

Pinellas County Schools

Clearwater Fundamental Middle School



2019-20 School Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

| | |
|---------------------------------------|-----------|
| School Demographics | 3 |
| Purpose and Outline of the SIP | 4 |
| School Information | 5 |
| Needs Assessment | 7 |
| Planning for Improvement | 13 |
| Title I Requirements | 0 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 23 |

Clearwater Fundamental Middle School

1660 PALMETTO ST, Clearwater, FL 33755

<http://www.coachman-ms.pinellas.k12.fl.us/>

Demographics

Principal: Stephanie Joyner

Start Date for this Principal: 10/16/2017

| | |
|--|--|
| 2018-19 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 |
| 2018-19 Title I School | No |
| 2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3) | 34% |
| 2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups in orange are below the federal threshold) | Asian Students Black/African American Students Economically Disadvantaged Students English Language Learners Hispanic Students Multiracial Students Students With Disabilities White Students |
| School Grade | 2018-19: A |
| School Grades History | 2017-18: A 2016-17: A 2015-16: A 2014-15: A 2013-14: A |
| 2018-19 Differentiated Accountability (DA) Information* | |
| SI Region | Southwest |
| Regional Executive Director | Tracy Webley |
| Turnaround Option/Cycle | N |
| Year | A |

| | |
|--|-----|
| ESSA Status | N/A |
| * As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here . | |

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Pinellas County School Board.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F. This plan is also a requirement for Targeted Support and Improvement (TS&I) and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CS&I) schools pursuant to 1008.33 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

To be designated as TS&I, a school must have one or more ESSA subgroup(s) with a Federal Index below 41%. This plan shall be approved by the district. There are three ways a school can be designated as CS&I:

1. have a school grade of D or F
2. have a graduation rate of 67% or lower
3. have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

For these schools, the SIP shall be approved by the district as well as the Bureau of School Improvement.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F, or a graduation rate 67% or less. Districts may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing for schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at www.floridacims.org.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement

The mission of the Clearwater Fundamental community is to promote highest student achievement through cooperative efforts and a challenging curriculum for our students to be college and career ready.

Provide the school's vision statement

100% Student success.

School Leadership Team

Membership

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

| Name | Title |
|---------------------|---------------------|
| Joyner, Stephanie | Principal |
| Principal | |
| Kurek, Paul | Assistant Principal |
| Assistant Principal | |
| Lane, Erin | Guidance Counselor |
| Guidance Counselor | |
| Binder, Cindy | Teacher, K-12 |
| Teacher, K-12 | |
| Bohnet, Bridget | Teacher, K-12 |
| Teacher, K-12 | |
| Cascone, Deborah | Teacher, K-12 |
| Teacher, K-12 | |
| Gray, Jennifer | Teacher, K-12 |
| Teacher, K-12 | |
| Hawthorne, Pam | Teacher, K-12 |
| Teacher, K-12 | |
| Johnston, Kinnan | Teacher, K-12 |
| Teacher, K-12 | |
| Roose, Matt | Teacher, K-12 |
| Teacher, K-12 | |
| Rubaii, Elaine | Teacher, K-12 |
| Teacher, K-12 | |
| Zaffiri, Carol | Teacher, ESE |
| Teacher, ESE | |

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

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

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|---------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|-----|-----|-----|---|----|----|----|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| Number of students enrolled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 263 | 278 | 258 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 799 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 4 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 17 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 |
| Course failure in ELA or Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 21 | 15 | 17 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 53 |
| | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |

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

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| Students with two or more indicators | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 |

The number of students identified as retainees:

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| Retained Students: Current Year | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 |
| 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)

38

Date this data was collected or last updated

Saturday 7/6/2019

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 warning indicators:

| Indicator | Grade Level | Total |
|-----------|-------------|-------|
|-----------|-------------|-------|

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 | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|---------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|----|----|----|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 7 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 16 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 |
| Course failure in ELA or Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 16 | 25 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 53 |

