

Pinellas County Schools

CLEARWATER FUNDAMENTAL MIDDLE SCHOOL



2024-25 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

SIP Authority 1

I. School Information 3

 A. School Mission and Vision 3

 B. School Leadership Team 3

 C. Stakeholder Involvement and Monitoring 6

 D. Demographic Data 7

 E. Early Warning Systems 8

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review 11

 A. ESSA School, District, State Comparison 12

 B. ESSA School-Level Data Review 13

 C. ESSA Subgroup Data Review 14

 D. Accountability Components by Subgroup 17

 E. Grade Level Data Review 20

III. Planning for Improvement 21

IV. Positive Culture and Environment 31

V. Title I Requirements (optional) 34

VI. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review 36

VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus 37

School Board Approval

This plan has not yet been approved by the Pinellas County School Board.

SIP Authority

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

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

ADDITIONAL TARGET SUPPORT AND IMPROVEMENT (ATSI)
A school not identified for CSI or TSI, but has one or more subgroups with a Federal Index below 41%.
TARGETED SUPPORT AND IMPROVEMENT (TSI)
A school not identified as CSI that has at least one consistently underperforming subgroup with a Federal Index below 32% for three consecutive years.
COMPREHENSIVE SUPPORT AND IMPROVEMENT (CSI)
A school can be identified as CSI in any of the following four ways: 1. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%; 2. Have a graduation rate at or below 67%; 3. Have a school grade of D or F; or 4. Have a Federal Index below 41% in the same subgroup(s) for 6 consecutive years.

ESEA sections 1111(d) requires that each school identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI develop a support and improvement plan created in partnership with stakeholders (including principals and other school leaders, teachers and parents), is informed by all indicators in the State's accountability system, includes evidence-based interventions, is based on a school-level needs assessment, and identifies resource inequities to be addressed through implementation of the plan. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as TSI, ATSI and non-Title I CSI must be approved and monitored by the school district. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as Title I, CSI must be approved by the school district and Department. The Department must monitor and periodically review implementation of each CSI plan after approval.

The Department's SIP template in the Florida Continuous Improvement Management System (CIMS), <https://cims2.floridacims.org>, meets all state and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all ESSA components for a support and improvement plan required for traditional public and public charter schools identified as CSI, TSI and ATSI, and eligible schools applying for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) funds.

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

The responses to the corresponding sections in the Department's SIP template may address the requirements for:

1. Title I schools operating a schoolwide program (SWD), pursuant to ESSA, as amended, Section 1114(b); and
2. Charter schools that receive a school grade of D or F or three consecutive grades below C, pursuant to Rule 6A-1.099827, F.A.C. The chart below lists the applicable requirements.

SIP SECTIONS	TITLE I SCHOOLWIDE PROGRAM	CHARTER SCHOOLS
I.A: School Mission/Vision		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(1)
I.B-C: School Leadership, Stakeholder Involvement & SIP Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)	
I.E: Early Warning System	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II.A-E: Data Review		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
III.A: Data Analysis/Reflection	ESSA 1114(b)(6)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(4)
III.B, IV: Area(s) of Focus	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(i-iii)	
V: Title I Requirements	ESSA 1114(b)(2, 4-5), (7)(A)(iii)(I-V)-(B) ESSA 1116(b-g)	

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

I. School Information

A. 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.

B. School Leadership Team

School Leadership Team

For each member of the school leadership team, enter the employee name, and identify the position title and job duties/responsibilities as they relate to SIP implementation for each member of the school leadership team.

