

# **Table of Contents**

| School Demographics            | 3  |
|--------------------------------|----|
| Purpose and Outline of the SIP | 4  |
| School Information             | 5  |
| Needs Assessment               | 7  |
| Planning for Improvement       | 12 |
| Title I Requirements           | 0  |
| Budget to Support Goals        | 28 |

# Fitzgerald Middle School

6410 118TH AVE, Largo, FL 33773

http://www.fitzgerald-ms.pinellas.k12.fl.us

Demographics

# Principal: Ija Hawthorne

Start Date for this Principal: 7/2/2019

| 2019-20 Status   |  |
|--|--|
| (per MSID File)  | Active   |
| School Type and Grades Served<br>(per MSID File)   | Middle School<br>6-8   |
| Primary Service Type<br>(per MSID File)  | K-12 General Education   |
| 2018-19 Title I School   | No   |
| 2018-19 Economically<br>Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate<br>(as reported on Survey 3)  | 63%  |
| <b>2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b><br>(subgroups with 10 or more students)<br>(subgroups in orange are below the federal threshold) | Asian Students<br>Black/African American Students<br>Economically Disadvantaged Students<br>English Language Learners<br>Hispanic Students<br>Multiracial Students<br>Students With Disabilities<br>White Students |
| School Grade   | 2018-19: B   |
|  | 2017-18: C   |
|  | 2016-17: C   |
| School Grades History  | 2015-16: C   |
|  | 2014-15: B   |
|  | 2013-14: В   |
| 2019-20 School Improvement   | (SI) Information*  |
| SI Region  | Southwest  |
| Regional Executive Director  | Tracy Webley   |
| Turnaround Option/Cycle  |  |
| Year   |  |

| Support Tier | NOT IN DA |
|--------------|-----------|
| ESSA Status  | TS&I      |

\* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, <u>click</u> <u>here</u>.

## School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Pinellas County School Board on 9/10/2019.

## 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.

# **Part I: School Information**

### **School Mission and Vision**

### Provide the school's mission statement

Our Mission is to promote the highest academic achievement through a positive and safe learning environment.

#### Provide the school's vision statement

Our Vision is for all students to enter high school with the skills necessary for a successful high school career and life outside of high school. (High School Readiness)

### School Leadership Team

#### Membership

Identify the name, email address and position title for each member of the school leadership team:

| Name                   | Title                  | Job Duties and Responsibilities   |
|------------------------|------------------------|---|
| Bernal,<br>Joanna      | Assistant<br>Principal | Serves as liaison between principal and other school personnel.<br>This administrator assumes any duties assigned by the Principal. |
| Douglass,<br>Christine | Assistant<br>Principal | Serves as liaison between principal and other school personnel.<br>This administrator assumes any duties assigned by the Principal. |
| Bowman,<br>Carson      | Assistant<br>Principal | Assist with moving the school vision and mission forward in serving as one of the school's instructional leaders                    |
|                        |                        |   |
| Hawthorne,<br>Ija      |                        |   |
| Gray,<br>Dayna         | Teacher,<br>K-12       | Science Department Chair  |
| Wolff,<br>Diana        | Teacher,<br>K-12       | Math Department Chair   |
| Waddell,<br>Jamie      | Teacher,<br>K-12       | ELA Co-Chair  |
| Weber,<br>Heidi        | Teacher,<br>K-12       | ELA Co-Chair  |
| Whaley,<br>Taylor      | Teacher,<br>K-12       | Department Chair - Related Arts   |
| arlv Warning           | Systems                |   |

### Early Warning Systems

#### **Current Year**

# The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:

| Indicator                       | Grade Level |   |   |   |   |   |     |     |     |   |    |    |    |       |
|---------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|-----|-----|-----|---|----|----|----|-------|
| indicator                       | Κ           | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6   | 7   | 8   | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total |
| Number of students enrolled     | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 408 | 419 | 341 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 1168  |
| Attendance below 90 percent     | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 36  | 45  | 17  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 98    |
| One or more suspensions         | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1   | 2   | 1   | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 4     |
| Course failure in ELA or Math   | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |       |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 129 | 163 | 123 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 415   |

### The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

| Indicator                            |   |   |   |   |   | G | rade | e Le | ve | Grade Level |    |    |    |       |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|--------------------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|------|------|----|-------------|----|----|----|-------|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| mulcator                             | Κ | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6    | 7    | 8  | 9           | 10 | 11 | 12 | IULAI |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Students with two or more indicators | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 19   | 31   | 7  | 0           | 0  | 0  | 0  | 57    |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

### The number of students identified as retainees:

| Indicator                           | Grade Level |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |   |   |    |    |    |       |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
| indicator                           | κ           | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7  | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total |
| Retained Students: Current Year     | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14 | 9 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 23    |
| Students retained two or more times | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |       |

### FTE units allocated to school (total number of teacher units) 65

### Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 8/22/2019

## **Prior Year - As Reported**

# The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:

| Indicator                                       | Grade Level         | Total |
|---|---------------------|-------|
| Attendance below 90 percent                     |                     |       |
| One or more suspensions                         |                     |       |
| Course failure in ELA or Math                   |                     |       |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment                 |                     |       |
| The number of students with two or more early w | varning indicators: |       |

| Indicator                            | Grade Level | Total |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|-------|
| Thudents with two or more indicators |             |       |

Students with two or more indicators

### **Prior Year - Updated**

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

| Indicator                       |     | Grade Level |   |   |   |   |     |     |     |   |    |    |    |       |  |  |
|---------------------------------|-----|-------------|---|---|---|---|-----|-----|-----|---|----|----|----|-------|--|--|
| indicator                       | Κ 1 | 1           | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6   | 7   | 8   | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total |  |  |
| Attendance below 90 percent     | 0   | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 268 | 277 | 227 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 772   |  |  |
| One or more suspensions         | 0   | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2   | 419 | 5   | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 426   |  |  |
| Course failure in ELA or Math   | 0   | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0   | 419 | 342 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 761   |  |  |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0   | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 189 | 202 | 163 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 554   |  |  |

## The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

| Indiantar                            |   | Grade Level |   |   |   |   |     |     |     |   |    |    |    |       |
|--------------------------------------|---|-------------|---|---|---|---|-----|-----|-----|---|----|----|----|-------|
| Indicator                            | Κ | 1           | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6   | 7   | 8   | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total |
| Students with two or more indicators | 0 | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 243 | 254 | 184 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 681   |

# Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

## School Data

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      |        | 2019     |       | 2018   |          |       |  |  |  |  |
|-----------------------------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|--|--|--|--|
| School Grade Component      | School | District | State | School | District | State |  |  |  |  |
| ELA Achievement             | 51%    | 52%      | 54%   | 47%    | 50%      | 53%   |  |  |  |  |
| ELA Learning Gains          | 52%    | 55%      | 54%   | 49%    | 50%      | 54%   |  |  |  |  |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile  | 37%    | 47%      | 47%   | 37%    | 42%      | 47%   |  |  |  |  |
| Math Achievement            | 57%    | 55%      | 58%   | 50%    | 54%      | 58%   |  |  |  |  |
| Math Learning Gains         | 56%    | 52%      | 57%   | 52%    | 54%      | 57%   |  |  |  |  |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 45%    | 46%      | 51%   | 45%    | 48%      | 51%   |  |  |  |  |
| Science Achievement         | 52%    | 51%      | 51%   | 47%    | 52%      | 52%   |  |  |  |  |
| Social Studies Achievement  | 68%    | 68%      | 72%   | 65%    | 65%      | 72%   |  |  |  |  |

## EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

| Indicator                       | Grade Lev | Total   |         |          |
|---------------------------------|-----------|---------|---------|----------|
| indicator                       | 6         | 7       | 8       | IULAI    |
| Number of students enrolled     | 408 (0)   | 419 (0) | 341 (0) | 1168 (0) |
| Attendance below 90 percent     | 36 ()     | 45 ()   | 17 ()   | 98 (0)   |
| One or more suspensions         | 1 (0)     | 2 (0)   | 1 (0)   | 4 (0)    |
| Course failure in ELA or Math   | 0 (0)     | 0 (0)   | 0 (0)   | 0 (0)    |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 129 (0)   | 163 (0) | 123 (0) | 415 (0)  |

### Grade Level Data

NOTE: This data is raw data and includes ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.

NOTE: 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-<br>District<br>Comparison | State | School-<br>State<br>Comparison |
| 06                    | 2019      | 46%    | 51%      | -5%                               | 54%   | -8%                            |
|                       | 2018      | 43%    | 49%      | -6%                               | 52%   | -9%                            |
| Same Grade C          | omparison | 3%     |          |                                   |       |                                |
| Cohort Com            | parison   |        |          |                                   |       |                                |
| 07                    | 2019      | 46%    | 51%      | -5%                               | 52%   | -6%                            |
|                       | 2018      | 47%    | 48%      | -1%                               | 51%   | -4%                            |
| Same Grade C          | omparison | -1%    |          |                                   |       |                                |
| Cohort Com            | parison   | 3%     |          |                                   |       |                                |
| 08                    | 2019      | 55%    | 55%      | 0%                                | 56%   | -1%                            |
|                       | 2018      | 49%    | 55%      | -6%                               | 58%   | -9%                            |
| Same Grade Comparison |           | 6%     |          |                                   |       |                                |
| Cohort Comparison     |           | 8%     |          |                                   |       |                                |

|                   |            |      | MATH     |                                   |       |                                |
|-------------------|------------|------|----------|-----------------------------------|-------|--------------------------------|
| Grade             | Grade Year |      | District | School-<br>District<br>Comparison | State | School-<br>State<br>Comparison |
| 06                | 2019       | 37%  | 44%      | -7%                               | 55%   | -18%                           |
|                   | 2018       | 31%  | 45%      | -14%                              | 52%   | -21%                           |
| Same Grade C      | omparison  | 6%   |          |                                   |       |                                |
| Cohort Com        | parison    |      |          |                                   |       |                                |
| 07                | 2019       | 54%  | 60%      | -6%                               | 54%   | 0%                             |
|                   | 2018       | 54%  | 59%      | -5%                               | 54%   | 0%                             |
| Same Grade C      | omparison  | 0%   |          |                                   |       |                                |
| Cohort Com        | parison    | 23%  |          |                                   |       |                                |
| 08                | 2019       | 44%  | 31%      | 13%                               | 46%   | -2%                            |
|                   | 2018       | 26%  | 31%      | -5%                               | 45%   | -19%                           |
| Same Grade C      | omparison  | 18%  |          |                                   |       |                                |
| Cohort Comparison |            | -10% |          |                                   |       |                                |

|                       |      |        | SCIENCE  |                                   |       |                                |
|-----------------------|------|--------|----------|-----------------------------------|-------|--------------------------------|
| Grade                 | Year | School | District | School-<br>District<br>Comparison | State | School-<br>State<br>Comparison |
| 08                    | 2019 | 50%    | 51%      | -1%                               | 48%   | 2%                             |
|                       | 2018 | 47%    | 53%      | -6%                               | 50%   | -3%                            |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | 3%     |          |                                   |       |                                |
| Cohort Comparison     |      |        |          |                                   |       |                                |

|      |        | BIOLO    | GY EOC                      |       |                          |
|------|--------|----------|-----------------------------|-------|--------------------------|
| Year | School | District | School<br>Minus<br>District | State | School<br>Minus<br>State |
| 2019 |        |          |                             |       |                          |
| 2018 |        |          |                             |       |                          |
|      |        | CIVIC    | CS EOC                      |       |                          |
| Year | School | District | School<br>Minus<br>District | State | School<br>Minus<br>State |
| 2019 | 65%    | 68%      | -3%                         | 71%   | -6%                      |
| 2018 | 62%    | 66%      | -4%                         | 71%   | -9%                      |
| Co   | mpare  | 3%       |                             | -     |                          |
|      |        | HISTO    | RY EOC                      |       |                          |
| Year | School | District | School<br>Minus<br>District | State | School<br>Minus<br>State |
| 2019 |        |          |                             |       |                          |
| 2018 |        |          |                             |       |                          |
|      |        | ALGEE    | BRA EOC                     |       |                          |
| Year | School | District | School<br>Minus<br>District | State | School<br>Minus<br>State |
| 2019 | 95%    | 55%      | 40%                         | 61%   | 34%                      |
| 2018 | 85%    | 57%      | 28%                         | 62%   | 23%                      |
| Со   | mpare  | 10%      |                             |       |                          |
|      |        | GEOME    | TRY EOC                     |       |                          |
| Year | School | District | School<br>Minus<br>District | State | School<br>Minus<br>State |
| 2019 | 100%   | 56%      | 44%                         | 57%   | 43%                      |
| 2018 | 100%   | 56%      | 44%                         | 56%   | 44%                      |
| Со   | mpare  | 0%       |                             |       |                          |