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

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| Students with two or more indicators | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 |

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 | District | State | School | District | State |
| ELA Achievement | 83% | 52% | 54% | 82% | 50% | 53% |
| ELA Learning Gains | 69% | 55% | 54% | 66% | 50% | 54% |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | 65% | 47% | 47% | 59% | 42% | 47% |
| Math Achievement | 89% | 55% | 58% | 90% | 54% | 58% |
| Math Learning Gains | 72% | 52% | 57% | 72% | 54% | 57% |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 69% | 46% | 51% | 75% | 48% | 51% |
| Science Achievement | 73% | 51% | 51% | 78% | 52% | 52% |
| Social Studies Achievement | 91% | 68% | 72% | 96% | 65% | 72% |

| EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey | | | | |
|--|-----------------------------------|---------|---------|---------|
| Indicator | Grade Level (prior year reported) | | | Total |
| | 6 | 7 | 8 | |
| Number of students enrolled | 263 (0) | 278 (0) | 258 (0) | 799 (0) |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 8 () | 4 () | 5 () | 17 (0) |
| One or more suspensions | 5 (0) | 0 (0) | 1 (0) | 6 (0) |
| Course failure in ELA or Math | 5 (0) | 2 (0) | 1 (0) | 8 (0) |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 21 (0) | 15 (0) | 17 (0) | 53 (0) |

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

| Indicator | Grade Level (prior year reported) | | | Total |
|-----------|-----------------------------------|-------|-------|-------|
| | 6 | 7 | 8 | |
| | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) |
| | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) |
| | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (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-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 06 | 2019 | 80% | 51% | 29% | 54% | 26% |
| | 2018 | 79% | 49% | 30% | 52% | 27% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 1% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 07 | 2019 | 81% | 51% | 30% | 52% | 29% |
| | 2018 | 81% | 48% | 33% | 51% | 30% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 0% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 2% | | | | |
| 08 | 2019 | 89% | 55% | 34% | 56% | 33% |
| | 2018 | 86% | 55% | 31% | 58% | 28% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 3% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 8% | | | | |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|-----------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 06 | 2019 | 82% | 44% | 38% | 55% | 27% |
| | 2018 | 81% | 45% | 36% | 52% | 29% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 1% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 07 | 2019 | 92% | 60% | 32% | 54% | 38% |
| | 2018 | 92% | 59% | 33% | 54% | 38% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 0% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 11% | | | | |
| 08 | 2019 | 37% | 31% | 6% | 46% | -9% |
| | 2018 | 85% | 31% | 54% | 45% | 40% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -48% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | -55% | | | | |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
|-----------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 08 | 2019 | 73% | 51% | 22% | 48% | 25% |
| | 2018 | 78% | 53% | 25% | 50% | 28% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -5% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |

| BIOLOGY EOC | | | | | |
|-------------|--------|----------|-----------------------|-------|--------------------|
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2019 | | | | | |
| 2018 | | | | | |

| CIVICS EOC | | | | | |
|------------|--------|----------|-----------------------|-------|--------------------|
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2019 | 91% | 68% | 23% | 71% | 20% |
| 2018 | 96% | 66% | 30% | 71% | 25% |
| Compare | | -5% | | | |

| HISTORY EOC | | | | | |
|-------------|--------|----------|-----------------------|-------|--------------------|
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2019 | | | | | |
| 2018 | | | | | |

| ALGEBRA EOC | | | | | |
|-------------|--------|----------|-----------------------|-------|--------------------|
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2019 | 95% | 55% | 40% | 61% | 34% |
| 2018 | 95% | 57% | 38% | 62% | 33% |
| Compare | | 0% | | | |

| GEOMETRY EOC | | | | | |
|--------------|--------|----------|-----------------------|-------|--------------------|
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2019 | 100% | 56% | 44% | 57% | 43% |
| 2018 | 100% | 56% | 44% | 56% | 44% |
| Compare | | 0% | | | |