Leadership Team Member #1

Employee's Name

Eric Krause

Position Title

Principal

Job Duties and Responsibilities

Academic and Operations

Leadership Team Member #2

Employee's Name

Mary Reynolds

Position Title

Assistant Principal

Job Duties and Responsibilities

Academic and Operations

Leadership Team Member #3

Employee's Name

Deanna Barthel

Position Title

Teacher, K-12

Job Duties and Responsibilities

ELA/Rdg Dept Head

Leadership Team Member #4

Employee's Name

Bridget Bohnet

Position Title

Teacher, K-12

Job Duties and Responsibilities

Math Dept Head

Leadership Team Member #5

Employee's Name

Kinnan Johnston

Position Title

Teacher, K-12

Job Duties and Responsibilities

SS Dept Head

Leadership Team Member #6

Employee's Name

Erin Lane

Position Title

School Counselor

Job Duties and Responsibilities

Helping students academically and emotionally

Leadership Team Member #7

Employee's Name

Kimberly Ritter

Position Title

Teacher, K-12

Job Duties and Responsibilities

ELA/Rdg Dept Head

Leadership Team Member #8

Employee's Name

Elaine Rubaii

Position Title

Teacher, K-12

Job Duties and Responsibilities

Science Dept Head

C. Stakeholder Involvement and Monitoring

Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Development

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

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

The plan is developed by the staff with input from our student counsel representative. Additionally, there is collaboration between the staff and content specialists from the Pinellas County School district. Then it is presented to SAC for input and questions.

SIP Monitoring

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

The school uses formative and summative data to measure student growth. If growth is not occurring the problem solving cycle is started to decide how we have to change our actions. The data and any possible changes are presented to the families and SAC in the middle of the school year.

D. Demographic Data

2024-25 STATUS (PER MSID FILE)	ACTIVE
SCHOOL TYPE AND GRADES SERVED (PER MSID FILE)	MIDDLE/JR. HIGH 6-8
PRIMARY SERVICE TYPE (PER MSID FILE)	K-12 GENERAL EDUCATION
2023-24 TITLE I SCHOOL STATUS	NO
2023-24 MINORITY RATE	35.4%
2023-24 ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED (FRL) RATE	31.1%
CHARTER SCHOOL	NO
RAISE SCHOOL	NO
2023-24 ESSA IDENTIFICATION *UPDATED AS OF 7/25/2024	N/A
ELIGIBLE FOR UNIFIED SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT GRANT (UNISIG)	
2023-24 ESSA SUBGROUPS REPRESENTED (SUBGROUPS WITH 10 OR MORE STUDENTS) (SUBGROUPS BELOW THE FEDERAL THRESHOLD ARE IDENTIFIED WITH AN ASTERISK)	STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES (SWD) ENGLISH LANGUAGE LEARNERS (ELL) ASIAN STUDENTS (ASN) BLACK/AFRICAN AMERICAN STUDENTS (BLK) HISPANIC STUDENTS (HSP) MULTIRACIAL STUDENTS (MUL) WHITE STUDENTS (WHT) ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED STUDENTS (FRL)
SCHOOL GRADES HISTORY <i>*2022-23 SCHOOL GRADES WILL SERVE AS AN INFORMATIONAL BASELINE.</i>	2023-24: A 2022-23: A* 2021-22: A 2020-21: 2019-20: A

E. Early Warning Systems

1. Grades K-8

Current Year 2024-25

Using 2023-24 data, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:

INDICATOR	GRADE LEVEL									TOTAL
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more school days							13	12	13	38
One or more suspensions							0	0	0	0
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)							0	3	0	3
Course failure in Math							0	0	0	0
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment							16	10	3	29
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment							10	2	3	15
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C. (only applies to grades K-3)										0
Number of students with a substantial mathematics defined by Rule 6A-6.0533, F.A.C. (only applies to grades K-4)										0

Current Year 2024-25

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

INDICATOR	GRADE LEVEL									TOTAL
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators							2	3	0	5

Current Year 2024-25

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

INDICATOR	GRADE LEVEL									TOTAL
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained students: current year							1	0	0	1
Students retained two or more times							0	0		0

Prior Year (2023-24) As Last Reported (pre-populated)

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

INDICATOR	GRADE LEVEL									TOTAL
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more school days							7	13	16	36
One or more suspensions							2	3	5	10
Course failure in ELA										0
Course failure in Math							1	1		2
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment							29	10	21	60
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment							18	1	2	21
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C. (only applies to grades K-3)										0

Prior Year (2023-24) As Last Reported (pre-populated)

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

INDICATOR	GRADE LEVEL									TOTAL
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators							7	6	8	21

Prior Year (2023-24) As Last Reported (pre-populated)

The number of students retained:

INDICATOR	GRADE LEVEL									TOTAL
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained students: current year							1			1
Students retained two or more times										0

2. Grades 9-12 (optional)

This section intentionally left blank because it addresses grades not taught at this school or the school opted not to include data for these grades.

