 47 | | | 26 | 39 | 31 | | 6 | 49 |
| AMI | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ASN | 80 | | | 88 | | | 93 | 91 | 87 | | 5 | |
| BLK | 51 | | | 48 | | | 37 | 56 | 58 | | 6 | 33 |
| HSP | 61 | | | 65 | | | 60 | 72 | 72 | | 6 | 54 |
| MUL | 70 | | | 71 | | | 50 | 72 | 94 | | 5 | |
| PAC | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 64 | | | 70 | | | 67 | 68 | 71 | | 5 | |
| FRL | 51 | | | 52 | | | 45 | 57 | 63 | | 6 | 44 |

| 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 |
| All Students | 62 | 52 | 37 | 68 | 69 | 65 | 58 | 74 | 84 | | | 33 |
| SWD | 33 | 39 | 33 | 38 | 56 | 44 | 33 | 45 | 58 | | | |
| ELL | 41 | 46 | 34 | 50 | 62 | 49 | 39 | 57 | 72 | | | 33 |
| AMI | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ASN | 88 | 70 | | 90 | 86 | 83 | 86 | 93 | 100 | | | |

| 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 | 43 | 40 | 25 | 46 | 60 | 53 | 38 | 58 | 90 | | | 0 |
| HSP | 61 | 51 | 38 | 67 | 67 | 60 | 52 | 70 | 79 | | | 38 |
| MUL | 65 | 61 | 46 | 64 | 67 | 67 | 65 | 75 | 81 | | | |
| PAC | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 66 | 54 | 42 | 74 | 71 | 74 | 63 | 80 | 83 | | | |
| FRL | 54 | 48 | 36 | 58 | 64 | 58 | 50 | 64 | 80 | | | 28 |

| 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 | 63 | 51 | 32 | 64 | 45 | 30 | 68 | 72 | 77 | | | 52 |
| SWD | 30 | 34 | 25 | 34 | 38 | 28 | 35 | 48 | 65 | | | |
| ELL | 46 | 48 | 30 | 47 | 32 | 22 | 33 | 59 | 71 | | | 52 |
| AMI | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ASN | 86 | 68 | | 87 | 60 | | 87 | 93 | 89 | | | |
| BLK | 45 | 45 | 32 | 38 | 32 | 22 | 50 | 56 | 70 | | | |
| HSP | 58 | 46 | 29 | 58 | 43 | 26 | 60 | 63 | 72 | | | 62 |
| MUL | 69 | 57 | 55 | 68 | 57 | 44 | 65 | 73 | 70 | | | |
| PAC | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 69 | 52 | 31 | 71 | 47 | 33 | 75 | 79 | 79 | | | |
| FRL | 52 | 46 | 30 | 51 | 40 | 29 | 57 | 62 | 72 | | | 47 |

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 | 58% | 48% | 10% | 47% | 11% |
| 08 | 2023 - Spring | 60% | 47% | 13% | 47% | 13% |

| ELA | | | | | | |
|-------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 06 | 2023 - Spring | 59% | 45% | 14% | 47% | 12% |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|-------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 06 | 2023 - Spring | 60% | 54% | 6% | 54% | 6% |
| 07 | 2023 - Spring | 41% | 36% | 5% | 48% | -7% |
| 08 | 2023 - Spring | 69% | 65% | 4% | 55% | 14% |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
|---------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 08 | 2023 - Spring | 60% | 46% | 14% | 44% | 16% |

| ALGEBRA | | | | | | |
|---------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| N/A | 2023 - Spring | 96% | 48% | 48% | 50% | 46% |

| GEOMETRY | | | | | | |
|----------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| N/A | 2023 - Spring | 100% | 50% | 50% | 48% | 52% |

| CIVICS | | | | | | |
|--------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| N/A | 2023 - Spring | 69% | 65% | 4% | 66% | 3% |

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.