Subgroup Data

| 2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|----------|--------|-------------|-----------|---------|--------------|----------|---------|-----------|-------------------|---------------------|
| Subgroups | ELA Ach. | ELA LG | ELA LG L25% | Math Ach. | Math LG | Math LG L25% | Sci Ach. | SS Ach. | MS Accel. | Grad Rate 2016-17 | C & C Accel 2016-17 |
| SWD | 55 | 67 | 62 | 55 | 62 | 50 | | 55 | | | |
| ELL | 52 | 58 | 52 | 75 | 59 | 54 | 57 | 56 | 89 | | |

| 2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|----------|--------|-------------|-----------|---------|--------------|----------|---------|-----------|-------------------|---------------------|
| Subgroups | ELA Ach. | ELA LG | ELA LG L25% | Math Ach. | Math LG | Math LG L25% | Sci Ach. | SS Ach. | MS Accel. | Grad Rate 2016-17 | C & C Accel 2016-17 |
| ASN | 100 | 77 | | 100 | 79 | | | | | | |
| BLK | 68 | 57 | 46 | 81 | 80 | 73 | | 86 | | | |
| HSP | 67 | 63 | 56 | 79 | 72 | 61 | 58 | 75 | 86 | | |
| MUL | 83 | 86 | 83 | 89 | 81 | 75 | 58 | 100 | 92 | | |
| WHT | 88 | 70 | 71 | 92 | 70 | 72 | 79 | 96 | 94 | | |
| FRL | 69 | 63 | 58 | 81 | 68 | 57 | 59 | 77 | 92 | | |

| 2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|----------|--------|-------------|-----------|---------|--------------|----------|---------|-----------|-------------------|---------------------|
| Subgroups | ELA Ach. | ELA LG | ELA LG L25% | Math Ach. | Math LG | Math LG L25% | Sci Ach. | SS Ach. | MS Accel. | Grad Rate 2015-16 | C & C Accel 2015-16 |
| SWD | 42 | 46 | 33 | 65 | 69 | 74 | 43 | | | | |
| ELL | 52 | 66 | 59 | 77 | 68 | 67 | 40 | 83 | 82 | | |
| ASN | 89 | 78 | | 100 | 75 | | | | 92 | | |
| BLK | 59 | 71 | 60 | 68 | 62 | 59 | 50 | | 50 | | |
| HSP | 69 | 62 | 53 | 81 | 69 | 69 | 66 | 91 | 69 | | |
| MUL | 84 | 70 | 62 | 92 | 68 | 80 | 90 | 100 | 93 | | |
| WHT | 87 | 67 | 61 | 93 | 74 | 79 | 82 | 98 | 80 | | |
| FRL | 71 | 63 | 53 | 85 | 68 | 73 | 75 | 91 | 71 | | |

ESSA Data

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

| ESSA Federal Index | |
|---|------|
| ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I) | N/A |
| OVERALL Federal Index - All Students | 77 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students | NO |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 0 |
| Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency | 66 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 770 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 10 |
| Percent Tested | 100% |

Subgroup Data

| Students With Disabilities | |
|---|----|
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities | 58 |
| Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |

| English Language Learners | |
|--|-----|
| Federal Index - English Language Learners | 62 |
| 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 | 89 |
| 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 | 70 |
| Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| Hispanic Students | |
| Federal Index - Hispanic Students | 68 |
| 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 | 83 |
| 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 | 81 |
| 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 | 69 |
| 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

The lowest component for CFMS was the ELA lowest quartile component. While we did improve by 6%, in other words, went from 59 points to 65 points in the cell, we still have room for improvement.

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

My greatest decline was in math grade 8 FSA. The reason for this decrease was due to all level 3 students were pulled and put into the pre alg/alg block to help the acceleration cell. We only had 19 students in regular math 8. On the other hand, our acceleration box went up by 15 points. When you combine our 6, 7 and 8th grade on grade level, we only ended up dropping 1 point for making level 3 or above.