# Subgroup Data

|           | 2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS |           |                   |              |            |                    |             |            |              |                         |                           |
|-----------|---|-----------|-------------------|--------------|------------|--------------------|-------------|------------|--------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|
| Subgroups | ELA<br>Ach.                               | ELA<br>LG | ELA<br>LG<br>L25% | Math<br>Ach. | Math<br>LG | Math<br>LG<br>L25% | Sci<br>Ach. | SS<br>Ach. | MS<br>Accel. | Grad<br>Rate<br>2016-17 | C & C<br>Accel<br>2016-17 |
| SWD       | 12  | 35        | 31                | 15           | 35         | 38                 | 6           | 24         |              |                         |                           |
| ELL       | 26  | 43        | 38                | 38           | 45         | 41                 | 24          | 60         | 79           |                         |                           |
| ASN       | 78  | 68        |                   | 84           | 79         | 67                 | 84          | 88         | 94           |                         |                           |
| BLK       | 26  | 37        | 31                | 28           | 45         | 55                 | 15          | 44         |              |                         |                           |
| HSP       | 41  | 52        | 40                | 46           | 48         | 39                 | 37          | 61         | 71           |                         |                           |
| MUL       | 64  | 64        |                   | 59           | 59         | 27                 | 60          | 77         | 92           |                         |                           |
| WHT       | 58  | 52        | 39                | 66           | 60         | 47                 | 60          | 75         | 86           |                         |                           |
| FRL       | 37  | 46        | 35                | 43           | 49         | 43                 | 38          | 58         | 77           |                         |                           |

|           | 2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS |           |                   |              |            |                    |             |            |              |                         |                           |
|-----------|---|-----------|-------------------|--------------|------------|--------------------|-------------|------------|--------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|
| Subgroups | ELA<br>Ach.                               | ELA<br>LG | ELA<br>LG<br>L25% | Math<br>Ach. | Math<br>LG | Math<br>LG<br>L25% | Sci<br>Ach. | SS<br>Ach. | MS<br>Accel. | Grad<br>Rate<br>2015-16 | C & C<br>Accel<br>2015-16 |
| SWD       | 12  | 35        | 33                | 13           | 42         | 40                 | 10          | 30         |              |                         |                           |
| ELL       | 14  | 35        | 38                | 21           | 37         | 48                 | 6           | 31         | 25           |                         |                           |
| ASN       | 73  | 63        | 29                | 73           | 67         | 80                 | 80          | 83         | 92           |                         |                           |
| BLK       | 18  | 35        | 40                | 19           | 32         | 30                 | 15          | 36         | 60           |                         |                           |
| HSP       | 34  | 41        | 36                | 38           | 47         | 57                 | 32          | 56         | 62           |                         |                           |
| MUL       | 59  | 50        |                   | 61           | 58         | 60                 | 53          | 77         | 100          |                         |                           |
| WHT       | 56  | 55        | 35                | 60           | 56         | 39                 | 56          | 71         | 79           |                         |                           |
| FRL       | 34  | 43        | 38                | 38           | 42         | 41                 | 34          | 51         | 66           |                         |                           |

## ESSA Data

This data has been updated for the 2018-19 school year as of 7/16/2019.

| This data has been updated for the 2010-19 school year as of 7/10/2019.         |      |
|---|------|
| ESSA Federal Index  |      |
| ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)  | TS&I |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students  | 57   |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students                                    | NO   |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target                                    | 2    |
| Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency | 66   |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index                                       | 570  |
| Total Components for the Federal Index  | 10   |
| Percent Tested  | 98%  |
| Subgroup Data   |      |
| Students With Disabilities  |      |
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities                                      | 23   |
| Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?              | YES  |
| Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%       | 2    |
| 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    |
| Asian Students  |      |
| Federal Index - Asian Students  | 80   |
| 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                                    | 35  |
| Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?            | YES |
| Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%     | 0   |
|  |     |
| Hispanic Students  | 50  |
| Federal Index - Hispanic Students  | 50  |
| Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?                          | NO  |
| Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%                   | 0   |
| Multiracial Students   |     |
| Federal Index - Multiracial Students   | 63  |
| Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?                       | NO  |
| Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students 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   |
| 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   | 62  |
| 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                                | 49  |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?        | NO  |
| Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0   |

Analysis

### **Data Reflection**

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources (see guide for examples for relevant data sources).

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

Our lowest performance is in L25 ELA Learning gains at 37% lagging 15 points behind our overall ELA gains of 52%. Looking at subgroup data the contributing factors would be a lack of gains among our SWD and ELL students.

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

We did not experience decline in any area. L25 ELA gains remained stagnant at 37%. Our L25 math gains also remained stagnant at 45%.

# 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 greatest gap according to our data is African American students with their proficiency in ELA, Mathematics and Acceleration. There is a disproportionate amount of out of school suspensions and disciplinary referrals for AA students.

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

We gained eight (8) points in acceleration and seven (7) points in overall math.

# Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern? (see Guidance tab for additional information)

Reflecting on EWS data, our areas of concern are high absences of Hispanic and African American Students and low test scores for African American students.