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review (ESEA Section 1114(b)(6))

A. ESSA School, District, State Comparison

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

Data for 2023-24 had not been fully loaded to CIMIS at time of printing.

ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENT	2024		2023		2022**	
	SCHOOL	DISTRICT†	STATE†	SCHOOL	DISTRICT†	STATE†
ELA Achievement *	85			79	49	49
ELA Grade 3 Achievement **						
ELA Learning Gains	75					60
ELA Learning Gains Lowest 25%	80					49
Math Achievement *	95			93	58	56
Math Learning Gains	80					73
Math Learning Gains Lowest 25%	80					68
Science Achievement *	83			78	48	49
Social Studies Achievement *	96			95	69	68
Graduation Rate						
Middle School Acceleration	93			81	77	73
College and Career Readiness						
ELP Progress	72			64	38	40

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

**Grade 3 ELA Achievement was added beginning with the 2023 calculation.

† District and State data presented here are for schools of the same type: elementary, middle, high school, or combination.

B. ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2023-24 ESSA FPPI	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL FPPI – All Students	84%
OVERALL FPPI Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the FPPI	839
Total Components for the FPPI	10
Percent Tested	100%
Graduation Rate	

ESSA OVERALL FPPI HISTORY						
2023-24	2022-23	2021-22	2020-21	2019-20*	2018-19	2017-18
84%	81%	76%	77%		77%	78%

* Pursuant to Florida Department of Education Emergency Order No. 2020-EO-1 (PDF), spring K-12 statewide assessment test administrations for the 2019-20 school year were canceled and accountability measures reliant on such data were not calculated for the 2019-20 school year. In April 2020, the U.S. Department of Education provided all states a waiver to keep the same school identifications for 2019-20 as determined in 2018-19 due to the COVID-19 pandemic.

C. ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

2023-24 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA SUBGROUP	FEDERAL PERCENT OF POINTS INDEX	SUBGROUP BELOW 41%	NUMBER OF CONSECUTIVE YEARS THE SUBGROUP IS BELOW 41%	NUMBER OF CONSECUTIVE YEARS THE SUBGROUP IS BELOW 32%
Students With Disabilities	67%	No		
English Language Learners	72%	No		
Asian Students	95%	No		
Black/African American Students	86%	No		
Hispanic Students	81%	No		
Multiracial Students	88%	No		
White Students	86%	No		
Economically Disadvantaged Students	81%	No		

2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA SUBGROUP	FEDERAL PERCENT OF POINTS INDEX	SUBGROUP BELOW 41%	NUMBER OF CONSECUTIVE YEARS THE SUBGROUP IS BELOW 41%	NUMBER OF CONSECUTIVE YEARS THE SUBGROUP IS BELOW 32%
Students With Disabilities	53%	No		
English Language Learners	64%	No		
Asian Students	97%	No		
Black/African American Students	73%	No		
Hispanic Students	75%	No		
Multiracial Students	89%	No		
White Students	88%	No		
Economically Disadvantaged Students	78%	No		

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA SUBGROUP	FEDERAL PERCENT OF POINTS INDEX	SUBGROUP BELOW 41%	NUMBER OF CONSECUTIVE YEARS THE SUBGROUP IS BELOW 41%	NUMBER OF CONSECUTIVE YEARS THE SUBGROUP IS BELOW 32%
Students With Disabilities	37%	Yes	1	
English Language Learners	62%	No		
Native American Students				
Asian Students	89%	No		
Black/African American Students	70%	No		
Hispanic Students	69%	No		
Multiracial Students	80%	No		
Pacific Islander Students				
White Students	76%	No		
Economically Disadvantaged Students	73%	No		