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 positive gap was +38 above the state in 7th grade math and I think that was because the teachers worked closely together on remediation plans for the students. The math 8 showed a -9 gap below state data. Part of this was the adjustment of only having level 1 and 2 students in the classroom and the teacher was not used to having only level 1 and 2 students.

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

Our acceleration cell showed the most improvement and this is because we scheduled all level 3 students into the pre-alg/alg block. We will continue this action for the 2019-20 school year.

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

Number of students with 2 or more indicators.

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

1. Learning Gains for ELA
2. Learning Gains for math
3. Acceleration points
4. Civics
5. Science 8

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

| | |
|--|--|
| #1 | |
| Title | ELA |
| Rationale | Our current level of performance is 69% of students making learning gains, as evidenced in FSA 2019. We expect our performance level to be 79% by FSA 2020. |
| State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve | The problem/gap is occurring because of the lack of rigorous complex text for all students. If teachers use more rigorous text, students will increase the learning gains by 10% as measured by the the 2020 ELA FSA. |
| Person responsible for monitoring outcome | Cindy Binder (binderc@pcsb.org) |
| Evidence-based Strategy | AVID focused note taking Core Connections prompts |
| Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy | The problem/gap is occurring because of the lack of rigorous complex text and planning for instruction. If teachers use more rigorous text, students will increase the learning gains by 10% as measured by the the 2020 ELA FSA. |
| Action Step | |
| Description | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. AVID note taking will be facilitated by the ELA/reading teachers ongoing throughout the year. 2. AVID collaboration/study group training will be facilitated by the ELA/reading teachers ongoing throughout the year. 3. ELA teachers receive professional development around close reading standards, assessment and instructional methods through the one Core Connections training during the year. 4. ELA/reading teachers will meet in department PLCs, to review student data, examine student examples and work on ways to utilize questions to help students elaborate on content. ELA dept chair will share data monthly at SBLT. 5. Teachers of SS classrooms will continue integration of the literacy standards into the SS curriculum including DBQs monthly. 6. ELA teachers will use past core connection prompts for practice with the students monthly. 7. ELA teachers will work on developing a common unit calendar by grade level. |
| Person Responsible | Cindy Binder (binderc@pcsb.org) |

| | |
|--|---|
| #2 | |
| Title | Mathematics |
| Rationale | Our current level of performance is 72% making learning gains, as evidenced in FSA math scores. We expect our performance level to be 82% of the students making learning gains by May 2020 as measured by the 2020 FSA learning gains. |
| State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve | The percent of all students earning learning gains will increase from 72% to 82%, as measured by FSA math. |
| Person responsible for monitoring outcome | Bridget Bohnet (bohnetb@pcsb.org) |
| Evidence-based Strategy | Strengthen staff ability to engage students in complex tasks. |
| Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy | Through complex tasks we hope to support students to transfer strategies. |
| Action Step | |
| Description | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Math teachers utilize systemic documents (adopted curriculum, pacing guides, etc.) to effectively plan for mathematics units that incorporate the Standards for Mathematical Practice and rigorous performance tasks aligned to MAFS which will be measured monthly. 2. Math teachers will provide ELP support and small group tutoring for level 3 students in the Algebra block course which can be measured biweekly. 3. Weekly ELP support for the lowest 25% will be provided by the math teachers. 4. Math teachers will conduct data chats with students regarding data based on mastery/non-mastery of standards each quarter. 5. Math teachers will encourage productive struggle for students as they work through vocabulary and comprehension using appropriate strategies daily. 6. Students will be placed strategically in with teachers for academic results. |
| Person Responsible | Bridget Bohnet (bohnetb@pcsb.org) |