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

- 1. L25 ELA Gains
- 2. L25 Math Gains
- 3. African American Proficiency
- 4. SWD Proficiency
- 5. ELL Proficiency

# **Part III: Planning for Improvement**

Areas of Focus:

| #1  |  |
|---|--|
| Title   | Career and College- Readiness  |
| Rationale   | <ol> <li>Our prior year level of performance is 40% of our students are taking at<br/>least one advanced course, as evidenced in advanced course enrollment.</li> <li>We expect our performance level to be 50% of our students taking at<br/>least one advanced course by the end of the 2019-2020 school year.</li> <li>The problem/gap is occurring because students are not being placed into<br/>academically challenging classes and then supported by either intensive<br/>classes or the AVID elective or both.</li> <li>If students were placed into academically challenging courses and offered<br/>ongoing support would occur, the problem would be reduced by 10%</li> </ol> |
| State the<br>measureable<br>outcome the<br>school plans<br>to achieve | By the end of the 2019-2020 school year, 50% of our students will have successfully completed one or more advanced classes earning high school credit, industry certification or both.   |
| Person<br>responsible<br>for<br>monitoring<br>outcome                 | Christine Douglass (douglassc@pcsb.org)  |
| Evidence-<br>based<br>Strategy  | Students will be placed in AVID or intensive classes to support them as they<br>enter more challenging, rigorous courses. Additionally faculty will receive<br>focused professional development which will enable them to employ AVID<br>and Marzano strategies in delivering standards based instruction with rigor<br>to all students.   |
| Rationale for<br>Evidence-<br>based<br>Strategy                       | Students who receive additional support either through intensive classes or<br>AVID will develop the skills necessary succeed in more rigorous courses.<br>Teachers who are trained in the use of research based strategies will be able<br>to provide the scaffolding and differentiation necessary for all students to<br>succeed.   |
| Action Step   |  |
| Description   | <ol> <li>Offer advanced classes to all students.</li> <li>Expand our AVID program from 30 to 100 students.</li> <li>Ensure that students enrolled in advanced classes are receiving the necessary support. i.e. AVID or Intensive Classes</li> <li>Bring focused, quality professional development to our school.</li> <li>Provide remediation for students needing support with industry certifications.</li> <li>Work closely with teachers to develop meaningful IPDP Plans that will build capacity among teachers enabling them to support our students as they tackle increasingly rigorous content.</li> </ol>  |
| Person<br>Responsible   | Christine Douglass (douglassc@pcsb.org)  |

| #2  |   |
|---|---|
| Title   | ELA   |
|   | Our current level of performance is 51% proficiency, as evidenced in FSA Achievement.   |
| Rationale   | We expect our performance level to be 56% proficiency as evidenced by FSA Scores in the year 2020.  |
| Kationale   | The problem is occurring because we are not providing the necessary scaffolding and differentiation to our L25 population.  |
|   | If standards-based instruction reading instruction using research-based teaching strategies were to occur, proficiency would increase by 5%.  |
| State the<br>measureable<br>outcome the<br>school plans to<br>achieve | The percent of all students achieving ELA Proficiency will increase from 51% to 56%, as measured by the ELA FSA.  |
| Person<br>responsible for<br>monitoring<br>outcome                    | Christine Douglass (douglassc@pcsb.org)   |
| Evidence-based<br>Strategy  | <ul> <li>-Enhance the staff with the capacity to identify critical content from the Standards in alignment with district resources.</li> <li>-Strengthen the staff's ability to engage students in complex tasks. The infrastructure will occur through AVID strategy use with fidelity, CRT will be incorporated within PLC's and evidence of Equity training implementation.</li> <li>-Support staff to utilize data to organize students to interact with content in manners that differentiate/scaffold instruction to meet the needs of each student.</li> </ul>   |
| Rationale for<br>Evidence-based<br>Strategy                           | Faculty needs to move toward a more student centered design for<br>learning. By utilizing the aforementioned strategies, teachers will meet<br>the needs of a diverse student population ensuring that all are engaged<br>and learning.   |
| Action Step   |   |
| Description   | <ol> <li>Teachers will utilize WICOR strategies across the content after being<br/>trained. (ADD specific WICOR)</li> <li>ELA/Reading teachers will utilize a planning roadmap/middle reading<br/>notebook to choose strategies and<br/>resources for use as they plan, to ensure high engagement, rigor, and<br/>progress<br/>monitoring.</li> <li>Conference with students and communicate with parents L25 status<br/>and goals.</li> <li>Secure mentors, (role to be defined), for those students and make sure<br/>all teachers are aware of their L25 population.</li> <li>Ensure correct placement and schedules for all L25 students.</li> <li>Teachers to take part in Wednesday PLC Meetings to include the<br/>following: participation with content specific PLC's, collaborative planning</li> </ol> |

and implementation of equity centered practices; review chats with administrators to track progress specifically of the L25.
 7. PLP homework to address individual needs, aligned with ELA/Reading standards.
 8. Create celebration plan for L25 students who show success/gains on performance assessments, to include: Writescore, RI, IReady Diagnostic and Performance Matters.
 Person Responsible

| #3  |  |
|---|--|
| Title   | School Climate/ Conditions for Learning  |
|   | 1. Our current level of performance in school-wide behavior is 934 total referrals. We expect our performance level to be below 750 by the end of the 2019-20 school year.   |
| Rationale   | 2. The problem/gap in behavior performance is occurring because the<br>behavior support structures were not consistently delivered or followed. The<br>school culture needs to be informed of the<br>Three A's and how to effectively use PBIS and their PBIS aligned hierarchy of<br>classroom consequences to include restorative practices.   |
|   | 3. If continued positive reinforcement and restorative practices occur, the occurrence of ODRs would be reduced by 20% as evidenced by total numbers of referrals. (include data to validate your hypothesis.)   |
|   | 4. We will analyze and review our data for the effective implementation of<br>our strategies by the end of the first grade reporting period to include<br>schoolwide celebrations for students meeting the Three A's expectation.  |
| State the   |  |
|   | The referral risk (percentage of students receiving ODRs) of all students receiving discipline Referrals will decrease from 19% to 15% as measured by FOCUS ODRs.  |
| Person<br>responsible<br>for<br>monitoring<br>outcome | Joanna Bernal (bernalj@pcsb.org)   |
| Evidence-<br>based<br>Strategy                        | School expectations will be clearly posted and followed with consistency and fidelity. The 3 A's. Attendance, Attitude and Achievement will be emphasized school wide. We will train our faculty and staff in restorative practices, culturally relevant teaching and equity in order to better address student behavior. MTSS will meet regularly to plan for Tier 2 & 3 interventions when necessary.  |
| Rationale<br>for<br>Evidence-<br>based<br>Strategy    | Student discipline needs to address the needs of individual students and needs to be fair and consistent.  |
| Action Step   |  |
| Description   | <ol> <li>Ensure at least one staff member attend and becomes is a certified Trainer<br/>of RP</li> <li>Develop and implement a school wide discipline plan using the PBIS<br/>Medium.</li> <li>Provide continuous training opportunities in restorative practice and<br/>culturally relevant teaching.</li> <li>Provide additional training and support to teachers struggling with<br/>management.</li> <li>Monitor and support staff for implementation with fidelity</li> </ol> |

6. Address students with high instances of referrals through MTSS and VE Specialist ensuring they receive the necessary supports to be successful in a school environment.