D. Accountability Components by Subgroup

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

2023-24 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS														ELP PROGRESS
	ELA ACH.	GRADE 3 ELA ACH.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	MATH ACH.	MATH LG	MATH LG L25%	SCI ACH.	SS ACH.	MS ACCEL.	GRAD RATE 2022-23	C&C ACCEL 2022-23		
All Students	85%		75%	80%	95%	80%	80%	83%	96%	93%			72%	
Students With Disabilities	42%		61%	65%	74%	83%	94%	42%	73%					
English Language Learners	55%		76%	86%	87%	76%	80%	41%	76%	75%			72%	
Asian Students	100%		81%		100%	95%				100%				
Black/African American Students	79%		69%	77%	90%	86%	100%		100%					
Hispanic Students	79%		75%	86%	93%	79%	82%	68%	88%	91%			73%	
Multiracial Students	89%		81%		89%	76%		85%	100%	95%				
White Students	87%		74%	76%	96%	79%	79%	89%	98%	93%				
Economically Disadvantaged Students	78%		74%	80%	92%	79%	83%	74%	92%	89%			67%	

06/2024

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS													
	ELA ACH.	GRADE 3 ELA ACH.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	MATH ACH.	MATH LG	MATH LG L25%	SCI ACH.	SS ACH.	MS ACCEL.	GRAD RATE 2021-22	C&C ACCEL 2021-22	ELP PROGRESS
All Students	79%				93%			78%	95%	81%			64%
Students With Disabilities	37%				73%			38%		62%			
English Language Learners	45%				85%			38%	81%	76%			57%
Asian Students	100%				100%					92%			
Black/African American Students	63%				83%								
Hispanic Students	64%				90%			65%	94%	79%			55%
Multiracial Students	78%				94%				92%	92%			
White Students	85%				95%			83%	95%	81%			
Economically Disadvantaged Students	69%				90%			73%	94%	83%			61%

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS													
	ELA ACH.	GRADE 3 ELA ACH.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	MATH ACH.	MATH LG	MATH LG L25%	SCI ACH.	SS ACH.	MS ACCEL.	GRAD RATE 2020-21	C&C ACCEL 2020-21	ELP PROGR
All Students	76%		60%	49%	89%	73%	68%	72%	94%	89%			90%
Students With Disabilities	17%		34%	28%	52%	52%	48%	0%	65%				
English Language Learners	44%		39%	36%	78%	67%	67%	35%	68%	96%			90%
Native American Students													
Asian Students	100%		89%		94%	72%				92%			
Black/African American Students	65%		69%	60%	82%	75%							
Hispanic Students	64%		49%	35%	84%	71%	63%	61%	85%	86%			90%
Multiracial Students	86%		64%	60%	93%	79%				100%			
Pacific Islander Students													
White Students	79%		62%	54%	90%	74%	69%	72%	96%	89%			
Economically Disadvantaged Students	69%		58%	49%	86%	73%	70%	61%	89%	91%			88%

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

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

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

Data for 2023-24 had not been loaded to CIMS at time of printing.

III. Planning for Improvement

A. Data Analysis/Reflection (ESEA Section 1114(b)(6))

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

Most Improvement

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

The data component that showed the greatest growth was the Science Achievement by increasing 11 points year over year. Actions that were taken in this area were student data chats, spiraling of content, and data driven PLC's focused on standard remediation.

Lowest Performance

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

While all of SIP goals were achieved year over year, the area that shows the lowest performance is related to subgroup data. Regarding our ESE data, only 38% of ESE students were proficient on their ELA assessments compared to 87% of non ESE students. However, within our ESE population, 62% made a learning gain. Contributing factors considered are the need for more in class scaffolding, ensuring attendance with afterschool ELP, as well as daily attendance factors with this subgroup. Per attendance reports, about 70% of our overall ESE students missed more than 10% of school and half of the 70% missed over 20%.

Greatest Decline

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

CFMS exceeded all of their SIP goals as well as increased in all measured assessments with respect to proficiency. With last year being a baseline year, more data is needed regarding learning gains, L25, etc.. .