| | |
|--|---|
| #3 | |
| Title | Social Studies |
| Rationale | Our current level of performance is 91% of the 7th graders scoring at a level 3 or higher, as evidenced in the 2019 Civics EOC. We expect our performance level to be 96% scoring at a level 3 or higher by the 2020 Civics EOC. |
| State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve | Increase number of students achieving a level 3 or higher by 5% as measured by Civics EOC data. |
| Person responsible for monitoring outcome | Kinnan Johnston (johnstonki@pcsb.org) |
| Evidence-based Strategy | Focused-note taking (AVID strategy) Cooperative grouping Costa's Levels of Questioning and Thinking |
| Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy | If SS teachers work on questioning, thinking and note taking strategies, the problem would be reduced by 5%. All strategies are based off AVID research. |
| Action Step | |
| Description | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. SS teachers will implement AVID strategies including Focused- note taking, cooperative grouping, Costa's levels of questioning and thinking and WICOR on a biweekly basis. 2. SS teachers will implement DBQs in the classrooms monthly. 3. SS teachers will use complex SS texts read by students in multiple class settings as support for the Civics curriculum and expose students to difficult text monthly. 4. Teachers will provide students with exposure to a variety of primary source documents at varying complexities monthly. 5. SS teachers will attend and implement core connections trainings in their classrooms. |
| Person Responsible | Kinnan Johnston (johnstonki@pcsb.org) |

| | |
|--|---|
| #4 | |
| Title | Science |
| Rationale | Our current level of performance is 73% of the 8th grade students achieved a level 3 or higher as evidenced in SSA data. We expect our performance level to be at 78% by Spring on 2020 as measured by SSA data. |
| State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve | Increase number of 8th grade students achieving a level 3 or higher by 5% as measured by FSA 8th grade science data (SSA). |
| Person responsible for monitoring outcome | Elaine Rubaii (rubaiie@pcsb.org) |
| Evidence-based Strategy | Cognitively-complex tasks. |
| Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy | The gap is occurring because collaboration in Cognitively-complex tasks for students is not occurring in the classrooms. If collaboratively planned cognitively-complex tasks for students in all science classrooms would occur, the problem would be reduced by 5%. |
| Action Step | |
| Description | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Teachers will give cycle assessments three times a year and data is reviewed by teachers to see if any skills need reteaching. 2. Teachers will implement weekly AVID strategies including collaborative groups/study groups, focused note taking and reading strategies. 3. Teachers will review test taking strategies monthly. 4. ELP support for the supports needing extra support will be offered by teachers weekly. 5. Teachers will work collaboratively to develop cognitively-complex tasks for students such as investigations that use focused note-taking and techniques for student reflection and revision of work biweekly. 6. Teachers use the 5E model to support rigor in the classroom using the Discovery Education resources weekly. (Learning through inquiry.) 7. Teachers will use the unit assessments to measure growth on the unit. |
| Person Responsible | Elaine Rubaii (rubaiie@pcsb.org) |

| | |
|--|---|
| #5 | |
| Title | College Career Readiness |
| Rationale | Our current level of performance is 93% eligible earned acceleration credit through coursework are receiving the credit, as evidenced in MS Acceleration cell on the school grade. |
| State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve | Increase the number of students receiving middle school acceleration coursework will increase by 3% as measured by the MS Acceleration cell on the 2020 School grade. |
| Person responsible for monitoring outcome | Bridget Bohnet (bohnetb@pcsb.org) |
| Evidence-based Strategy | collaborative group work ELP enrichment opportunities |
| Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy | The gap is occurring due to not all level 3 students that should be placed in Algebra where placed in Algebra. The other reason the gap is occurring is because we only offered 1 way to get computer certification which we did add a second program mid school year. |
| Action Step | |
| Description | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Guidance will stress importance with students on taking advantage of Alg, Geom, Adobe or Microsoft Bundle opportunities monthly. 2. Guidance will facilitate a parent meeting regarding course selections in August and January. 3. Guidance will place level 3 students not going directly into Hn. Alg into the block of pre alg and Hn Alg at the beginning of the school year. 4. Guidance will place more students into the DIT and Intro into AV Arts programs. |
| Person Responsible | Erin Lane (laneer@pcsb.org) |