FY23 FAST PM#3 /EOC FY22 FY19
ELA 59 63 72
SWDs 35 33 37

Math 60 68 76
SWDs 37 38 40

Math Acceleration NA 84 78
SWDs 42 58 55

Algebra 96 NA NA
Geometry 100 NA NA

Science 60 58 71
SWDS 33 33 37

Civics 69 74 81
SWDS 49 45 54

Our lowest performance when comparing FY19 to FY23 is in ELA (-13 pts), Civics (-11 pts), Science (-11 pts), and Math (-16pts). This decline also is seen in our SWD subgroups, which show a range of -2 to -13 points in the content areas. When looking at our FY22 data, we are also seeing declines in all the content areas. We feel the decline is demonstrating a trend.

A contributing factor was the unfamiliarity of the teachers and the students with the new standards. The school started FY23 with the majority of the leadership new to the school. We also experienced a high teacher attendance issue and there is a substitute shortage throughout the nation which caused an interruption in instruction and learning.

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

Our greatest decline was seen in:
FY23 FAST PM#3 /EOC FY22 FY19
ELA 59 63 72

Math 60 68 76

Math Acceleration SWDs
42 58 55
Science 60 58 71

Civics 69 74 81

A contributing factor was the unfamiliarity of the teachers and the students with the new standards. The school started FY23 with the majority of the leadership new to the school. We also experienced a high teacher attendance issue and there is a substitute shortage throughout the nation which caused an interruption in instruction and learning.

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.

When looking at the FAST Progress Monitoring data for Window 3 we see the following data. Due to the new BEST standard implementation, the State is not considering learning gains for FY23

School State
ELA Achievement 59
6th 59 47
7th 58 47
8th 60 47

Math Achievement 60
6th 60 54
7th 41 48
8th 69 55

Algebra 96 54
Geometry 100 49

Science 60 47

Civics 69 66

In comparison to the state, our school has outperformed the state in all content areas except for 7th-grade Math. Historically CMMS is a school that has strong teacher retention, therefore teachers have established routines and expectations that are consistent across the campus. Our feeder elementary schools have a population of high-performing students, therefore students come to us with a very high academic background, and our teachers dedicate more time to enrichment which is reflected in our high scores.

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

Math Acceleration NA 84 78
SWDs 42 58 55

Algebra 96 NA NA
Geometry 100 NA NA

The school had invested many resources such as online IXL math programs, tutoring services, and advanced math placement for students showing ability. We strategically placed two very strong instructional teachers in the acceleration courses. They had a wealth of knowledge and experience with the content. Historically CMMS is a school that has strong teacher retention, therefore teachers have established routines and expectations that are consistent across the campus. Our feeder elementary schools have a population of high-performing students, therefore students come to us with a very high academic background, and our teachers dedicate more time to enrichment which is reflected in our high scores.

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

Ensuring student success is at the forefront of our focus. If we address the areas of concern below, we are ensuring our students receive the support needed for growth and achievement. When looking at our Early Warning System indicators our two potential areas of concern are:

- Suspensions
- Level 1 State Assessments ELA & Math

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

Ensure that the ELA and Science scores increase this year across the board. Teachers will be provided professional development and support to maximize common planning meetings (CPM). The progress monitoring of student achievement will be enhanced and reviewed during CPMs. ELA Gains have been a focus for the school for many years and knowing that PYG, Gains, and Achievement go hand in hand, a laser-like focus will remain in place. If teachers work to get the academic growth needed in every student, then those gains will equate to achievement increases across the board. We will work closely with the secondary Literacy District department to schedule PDs and coaching opportunities focused on ELA strategies and content.

Administration and Department Heads on campus will guide teachers in the process of reviewing and analyzing data. Teachers will be shown how to use summative and formative data to target areas of need and differentiate instruction. All teachers will receive specific training for testing that will include the importance of exams and the effect of student effort during exams on exam performance. The administration will provide support from the top while utilizing change-sustaining approaches. We must be prepared to shift paradigms when needed while at the same time exhibiting transparent communication skills.

We will assimilate and integrate by investing in the planning process for sustained results. We will ensure additional support for our SWD students through differentiated small-group instruction by our ESE teachers working in collaboration with the content-area teachers. Lastly, we will use strategies such as developing a “yes we can” attitude; interprofessional reflective practice; individual, multilevel, and collective leadership; evidence generation and use; and performance evaluation.