Greatest Gap

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.

Based on available data at this time, CFMS is performing above district and state average.

EWS Areas of Concern

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

One area of concern we see is related to student attendance. Last year, roughly 5% of our students

missed over 10% of the school year.

Highest Priorities

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

- 1) Addressing attendance concerns for students with more than 10%
- 2) Closing the achievement gap within tested areas (ESE, ELL)
- 3) Strengthening current systems in place in an effort to continue prior years growth

B. Area(s) of Focus (Instructional Practices)

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

Area of Focus #1

Address the school's highest priorities based on any/all relevant data sources.

Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science

Area of Focus Description and Rationale

Include a description of your Area of Focus, how it affects student learning, and a rationale explaining how it was identified as a crucial need from the prior year data reviewed.

Our 2024 8th grade level of performance was 83% proficiency (level 3 or above) as measured by the SSA exam in May 2024. This was an increase from 78% in 2023. Performance Distribution data from the 2024 SSA exam showed that student performance in the area of the Nature of Science (NOS) was less than the performance in the areas of Earth/Space science, Physical science, and Life science.

By intentionally focusing on the Nature of Science, Inquiry, and Complex Scientific Thinking and Process Skills, the proficiency level of students will improve even more. Teachers will plan and monitor science lessons that address and embed NOS standards and that spiral NOS content/skills from year to year. If we persist in engaging students in rigorous tasks with a deliberate focus on NOS standards, our overall scores should increase.

Measurable Outcome

Include prior year data and state the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each relevant grade level. This should be a data-based, objective outcome.

The percent of 8th grade students achieving science proficiency will increase from 83% to 86% as measured by the Statewide SSA in May 2025. For our 6th and 7th grade students, the average score on the district-made final exam for each course (such as advanced or accelerated science) will increase by 3% from 2024 to 2025.

Monitoring

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome. Include a description of how ongoing monitoring will impact student achievement outcomes.

Teacher-made checklists of NOS standards/benchmarks, classroom observations, teacher assessments (formal and informal), cycle assessment data, mock SSA data, grade-level teacher collaboration, Professional Learning Community (PLC) monthly meetings, teacher/administrator

conversations

Person responsible for monitoring outcome

Elaine Rubaii

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention (practices/programs) being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each relevant grade level, explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy, and describe how the identified interventions will be monitored for this Area of Focus (ESEA Section 8101(21)(B)).

Description of Intervention #1:

We will strengthen staff ability to engage students in complex tasks using scientific thinking skills, processes and procedures of science (ex, experimenting/observing, hypothesizing, data gathering and recording, analyzing charts and graphs). We will also increase instances of spiraling NOS standards and embedding them into lessons across the middle school curriculum.

Rationale:

Student performance on Nature of Science (N.O.S.) Standards across all grade levels has historically been lower than performance on life science, earth science, or physical science standards on state and district assessments. NOS standards can be embedded into the curriculum, so they help with the teaching of ALL science standards. Active learning (doing science) also increases student engagement, fosters a positive attitude toward science, and helps with critical thinking and problem-solving. If we focus on improving performance on NOS standards, overall scores will improve. For two years, our school focused on this intervention, and our 8th grade SSA scores improved (from 72% in 2022 to 78% in 2023 to 83% in 2024). With continued focus and effort, our growth should continue its upward trend.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention:

Tier 1 – Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement:

List the action steps that will be taken to address this Area of Focus or implement this intervention. Identify 2-3 action steps and the person responsible for each step.

Action Step #1

Intentional Planning

Person Monitoring:

Elaine Rubaii

By When/Frequency:

Ongoing

Describe the Action to Be Taken and how the school will monitor the impact of this action step:

Teachers will intentionally plan lessons to include Nature of Science standards, Scientific Inquiry, Scientific Thinking, Scientific Process Skills, and S.T.E.M. challenges. Teachers will make use of District resources regarding course roadmaps and NOS on the District Sharepoint site. Grade-level teachers collaborate as much as possible for more school-wide consistency in delivering rigorous, standards-based, N.O.S.-infused lessons.