7.Institute and continually support a highly visible PBIS plan.

Person Responsible Joanna Bernal (bernalj@pcsb.org)

| #4   |  |  |  |  |
|--|--|--|--|--|
| Title  | Bridging the Gap (Black Student Achievement)   |  |  |  |
|  | <ol> <li>Our current level of performance is 22% African-American<br/>Students are enrolled at least one Advanced-:<br/>Level course, as evidenced in FOCUS.</li> </ol>  |  |  |  |
| Rationale  | 2. We expect our performance level to be 35% of African-American students in Advanced-level courses by the end of the 2019-2020 school year.   |  |  |  |
|  | 3. The problem/gap is occurring because students were not being placed in courses based on the potential for success with adequate supports in place.  |  |  |  |
|  | 4. If students are placed in challenging courses with adequate supports, the problem would be reduced by 13%.  |  |  |  |
| State the<br>measureable outcome<br>the school plans to<br>achieve | The percent of all African- American students represented in advanced courses will increase from 22% to 35%, as measured by the end of the 2019-2020 school year.  |  |  |  |
| Person responsible<br>for monitoring<br>outcome                    | Carson Bowman (bowmanca@pcsb.org)  |  |  |  |
| Evidence-based<br>Strategy   | Students will be placed in advanced classes with additional support provided through AVID and intensive classes.   |  |  |  |
| Rationale for<br>Evidence-based<br>Strategy                        | AVID is designed to help students achieve success with increasingly rigorous content. AVID will provide a support to student that have been  |  |  |  |
| Action Step  |  |  |  |  |
| Description  | <ol> <li>Increase the number of African-American students enrolled in<br/>Advanced courses as well as offering those students increased<br/>support through AVID or intensive classes.</li> <li>a) Measured by the percentage of African-American students<br/>enrolled in Advance and Avid courses</li> <li>Provide students with adult mentors either through Girlfriends<br/>or 5000 Role models (Build partnerships with area high schools to<br/>provide students with High School mentors).</li> <li>a) demonstrated by the number of role models partnered with<br/>students</li> <li>Provide additional support through the before and after school<br/>ELP.</li> <li>a) demonstrated by the number of students enrolled and regularly<br/>attending ELP.</li> <li>The Equity Champion will train faculty in CRT and Equitable<br/>Grading Practices.</li> <li>a) demonstrated by Grade House meetings' agendas and<br/>presentations.</li> <li>Provide culturally responsive based professional development to<br/>staff to ensure social-emotional learning needs are being met.</li> <li>a) demonstrated by through PLN transcripts and PD calendar.</li> </ol> |  |  |  |

6) Cultivate a restorative culture within the school as evidenced with PBIS walkthrough data.
a) demonstrated by PBIS walkthrough data
7) Create equity centered PLCs in all subject areas.
a) demonstrated by items PLC's agendas
8) Create progress monitoring plans for all African American students (Design of plans will be to identify the specific needs of all learners).
a) demonstrated by A-Team meeting and Grade house agenda items.

| #5   |   |  |  |  |
|--|---|--|--|--|
| Title  | Math  |  |  |  |
|  | Our current level of performance is 57% proficiency, as evidenced in FSA Achievement.   |  |  |  |
|  | We expect our performance level to be 65% proficiency by FSA 2020.  |  |  |  |
| Rationale  | The problem/gap is occurring because the identification of critical content and the time spent on meaningful, higher level writing activities is not consistent across all classrooms.  |  |  |  |
|  | If standards-based instruction writing would occur, the problem would be reduced by 8%  |  |  |  |
| State the<br>measureable outcome<br>the school plans to<br>achieve | Our math proficiency rate will rise to 65% from 57%.  |  |  |  |
| Person responsible<br>for monitoring<br>outcome                    | Carson Bowman (bowmanca@pcsb.org)   |  |  |  |
| Evidence-based<br>Strategy   | Teachers will employ standards based instruction using AVID and<br>Marzano teaching strategies including collaborative structures and<br>differentiated instruction.  |  |  |  |
| Rationale for<br>Evidence-based<br>Strategy                        | AVID and Marzano are both research based strategies proven to increase student performance.   |  |  |  |
| Action Step  |   |  |  |  |
| Description  | <ol> <li>Increase the number of African-American students enrolled in<br/>Advanced courses as well as offering those students increased<br/>support through AVID or intensive classes.</li> <li>a) Measured by the percentage of African-American students<br/>enrolled in Advance and Avid courses</li> <li>Provide students with adult mentors either through Girlfriends<br/>or 5000 Role models (Build partnerships with area high schools to<br/>provide students with High School mentors).</li> <li>a) demonstrated by the number of role models partnered with<br/>students</li> <li>Provide additional support through the before and after school<br/>ELP.</li> <li>a) demonstrated by the number of students enrolled and regularly<br/>attending ELP.</li> <li>4) The Equity Champion will train faculty in CRT and Equitable<br/>Grading Practices.</li> <li>a) demonstrated by Grade House meetings' agendas and<br/>presentations.</li> <li>Frovide culturally responsive based professional development to<br/>staff to ensure social-emotional learning needs are being met.</li> <li>a) demonstrated by through PLN transcripts and PD calendar.</li> <li>Cultivate a restorative culture within the school as evidenced</li> </ol> |  |  |  |