Our school will infuse the content required by Florida Statute 1003.42(2) and S.B. Policy 2.09 (8)(b)(ii), as applicable to appropriate grade levels, including but not limited to:

- (g) History of the Holocaust
- (h) History of Africans and African Americans
- (i) History of Asian Americans & Pacific Islanders
- (o) Health Education, Life Skills & Social Media
- (q) Hispanic Contributions
- (r) Women’s Contributions
- (t) Civic & Character Education
- (u) Sacrifices of Veterans, and the value of Medal of Honor recipients

2. Character-development program (required K-12) with curriculum to address: patriotism; responsibility; citizenship; kindness; respect for authority, life, liberty, and personal property; honesty; charity; self-control; racial, ethnic, and religious tolerance; and cooperation.

3. Our school highlights multicultural diversity within the curriculum and the arts.

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.

When looking at our incident data we see:

2019 2020 2021 2022 2023

137 146 71 294 352

Students with one or more suspensions increased from 133 SY22 to 179 SY23.

In alignment with the District's Strategic Plan, we enhance a sense of belonging, safety, and acceptance for all students. Our instructional priority is to use trends in student data to identify needs in order to support positive behaviors.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Considering that there has been a trend in the increase of incidents and suspensions we will review and monitor student behavior data closely every quarter.

Quarter 1, reduce suspension by 25

Quarter 2, reduce suspension by 25

Quarter 3, reduce suspension by 25

Quarter 4, reduce suspension by 25

The goal is to reduce one or more suspensions to 100 or below by May 2024.

Monitoring:

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

The area of focus will be monitored monthly in SIS and Principal's dashboard as well as EDW during Admin meetings and safety committee meetings.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Dwight Graydon (dwight.graydon@palmbeachschools.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.)

1. Professional Development during preschool
2. The school has purchased a new monitoring system Student Conductor which Admin and support staff as well as teachers will use to document and monitor various areas of concern that could lead to student suspension.
3. HEROES

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

1. District support with professional development towards teacher understanding of minor vs. major incidences.
2. Student conductor tracks hall passes, discipline, school rules such as cellphone policy, and tardies. With the purchase of this program, the Administration can monitor and address concerns before they reach level 2 offenses.
3. HEROES is an incentive program where teachers reward students for appropriate behaviors on and out of the classroom environment. The focus is on the positive.

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.

PD:

1. Collaborate with the District to schedule PD on incidences
2. Focus was on understanding minor vs. major issues
3. Teachers will use the 2464 eForm; Corrective Behavior form instead of the disciplinary referrals.
4. The expectation is that the amount of referrals will decline

Person Responsible: Dwight Graydon (dwight.graydon@palmbeachschools.org)

By When: August 2023- May 30, 2024

Student Conductor

1. Teachers and students are trained on how to utilize the Student Conductor.
2. The tracking system gives a time stamp on when the students are in and out of class and where they are going system.
3. The goal is for teachers and Admin to minimize student movement during instructional time.

Person Responsible: Dwight Graydon (dwight.graydon@palmbeachschools.org)

By When: August 2023-May 2024

HEROES

1. Teachers trained to understand the expectations
2. Host student assemblies to explain HEROES and the expectations
3. Teachers monitor and track student behaviors through the HEROES monitoring program.
4. Teachers award points for positive behaviors.
5. Students can accumulate and utilize points towards rewards.
6. The admin monitors the tracking system to ensure teachers using the program with fidelity and which students are being awarded.

Person Responsible: Dwight Graydon (dwight.graydon@palmbeachschools.org)

By When: August 2023- May 2024

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Collaborative Planning**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.