Action Step #2

inquiry/STEM training

Person Monitoring:

Eric Krause

By When/Frequency:

Ongoing

Describe the Action to Be Taken and how the school will monitor the impact of this action step:

Teachers will participate in conferences and/or trainings to support Scientific Inquiry, Project Based (Problem-Based) Learning, and/or STEM strategies in the classroom.

Action Step #3

Progress Monitoring

Person Monitoring:

Elaine Rubaii

By When/Frequency:

Monthly

Describe the Action to Be Taken and how the school will monitor the impact of this action step:

Teachers will regularly assess (formally and informally) and utilize data to modify and adjust instruction. The Science Department will conduct regular, monthly, Professional Learning Communities (PLCs) to review student data and plan for instructional lessons that include N.O.S. standards, as well as close and critical reading to implement during core instruction to support success with complex texts.

Action Step #4

Spiraling of curriculum in Science lessons

Person Monitoring:

Eric Krause

By When/Frequency:

Ongoing

Describe the Action to Be Taken and how the school will monitor the impact of this action step:

Teachers will intentionally plan for identification of previously introduced Science standards where scholars will be encouraged to use and apply different concepts within these domains. By going beyond recall of discrete facts to an application/activation of their prior knowledge and skills, this will allow for a deeper understanding and reinforcement of previously-learned concepts, leading to the increase in retention of skills utilized in later grades.

Area of Focus #2

Address the school's highest priorities based on any/all relevant data sources.

Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math**Area of Focus Description and Rationale**

Include a description of your Area of Focus, how it affects student learning, and a rationale explaining how it was identified as a crucial need from the prior year data reviewed.

In an effort to increase student achievement as measured by Florida EOC's, our teachers will utilize systemic documents (adopted curriculum, pacing guides, etc.) to effectively plan for mathematics units that incorporate the Mathematical Thinking and Reasoning Standards and rigorous performance tasks aligned to the B.E.S.T. Benchmarks for Mathematics.

Measurable Outcome

Include prior year data and state the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each relevant grade level. This should be a data-based, objective outcome.

The percent of all students achieving math proficiency will increase by two percentage points from current levels, as measured by end-of-year FAST assessment or Algebra/Geometry EOC exam.

Monitoring

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome. Include a description of how ongoing monitoring will impact student achievement outcomes.

Student data from cycle and unit assessments will be analyzed by teacher, department and administration. Teachers will engage in data chats with students throughout the year.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome

Bridget Bohnet (bohnetb@pcsb.org)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention (practices/programs) being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each relevant grade level, explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy, and describe how the identified interventions will be monitored for this Area of Focus (ESEA Section 8101(21)(B)).

Description of Intervention #1:

CFMS is not identified for ATSI or TSI

Rationale:

Differentiation and equity for all students should be a focus across all grade levels within the math department. A variety of instruction strategies including but not limited to AVID structures will be evident in all mathematics classrooms to ensure highest student achievement.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention:

Tier 1 – Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement:

List the action steps that will be taken to address this Area of Focus or implement this intervention. Identify 2-3 action steps and the person responsible for each step.

Action Step #1

Focused PD

Person Monitoring:

Bridget Bohnet (bohnetb@pcsb.org)

By When/Frequency:

On going

Describe the Action to Be Taken and how the school will monitor the impact of this action

step:

Mathematics teachers participate in professional learning opportunities around the B.E.S.T. Standards, the Mathematical Thinking & Reasoning Standards, and Differentiation in the Math Classroom

Action Step #2

Data Driven PLC

Person Monitoring:

Bridget Bohnet (bohnetb@pcsb.org)

By When/Frequency:

monthly

Describe the Action to Be Taken and how the school will monitor the impact of this action step:

Conduct regular, monthly, Professional Learning Communities (PLCs) inclusive of 'data chats' to review student data to identify and plan for differentiation opportunities based on the students' readiness, interest, and/or learning profile. Data can come from the FAST assessments, IXL, Instructional Materials assessments, and/or teacher and district formal and informal assessments

Action Step #3

Target/ Task Alignment

Person Monitoring:

Bridget Bohnet (bohnet@pcsb.org)

By When/Frequency:

ongoing

Describe the Action to Be Taken and how the school will monitor the impact of this action step:

Administrators and teachers engage in mathematics-focused learning walks/discussions with a focus on target/task alignment and differentiated learning opportunities for students.