| Pinellas - 1281 - Fitzgerald Middle School - 2019-20 SIP           |   |  |  |  |
|--|---|--|--|--|
|  | with PBIS walkthrough data.<br>a) demonstrated by PBIS walkthrough data<br>7) Create equity centered PLCs in all subject areas.<br>a) demonstrated by items PLC's agendas<br>8) Create progress monitoring plans for all African American<br>students (Design of plans will be to identify the specific needs of<br>all learners).<br>a) demonstrated by A-Team meeting and Grade house agenda<br>items.  |  |  |  |
| Person Responsible   | Carson Bowman (bowmanca@pcsb.org)   |  |  |  |
| #6   |   |  |  |  |
| Title  | Family and Community Engagement   |  |  |  |
|  | Our current level of performance is 51% proficiency, as evidenced in FSA Achievement.   |  |  |  |
| Rationale  | We expect our performance level to be 60% proficiency by FSA 2020.  |  |  |  |
|  | We have not effectively and consistently engaged parents and the community in our students' learning and progress.  |  |  |  |
| State the<br>measureable outcome<br>the school plans to<br>achieve | We will increase our overall ELA proficiency by 9% to 60%.  |  |  |  |
| Person responsible<br>for monitoring<br>outcome                    | lja Hawthorne (hawthornei@pcsb.org)   |  |  |  |
| Evidence-based<br>Strategy   | Intentionally build relationships with families and community partners.   |  |  |  |
| Rationale for<br>Evidence-based<br>Strategy                        | Students who are supported outside of the classroom will perform at higher levels in school.  |  |  |  |
| Action Step  |   |  |  |  |
| Description  | <ol> <li>Effectively communicate with families about student progress<br/>and school processes / practices.</li> <li>Provide academic tools to families in support of their students'<br/>achievement at home.</li> <li>Purposefully involve families with opportunities for them to<br/>advocate for their students i.e. parent events and going into the<br/>community to sponsor academic interventions.</li> <li>Intentionally build positive relationships with families and<br/>community partners.</li> <li>Utilize student services to provide families and students with<br/>resources, tools and outside agency referrals.</li> </ol> |  |  |  |
| Person Responsible   | lja Hawthorne (hawthornei@pcsb.org)   |  |  |  |

| #7  |   |  |  |
|---|---|--|--|
| Title   | Social Studies  |  |  |
|   | Our current level of performance is 68%, as evidenced in 2019 Spring EOC<br>Civics Assessment. We expect our performance level to be 75% by 2020<br>Spring EOC Assessment.  |  |  |
| Rationale   | The problem/gap is occurring because scores have only risen incrementally<br>over the last four years. ISM visit data shows that classroom practices do not<br>consistently include student-centered learning environments with rigor and<br>teachers do not consistently monitor for learning and differentiation is not<br>readily apparent.  |  |  |
|   | If teachers collaboratively plan for student-centered, scaffolded exercises to<br>build on Higher Order Thinking opportunities would occur, the problem<br>would be reduced in the data received from the ISM visits throughout the<br>year and increases on the Civics EOC.  |  |  |
| State the<br>measureable<br>outcome the<br>school plans<br>to achieve | The percent of 7th grade students achieving proficiency on the Civics EOC will increase from 68% to 75%, as measured by the spring administration of the Civics EOC.  |  |  |
| Person<br>responsible<br>for<br>monitoring<br>outcome                 | Joanna Bernal (bernalj@pcsb.org)  |  |  |
| Evidence-<br>based<br>Strategy  | Teachers will employ collaborative structures in order to scaffold and differentiate instruction thereby increasing rigor and leading to higher order thinking.   |  |  |
| Rationale for<br>Evidence-<br>based<br>Strategy                       | By removing selected students from Civics and placing them into World<br>History, this will allow them more opportunity to develop the skills necessary<br>to improve their Civics score. The students will gain more repetition in the<br>test taking strategies that will help them to be successful.   |  |  |
| Action Step   |   |  |  |
| Description   | <ol> <li>Conduct twice monthly professional learning communities (PLCs) to<br/>discuss standards missed on cycle benchmark assessments.</li> <li>Create a remediation plan with the assistance of the district staff<br/>developer after each unit assessment but before the cycle assessments<br/>addressing those benchmarks which the students did not meet on the unit<br/>assessment.</li> <li>Teachers will differentiate instruction to provide remediation of standards<br/>missed on benchmark assessment prior to cycle assessment.</li> <li>Teachers will incorporate an AVID strategy, demonstrated and approved<br/>by school-based AVID Instructor, into lesson at least once a month.</li> </ol> |  |  |
| Person<br>Responsible   | Joanna Bernal (bernalj@pcsb.org)  |  |  |

| #8  |   |
|---|---|
| Title   | ELL (As appropriate, based on school data)  |
| Rationale   | <ol> <li>Our current level of performance is our ELL students' proficiency in ELA is 26%, as evidenced in 2018-2019 Florida Standards Assessment.</li> <li>We expect our performance level to be 35% by the end of the 2019-2020 school year.</li> <li>The problem/gap is occurring because teachers are not adequately modifying and / or differentiating the ELA Florida Standards so that ELL students will have greater access to the concepts.</li> <li>If modifications and differentiation of the ELA standards would occur, the problem would be reduced by 9%.</li> </ol>  |
| State the<br>measureable<br>outcome the<br>school plans<br>to achieve |   |
| Person<br>responsible<br>for<br>monitoring<br>outcome                 | lja Hawthorne (hawthornei@pcsb.org)   |
| Evidence-<br>based<br>Strategy  | AVID and Marzano strategies for collaborative, student-centered learning with scaffolding and differentiation.  |
| Rationale for<br>Evidence-<br>based<br>Strategy                       | Both Marzano and AVID are research-based and proven effective<br>instructional strategies that are student centered, differentiated,<br>individualized and scaffolded to accommodate students' varying needs. If<br>we employ these strategies in ELL classrooms, achievement will improve.   |
| Action Step   |   |
| Description   | <ol> <li>Review school-based data and thoughtfully plan for remediation and<br/>enrichment interventions.</li> <li>Provide regular opportunities for ESOL and content teachers to<br/>collaborate and co-plan to bridge grade-level work and the integration of<br/>language development within content specific instruction</li> <li>Provide learning opportunities for teachers and staff to plan and<br/>implement effective instruction that utilizes proven strategies that engage<br/>English learners to advance learning and language development across all<br/>content areas. Professional development will include WICOR and standards<br/>based instruction.</li> <li>Plan for meaningful communication with families via the website,<br/>newsletter, parent letters, etc. and ensure communication is available in<br/>languages spoken by ELLs</li> <li>Ensure language needs of ELL families are considered for all academic<br/>and engagement events</li> </ol> |
| Person<br>Responsible   | lja Hawthorne (hawthornei@pcsb.org)   |