| | |
|--|---|
| #6 | |
| Title | Black Student Achievement |
| Rationale | Our current level of performance is 68% are proficient, as evidenced by FSA ELA proficiency scores. We expect our performance level to be 75% by May 2020. |
| State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve | An increase of 7% in our proficiency level for FSA ELA test by May 2020. |
| Person responsible for monitoring outcome | Cindy Binder (binderc@pcsb.org) |
| Evidence-based Strategy | cooperative learning Study/collaborative groups data chats |
| Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy | The gap is occurring because the lack of students understanding their own data. If monthly data chats would occur, the problem would be reduced by 7%. |
| Action Step | |
| Description | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. ELA teachers will ensure black students are participating in ELP opportunities after school by recruiting and targeting resources. 2. Equity champions will provide targeted PD for teachers on equity in the classroom bimonthly. 3. Dept. heads will ensure staff has access to real time data specific to black students in order to have effective data chats and targeted support for improved learning monthly. 4. ELA teachers will implement culturally relevant instructional practices in classrooms such as cooperative and small group settings, explicit vocabulary instruction and monitoring with feedback weekly. 5. Dept heads will use equity questions running their PLCs . |
| Person Responsible | Stephanie Joyner (joyners@pcsb.org) |

| | |
|--|--|
| #7 | |
| Title | School climate/Conditions for learning |
| Rationale | Our current level of performance in school-wide behavior is 40% of the teachers are using RP strategies. We expect our performance level to be 70% by the end of the 2020 school year. The gap in behavior performance is occurring because minimum staff was trained in RP. |
| State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve | Our performance level of staff using RP strategies will increase by 30% by May 2020. |
| Person responsible for monitoring outcome | Stephanie Joyner (joyners@pcsb.org) |
| Evidence-based Strategy | RP conversations/strategies. |
| Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy | If RP conversations/strategies are occurring, we will see a 2% decrease in discipline referrals. We will analyze and review our data for effective implementation of our strategies by PLC and SBLT minutes. |
| Action Step | |
| Description | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Staff will attend district led Restorative Approaches training offered by school or district. 2. The SBLT will continue school-wide roll out and develop plan continuation of RP/SEL monthly. 3. Administration will monitor and support staff for the implementation with fidelity monthly. 4. CST will review student and teacher data for trends and next steps monthly. 5. Administration will provide equity training for the teachers during preschool. |
| Person Responsible | Stephanie Joyner (joyners@pcsb.org) |

| | |
|--|---|
| #8 | |
| Title | Attendance |
| Rationale | Through students attending school, they will achieve more academically and it will be able to put them in more classes with more rigor. |
| State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve | Currently, we have an average of 3% with chronic attendance issues. This has dropped by 1% each of the past 2 years. We would like to have no more than 2% of the students with chronic attendance issues. |
| Person responsible for monitoring outcome | Paul Kurek (kurekp@pcsb.org) |
| Evidence-based Strategy | We believe that developing a attendance monitoring plan will decrease attendance issues with these students from 3% to 2%. |
| Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy | We began using the attendance progress monitoring plan this year for students with 15 days or more and when parents had to come in for a conference we were able to counsel the family about the importance of school We believe this is why we had a 1% decrease. |
| Action Step | |
| Description | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Review attendance taking process and school wide strategies for positive attendance with all staff. 2. Ensure attendance is accurately taken and recorded on a daily basis and reflects the appropriate entry codes. 3. Student is brought up in child study once they hit 5 days absent . The meetings of CST occur 2 times a month. 4. Five day notice is sent to the parent. 5. Student is brought up again in child study if they hit between 8-10 absences where we discuss medical issues or any other concerns with the student. 6. Second notice is sent to the parent. 7. Parent is contacted through phone. 8. When the student receives their 15th day of being absent, they are once again brought to the child study team to verify interventions occurred which occurs biweekly. 9. CST will make a recommendation to send the student the the IAC team for an intervention plan biweekly. 10. IAC will issue an attendance monitoring plan during this parent meeting, as needed. 11. The student is monitored by the grade level representative for attendance two times a month.. |
| Person Responsible | Stephanie Joyner (joyners@pcsb.org) |