Area of Focus #3

Address the school's highest priorities based on any/all relevant data sources.

Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA**Area of Focus Description and Rationale**

Include a description of your Area of Focus, how it affects student learning, and a rationale explaining how it was identified as a crucial need from the prior year data reviewed.

In 6th grade, 83% of students scored Level 3 or above. In 7th grade, 86% of students scored Level 3 or above. In 8th grade, 87% of students scored Level 3 or above. Overall, 85% of students at CFMS scored Level 3 or above. Our area of focus for 2024-'25 is to increase student FAST ELA scores by 2% overall. To accomplish this, the ELA and Reading department will build culture and community as we utilize opportunities for professional collaboration through shared planning, department specific ELPs, personalized on-site professional development aligned to the B.E.S.T benchmarks. The ELA department will align their instruction to the "Five Essentials of Effective Instruction" specifically focusing on Close Reading & Annotations and Academic Discourse. The department will implement a universally utilized strategy for annotations of both literary and non-fiction texts to ensure continuity. Department chairs will act as model classes for Socratic Seminar, Fishbowl Discussion, and other methods that promote academic discourse. The department will provide additional opportunities to

encourage and celebrate student literacy and writing success through school-wide literacy events and competitions. The ELA department will provide targeted student intervention based on the iReady diagnostic assessments and PM1 and PM2 data.

Measurable Outcome

Include prior year data and state the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each relevant grade level. This should be a data-based, objective outcome.

The percent of students performing at or above grade level in Reading/Writing will increase by 2% as measured by the 2024-2025 FAST Reading/Writing Assessment.

Monitoring

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome. Include a description of how ongoing monitoring will impact student achievement outcomes.

This will be monitored through the use of formative assessments, state and district cycle data, and department-focused data chats.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome

TBA

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention (practices/programs) being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each relevant grade level, explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy, and describe how the identified interventions will be monitored for this Area of Focus (ESEA Section 8101(21)(B)).

Description of Intervention #1:

ELA/Reading teachers will focus on co-planning and consistency in our department and work on implementing standards-based lessons aligned to district resources. Teachers will utilize data to evaluate students' progress towards standards mastery and use this information to differentiate and scaffold instruction.

Rationale:

Through focusing on department consistency and collective data analyses, ELA and Reading teachers will be able to meet the needs of each student in a more strategic manner.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention:

Tier 1 – Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement:

List the action steps that will be taken to address this Area of Focus or implement this intervention. Identify 2-3 action steps and the person responsible for each step.

Action Step #1

Student Data Chats

Person Monitoring:

Kimberly Ritter

By When/Frequency:

Monthly

Describe the Action to Be Taken and how the school will monitor the impact of this action step:

Consistently conduct data chats with students and support setting learning goals based on data and formative assessments.

Action Step #2

Student Placement

Person Monitoring:

Erin Lane

By When/Frequency:

Ongoing

Describe the Action to Be Taken and how the school will monitor the impact of this action step:

All students who scored a level 1 or 2 on FAST testing PM3 will be placed in intensive reading for the '23-'24 school year. If needed, students scoring a level 1 or 2 on PM2 will be moved midyear into intensive reading.

Action Step #3

Aligned Instruction

Person Monitoring:

Deanna Barthel

By When/Frequency:

Ongoing

Describe the Action to Be Taken and how the school will monitor the impact of this action step:

Based on the need identified through data analysis and data chats, ELA and Reading teachers will use strategies and resources as recommended and created by the district ELA/Reading staff.

Area of Focus #4

Address the school's highest priorities based on any/all relevant data sources.

Instructional Practice specifically relating to Social Studies

Area of Focus Description and Rationale

Include a description of your Area of Focus, how it affects student learning, and a rationale explaining how it was identified as a crucial need from the prior year data reviewed.