| #9   |  |  |  |  |  |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| Title  | Healthy Schools  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 1. Our current level of performance is (ex. 3 out of 6 modules in bronze), as evidenced in the Alliance for a Healthier Generation, Healthy Schools Program Framework.   |  |  |  |  |
|  | 2. We expect our performance level to be 6 out of 6 modules eligible for bronze/silver/gold by April 2020.   |  |  |  |  |
| Rationale  | 3. The problem/gap is occurring because lack of physical activity beyond recommended # of minutes, food sold in the cafeteria does not adhere to smart snack guidelines.   |  |  |  |  |
|  | 4. If our healthy school team can monitor the implementation of<br>administrative guidelines for wellness, our school would have a greater<br>opportunity to be eligible for recognition.  |  |  |  |  |
| State the  |  |  |  |  |  |
| measureable<br>outcome the<br>school plans to<br>achieveOur school will be eligible in 6 out of 6 modules for bronze/silver/g<br>recognition by April 2020 as evidenced by the Alliance for a Healt<br>Generation's Healthy Schools Program Framework. |  |  |  |  |  |
| Person   |  |  |  |  |  |
| responsible for<br>monitoring<br>outcome   | Carson Bowman (bowmanca@pcsb.org)  |  |  |  |  |
| Evidence-based<br>Strategy   |  |  |  |  |  |
| Rationale for<br>Evidence-based<br>Strategy  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Action Step  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 1. Assemble a Healthy School Team made up of a minimum of four (4)<br>individuals including, but not limited to: PE Teacher/Health Teacher,<br>Classroom Teacher, Wellness Champion, Administrator, Cafeteria<br>Manager, Parent, and Student. |  |  |  |  |
|  | 2. Attend district-supported professional development.   |  |  |  |  |
| Description  | 3. Complete Healthy Schools Program Assessment.  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 4. Complete the SMART Snacks in School Documentation.  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 5. Develop and Implement Healthy School Program Action Plan.   |  |  |  |  |
| _  | <ol><li>Update Healthy Schools Program Assessment and Apply for<br/>Recognition (if applicable).</li></ol>   |  |  |  |  |
| Person<br>Responsible  | Carson Bowman (bowmanca@pcsb.org)  |  |  |  |  |

| #10  |   |  |  |  |  |
|--|---|--|--|--|--|
| Title  | Science   |  |  |  |  |
| Rationale  | Our current level of performance is 50% as evidenced by FSA. We expect an 8% increase by May of 2020.   |  |  |  |  |
| State the<br>measureable<br>outcome the school<br>plans to achieve | The percent of all students achieving Science Proficiency will increase from 50% to 58%, as measured by the Science SSA.  |  |  |  |  |
| Person responsible<br>for monitoring<br>outcome                    | Joanna Bernal (bernalj@pcsb.org)  |  |  |  |  |
| Evidence-based<br>Strategy   | UDL will be used to address equity in conjunction with question sentence starters to support students with answering questions that address inquiry.  |  |  |  |  |
| Rationale for<br>Evidence-based<br>Strategy                        | Addressing the students, not at proficiency with UDL to make certain and question sentence starters to address the equity gap in science.   |  |  |  |  |
| Action Step  |   |  |  |  |  |
| Description  | <ol> <li>The administrator will support staff to utilize data to organize<br/>students to interact with content in manners that differentiates/<br/>scaffolds instruction to meet the needs of each student.</li> <li>Enhance staff capacity to identify critical content from the<br/>Standards in alignment with district resources.</li> <li>Strengthen staff practice to utilize questions to help students<br/>elaborate on content.</li> <li>Implement Focused Notetaking and Inquiry-based strategies</li> <li>Use formative assessments to align instruction.</li> <li>Every teacher will use student centered learning with rigor.</li> <li>Use more resources for VE instruction to implement strategies<br/>for highest student achievement</li> </ol> |  |  |  |  |
| Person Responsible   | Joanna Bernal (bernalj@pcsb.org)  |  |  |  |  |

| #11  |  |  |  |
|--|--|--|--|
| Title  | ESE  |  |  |
|  | The percent of all ESE students achieving proficiency will increase from 12% to 20%, as measured by the ELA FSA.<br>We expect our performance level to be 12% proficiency to 20% as evidenced by FSA Scores in the year 2020.  |  |  |
| Rationale  | The problem is occurring because we are not providing the necessary scaffolding and differentiation to empower our students to handle rigorous content.  |  |  |
|  | If standards-based reading instruction using research-based teaching strategies were to occur, proficiency would increase by 8%.   |  |  |
| State the  |  |  |  |
| measureable<br>outcome the<br>school plans<br>to achieve | The percent of all ESE students achieving proficiency will increase from 12% to 20%, as measured by the ELA FSA.   |  |  |
| Person<br>responsible<br>for<br>monitoring<br>outcome    | Christine Douglass (douglassc@pcsb.org)  |  |  |
| Evidence-<br>based<br>Strategy                           | Students requiring ESE services will work towards mastery of meaningful IEP goals. Students will receive additional reading support through unique skills classes and support facilitation. ESE student schedules will be inclusive and individualized based on documented areas of need and ongoing data analysis.  |  |  |
| Rationale for<br>Evidence-<br>based<br>Strategy          | Inclusive scheduling with individualized student scheduling will provide the<br>additional support and extended learning opportunities necessary for<br>students to become proficient in reading. Students will have increased<br>opportunity to interact with peers and to increase the feeling of belonging<br>necessary to encourage engagement.  |  |  |
| Action Step  |  |  |  |
| Description  | <ol> <li>Inclusive Scheduling-Master schedule built around the needs of ESE<br/>students who are scheduled first.</li> <li>Provide opportunities for ESE and general education teacher to co-plan for<br/>differentiated instruction and support delivery of services.</li> <li>Regular classroom observations and feedback from administrators to<br/>determine standard alignment and effective differentiation.</li> <li>Targeted professional development for general education teachers around<br/>CRT and WICOR.</li> <li>Targeted ELP support during their elective period/before or after school.</li> <li>Team Teaching PD at the beginning of the year and at intervals throughout<br/>the year. Support facilitators to take an active instructional role and to<br/>adhere to schedules with fidelity. This will be actively monitored by<br/>administration.</li> </ol> |  |  |
| Person<br>Responsible                                    | Christine Douglass (douglassc@pcsb.org)  |  |  |