| | |
|--|--|
| #9 | |
| Title | Family and Community Engagement |
| Rationale | Our number of volunteer hours dropped during the 2018-19 school year from the previous school year to 3417.5. |
| State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve | Increase the number of volunteer/mentor hours by 5% during the 2019-2020 school year. |
| Person responsible for monitoring outcome | Stephanie Joyner (joyners@pcsb.org) |
| Evidence-based Strategy | Mentor and volunteering-connection and support for students |
| Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy | The problem is occurring because not all volunteers are signing in when they are here to help with clubs. If we make it easier for them to sign in on the system we will be documenting the support our students are receiving. |
| Action Step | |
| Description | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The CIA will develop a flyer for recruitment. 2. Administration will discuss in SAC/PTA meeting about available opportunities. 3. The CIA will recruit at the parent introduction meetings. |
| Person Responsible | Erin Lane (laneer@pcsb.org) |

| | |
|------------------|---|
| #10 | |
| Title | Healthy Schools |
| Rationale | We have had an increased number of baker acts this school year. To hopefully support students, all teachers will be trained in the trauma informed care. Currently, only 10% of the teachers/administrators have participated in this training. |

| | |
|--|--|
| State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve | Currently we have 10% of the teachers trained in Trauma informed care. We will have 100% of the teachers participating in Trauma informed care PD preschool. |
| Person responsible for monitoring outcome | Erin Lane (laneer@pcsb.org) |
| Evidence-based Strategy | Currently only 10% of the staff have participated in trauma informed care training. We will have 100% of teachers and administrators participate in the trauma informed care training. |
| Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy | Suggested training by district. |

| | |
|---------------------------|---|
| Action Step | |
| Description | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Administration will contact the district and get the training set up. Administration will inform teachers of training data so they can sign up by the training date. Teachers and administrators will attend the trauma informed care training. |
| Person Responsible | Matt Roose (roosem@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)

School Safety will be addressed through training and drills.

Part V: Budget

| 1 | III.A | Areas of Focus: ELA | | | | \$2,800.00 |
|---|----------|-------------------------|---|--------------------------|-----|------------|
| | Function | Object | Budget Focus | Funding Source | FTE | 2019-20 |
| | 7200 | 140-Substitute Teachers | 0731 - Clearwater Fundamental Middle School | School Improvement Funds | | \$200.00 |
| | | | <i>Notes: TDEs to support classroom visits, coverage or conferences. (This will apply for all subject areas.)</i> | | | |