FY23 FAST PM#3 /EOC FY22 FY19

ELA 59 63 72

SWDs 35 33 37

Math 60 68 76

SWDs 37 38 40

Math Acceleration NA 84 78

SWDs 42 58 55

Algebra 96 NA NA

Geometry 100 NA NA

Science 60 58 71

SWDS 33 33 37

Civics 69 74 81

SWDS 49 45 54

Our lowest performance when comparing FY19 to FY23 is in ELA (-13 pts), Civics (-11 pts), Science (-11 pts), and Math (-16pts). This decline also is seen in our SWD subgroups, which show a range of -2 to -13 points in the content areas.

If we focus on standards-based instruction to increase learning gains in school-wide ELA and Math, then we will increase student achievement and ensure alignment to the District's Strategic Plan; This area of focus aligns directly with our District Strategic Plan, Theme A-Goal 3, Academic Excellence & growth. Our first instructional priority is to deliver, content, concept, or skill that is aligned to the benchmark and intended learning.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Student Learning Outcomes:

By February 2024, we will increase the overall percentage of students achieving proficiency in:

ELA: +4

Math: +4

Acceleration: +5

Science: +3

Civics: +3

SWDs: +2

By May 2024, we will increase the overall percentage of students achieving proficiency in:

ELA: +4

Math: +4

Acceleration: +5

Science: +3

Civics: +3
 SWDs: +2

By February 70% of our teachers will effectively follow the scope and sequence for all contents.
 By May 95% of our teachers will effectively follow the scope and sequence for all contents.

Monitoring:

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

Monitoring is a key detail in achieving student progress. It is a way of supporting learning through the adapting of instruction. It is an integral part of the continuous improvement model: Can, Do, Plan, Act. Monitoring is a very important step towards student achievement and school improvement. It provides teachers and administration the data that they need to make decisions about instruction and differentiated support for the students. Our goal is to monitor for implementation and for impact.

At CMMS we strategically plan for a variety of monitoring techniques:

Review of Lesson Plans, Data Analysis, Classroom walks, Student work samples/portfolio/binder reviews, Student attendance, Data Chats, Formal Observations, Professional Learning Communities attendance/participation, all Formative/Summative Assessments and Technology.

The implementation of Common Planning Meetings (CPM's) performed with fidelity, instructional walks, and placing a greater emphasis on data-driven instruction through progress monitoring.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Dwight Graydon (dwight.graydon@palmbeachschools.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.)

1. Common Planning
2. Scope and Sequence:
3. Professional Learning Community (PLC)/Professional Development

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

1. During common planning meetings, performance matters data will be reviewed and analyzed to drive instruction.
2. Teachers will follow the District scope and sequence to ensure all standards are being taught. A focus on Standards-based instruction, high expectations, personalized teaching and learning, and increased student engagement to support achievement outcomes.
3. Professional Learning Community (PLC)/Professional Development will ensure teachers collaboratively unite to focus on best practices and methodologies. PD will support the development of teacher expertise and instructional strategy success and focus.

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.

Common Planning:

1. Develop a common planning schedule to include ESE teachers
2. Admin monitors weekly CPMs closely with each grade-level content area team.
3. Teachers will review and analyze student data to make decisions on the next steps for instruction.
4. Teachers will use technology to reinforce standards such as Study Island, IXL, Reading Plus, etc.

Person Responsible: Dwight Graydon (dwight.graydon@palmbeachschools.org)

By When: August 2023 - May 30, 2024

Scope & Sequence

1. Teachers follow the Scope & Sequence in Blender to ensure teachers are teaching the standard within the specific time range to ensure student success in the formative/summative assessments.
2. Teachers maintain the Board configuration with a standard focus and daily instruction.
3. The administration monitors the instruction through classroom walks and data analysis reviews.

Person Responsible: Dwight Graydon (dwight.graydon@palmbeachschools.org)

By When: August 2023 - May 30, 2024

Professional Development

1. Collaborate with the District's secondary literacy department
2. Develop a schedule for the District team to provide PD for all ELA teachers.
3. Admin follows up with teachers to ensure the PD practices are being implemented. This will be evidenced through an increase in student learning and achievement and classroom observations.

Person Responsible: Dwight Graydon (dwight.graydon@palmbeachschools.org)

By When: August 2023 - May 30, 2024