| #12   |   |
|---|---|
| Title   | Gifted<br>Our current level of performance of our Gifted students scoring a level 4<br>or 5 on the Language Arts FSA was 76% and Math FSA was 84% in the  |
| Rationale   | 2018-19 school year. We expect our performance level to continue to be at or above the state average in the 2019-20 school year.  |
| State the<br>measureable<br>outcome the<br>school plans to<br>achieve | The percent of all gifted students reaching level 4 or higher on Language Arts and Math FSA will increase by 3%.  |
| Person<br>responsible for<br>monitoring<br>outcome                    | Joanna Bernal (bernalj@pcsb.org)  |
| Evidence-<br>based Strategy   | Strengthen staff practice to utilize questions to help students elaborate on<br>content with depth and complexity.<br>Support staff to differentiate instruction to meet the needs of every<br>student.   |
| Rationale for<br>Evidence-<br>based Strategy                          |   |
| Action Step   |   |
| Description   | <ol> <li>Support teachers in strengthening their role as a Center for Gifted<br/>Studies teachers as reflected in the CGS Teacher Expectation Hand Out.</li> <li>Support teacher's ability to plan for tiered learning to utilize questions<br/>with varying depth of knowledge beginning with more rigorous<br/>questioning when appropriate to student autonomy.</li> <li>Teachers will attend professional development focusing on AVID, CRT,<br/>and Differentiation</li> <li>The Center for Gifted Studies will implement a new curriculum for the<br/>Advanced Academics coursework to better support gifted learners.</li> </ol> |
| Person<br>Responsible   | Joanna Bernal (bernalj@pcsb.org)  |

| #13   |  |  |
|---|--|--|
| Title   | Related Arts   |  |
|   | Our current level of performance is 51% proficiency, as evidenced in FSA Achievement.  |  |
| Rationale   | We expect our performance level to be 60% proficiency by FSA 2020.   |  |
|   | We have not consistently engaged students in cross curriculum content to help students' learning and progress.   |  |
| State the measureable<br>outcome the school plans to<br>achieve |  |  |
| Person responsible for<br>monitoring outcome                    | Carson Bowman (bowmanca@pcsb.org)  |  |
| Evidence-based Strategy   | Consistently use AVID strategies in our class, while<br>utilizing cross curriculum content and fuse it with our<br>content.  |  |
| Rationale for Evidence-based<br>Strategy                        | Students who have more practice with the skills needed in the other classes will be more successful.   |  |
| Action Step   |  |  |
| Description   | <ol> <li>More visibility of what Related Arts does at Morgan<br/>Fitzgerald Middle School.</li> <li>Related Arts will use AVID strategies with fidelity.<br/>(WICOR)</li> <li>Cross Curriculum Content to increase L25 ELA and L25<br/>Math</li> </ol> |  |
| Person Responsible  | Carson Bowman (bowmanca@pcsb.org)  |  |
|   |  |  |

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities (optional)

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities (see the Guidance tab for more information)

We will incorporate AVID strategies that promote a growth mindset among all students and staff.

|   | Part V: Budget  |                        |                                    |                                |            |            |
|---|---|------------------------|------------------------------------|--------------------------------|------------|------------|
| 1 | 1 III.A Areas of Focus: Career and College- Readiness |                        |                                    |                                | \$0.00     |            |
| 2 | III.A   | Areas of Focus: ELA    |                                    |                                | \$2,000.00 |            |
|   | Function  | Object                 | Budget Focus                       | Funding<br>Source              | FTE        | 2019-20    |
|   | 6400  | 120-Classroom Teachers | 1281 - Fitzgerald Middle<br>School | School<br>Improvement<br>Funds |            | \$2,000.00 |

|   |  |                              | Notes: TDE allotment for teacher<br>feedback. | s to plan with staff c         | leveloper b | pased on   |  |
|---|--|------------------------------|---|--------------------------------|-------------|------------|--|
| 3                                       | III.A  | Areas of Focus: School       |   | \$835.00                       |             |            |  |
|   | Function   | Object                       | Budget Focus                                  | Funding<br>Source              | FTE         | 2019-20    |  |
|   | 3376   |                              | 1281 - Fitzgerald Middle<br>School            | School<br>Improvement<br>Funds |             | \$835.00   |  |
|   |  |                              | Notes: Classroom supplies, STOI               | C Books, and resourc           | ces         |            |  |
| 4                                       | III.A  | Areas of Focus: Bridging     | g the Gap (Black Studen                       | t Achievement                  | )           | \$400.00   |  |
|   | Function   | Object                       | Budget Focus                                  | Funding<br>Source              | FTE         | 2019-20    |  |
|   | 0000   | 120-Classroom Teachers       | 1281 - Fitzgerald Middle<br>School            |                                |             | \$400.00   |  |
|   | Notes: Working with having speakers come and speak |                              |   |                                |             |            |  |
| 5                                       | III.A  | Areas of Focus: Math         |   |                                |             | \$2,000.00 |  |
|   | Function   | Object                       | Budget Focus                                  | Funding<br>Source              | FTE         | 2019-20    |  |
|   | 9800   | 120-Classroom Teachers       | 1281 - Fitzgerald Middle<br>School            | School<br>Improvement<br>Funds |             | \$2,000.00 |  |
| 6                                       | III.A  | Areas of Focus: Family       | and Community Engagen                         | nent                           |             | \$0.00     |  |
| 7                                       | III.A  | Areas of Focus: Social S     | itudies                                       |                                |             | \$0.00     |  |
| 8                                       | III.A  | Areas of Focus: ELL (As      | appropriate, based on s                       | chool data)                    |             | \$400.00   |  |
|   | Function   | Object                       | Budget Focus                                  | Funding<br>Source              | FTE         | 2019-20    |  |
|   | 6150   | 120-Classroom Teachers       | 1281 - Fitzgerald Middle<br>School            | School<br>Improvement<br>Funds |             | \$400.00   |  |
|   | •  |                              | Notes: Resources and training for             | r parents                      | II.         |            |  |
| 9 III.A Areas of Focus: Healthy Schools |  |                              |   |                                | \$0.00      |            |  |
| 10                                      | III.A  | II.A Areas of Focus: Science |   |                                | \$0.00      |            |  |
| 11                                      | 11   III.A   Areas of Focus: ESE                   |                              |   |                                | \$0.00      |            |  |
| 12                                      | III.A  | Areas of Focus: Gifted       |   |                                |             | \$0.00     |  |
| 13                                      | III.A  | Areas of Focus: Related      | Arts  |                                |             | \$0.00     |  |
|   |  |                              |   |                                | Total:      | \$5,635.00 |  |