| | | | | | | |
|----------|--------------|---|---|--------------------------|-----|-------------------|
| | 7200 | 790-Miscellaneous Expenses | 0731 - Clearwater Fundamental Middle School | School Improvement Funds | | \$1,000.00 |
| | | | <i>Notes: Conferences to support student achievement. (This will apply for all subject areas.)</i> | | | |
| | 7200 | 790-Miscellaneous Expenses | 0731 - Clearwater Fundamental Middle School | Other | | \$1,500.00 |
| | | | <i>Notes: PTA will pay for vocabulary books</i> | | | |
| | 7200 | 790-Miscellaneous Expenses | 0731 - Clearwater Fundamental Middle School | School Improvement Funds | | \$100.00 |
| | | | <i>Notes: To help pay for spelling bee and geography awards.</i> | | | |
| 2 | III.A | Areas of Focus: Mathematics | | | | \$600.00 |
| | Function | Object | Budget Focus | Funding Source | FTE | 2019-20 |
| | 7200 | 790-Miscellaneous Expenses | 0731 - Clearwater Fundamental Middle School | | | \$600.00 |
| | | | <i>Notes: TDEs to support testing and visit other classrooms</i> | | | |
| 3 | III.A | Areas of Focus: Social Studies | | | | \$450.00 |
| | Function | Object | Budget Focus | Funding Source | FTE | 2019-20 |
| | 7200 | 790-Miscellaneous Expenses | 0731 - Clearwater Fundamental Middle School | General Fund | | \$450.00 |
| | | | <i>Notes: For TDE, registration and travel for teacher to go to geography bee if a student makes the competition.</i> | | | |
| 4 | III.A | Areas of Focus: Science | | | | \$180.00 |
| | Function | Object | Budget Focus | Funding Source | FTE | 2019-20 |
| | 7300 | 140-Substitute Teachers | 0731 - Clearwater Fundamental Middle School | School Improvement Funds | | \$180.00 |
| | | | <i>Notes: TDEs for teachers to attend training or observe other classes which applies to all areas..</i> | | | |
| 5 | III.A | Areas of Focus: College Career Readiness | | | | \$4,500.00 |
| | Function | Object | Budget Focus | Funding Source | FTE | 2019-20 |
| | 7200 | 790-Miscellaneous Expenses | 0731 - Clearwater Fundamental Middle School | School Improvement Funds | | \$2,500.00 |
| | | | <i>Notes: TDEs, travel and registration to support college and career initiatives. (conferences, field trips, etc.)</i> | | | |

| | | | | | | |
|-----------|--------------|---|---|--------------------------|---------------|--------------------|
| | 7200 | 790-Miscellaneous Expenses | 0731 - Clearwater Fundamental Middle School | School Improvement Funds | | \$2,000.00 |
| | | | <i>Notes: Support CFES initiatives including buses for fieldtrips, WestPoint robotics workshop and conferences</i> | | | |
| 6 | III.A | Areas of Focus: Black Student Achievement | | | | \$0.00 |
| 7 | III.A | Areas of Focus: School climate/Conditions for learning | | | | \$350.00 |
| | Function | Object | Budget Focus | Funding Source | FTE | 2019-20 |
| | 7200 | 790-Miscellaneous Expenses | 0731 - Clearwater Fundamental Middle School | School Improvement Funds | | \$350.00 |
| | | | <i>Notes: Incentives for students.</i> | | | |
| 8 | III.A | Areas of Focus: Attendance | | | | \$400.00 |
| | Function | Object | Budget Focus | Funding Source | FTE | 2019-20 |
| | 7200 | 790-Miscellaneous Expenses | 0731 - Clearwater Fundamental Middle School | School Improvement Funds | | \$400.00 |
| | | | <i>Notes: Funds will help pay for stamps, envelopes and paper for the letters. Incentives for students attending school.</i> | | | |
| 9 | III.A | Areas of Focus: Family and Community Engagement | | | | \$450.00 |
| | Function | Object | Budget Focus | Funding Source | FTE | 2019-20 |
| | 7200 | 790-Miscellaneous Expenses | 0731 - Clearwater Fundamental Middle School | Other | | \$250.00 |
| | | | <i>Notes: Donations to support volunteer program and GATI.</i> | | | |
| | 7200 | 790-Miscellaneous Expenses | 0731 - Clearwater Fundamental Middle School | Other | | \$200.00 |
| | | | <i>Notes: Copies of parent flyers, etc. Tickets to student celebrations. Awards, flowers, recognition for all areas.</i> | | | |
| 10 | III.A | Areas of Focus: Healthy Schools | | | | \$2,000.00 |
| | Function | Object | Budget Focus | Funding Source | FTE | 2019-20 |
| | 7200 | 120-Classroom Teachers | 0731 - Clearwater Fundamental Middle School | School Improvement Funds | | \$2,000.00 |
| | | | <i>Notes: Stipends for trainings and curriculum writing after school hours. (This is for all areas of focus(all teachers).)</i> | | | |
| | | | | | Total: | \$11,730.00 |