The percentage of students on the 2024 Spring Civics EOC Assessment earning a level 3 or higher was 96%.

In 2023, our students' performance was 95% earning a level 3 or higher.

Although the percentage of students earning a level 3 or higher increased, the problem/gap is occurring because teachers are not consistently scaffolding learning and encouraging higher order thinking.

Measurable Outcome

Include prior year data and state the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for

each relevant grade level. This should be a data-based, objective outcome.

The percentage of students on the 2025 Spring Civics EOC Assessment will increase to 98% earning a level 3 or higher.

Monitoring

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome. Include a description of how ongoing monitoring will impact student achievement outcomes.

This Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome by using the Civics Cycle 1, Civics Cycle 2 and Civics Cycle 3 data, and by engaging in monthly PLCs in which teachers discuss data, remediation strategies, reading/writing/higher order thinking in class, and collaboration.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome

Kinnan Johnston

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention (practices/programs) being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each relevant grade level, explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy, and describe how the identified interventions will be monitored for this Area of Focus (ESEA Section 8101(21)(B)).

Description of Intervention #1:

Strengthen SS teachers' ability to engage students in complex tasks and in reading, writing, and higher order thinking skills.

Rationale:

The Civics EOC requires students to analyze items such as historical quotes, charts, and political cartoons to answer questions. Eighty percent of those questions are level 2 or level 3 in complexity. If we increase student engagement in complex tasks, their Civics EOC scores will improve. If we also increase students' skills in reading, writing and higher order thinking, their Civics EOC scores will improve.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention:

Tier 1 – Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement:

List the action steps that will be taken to address this Area of Focus or implement this intervention. Identify 2-3 action steps and the person responsible for each step.

Action Step #1

Utilization of Primary Source Documents

Person Monitoring:

Kinnan Johnston

By When/Frequency:

Ongoing

Describe the Action to Be Taken and how the school will monitor the impact of this action

step:

Teachers will increase the utilization of primary source documents at varying complexity levels with appropriate reading/AVID strategies.

Action Step #2

Professional Learning Community

Person Monitoring:

Kinnan Johnston

By When/Frequency:**Describe the Action to Be Taken and how the school will monitor the impact of this action step:**

During our monthly Social Studies Department PLCs, teachers will review student data and collaborate on instructional strategies/lessons that meet the remediation and enrichment needs of students. Additionally, during PLC's, teachers will analyze student work (DBQ's, etc.), to systematically calibrate task alignment and task complexity.

Action Step #3

Monitoring and Feedback

Person Monitoring:

Kinnan Johnston

By When/Frequency:

Ongoing

Describe the Action to Be Taken and how the school will monitor the impact of this action step:

Regularly assess (formally and informally) and utilize data to modify and adjust instruction. Teachers utilize ongoing formative assessment (unit and cycle assessments) and use the information gained to adjust instruction, enrich and reteach, and provide research-based interventions.

Action Step #4

Improving Students Reading, Writing, Higher Order Thinking

Person Monitoring:

Kinnan Johnston

By When/Frequency:**Describe the Action to Be Taken and how the school will monitor the impact of this action step:**

Teachers will increase their use of supplemental resources (provided by the district/state), of primary sources, and of short challenging passages that elicit critical reading, writing in response to text, and higher order thinking.

IV. Positive Culture and Environment

Area of Focus #1

Other

Area of Focus Description and Rationale

Include a description of your Area of Focus for each relevant grade level, how it affects student learning, and a rationale explaining how it was identified as a crucial need from the prior year data reviewed.

By focusing on building a positive, productive community to which all stakeholders feel a connection,

improve the positive culture and environment of the school.

Measurable Outcome

Include prior year data and state the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each relevant grade level. This should be a data-based, objective outcome.

The percent of all students missing 10% or more days will decrease from 15% to 10%, as measured by attendance data and the Early Warning System data.

Monitoring

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome. Include a description of how ongoing monitoring will impact student achievement outcomes.

Attendance data is reviewed at Administration Meetings, School-Based Leadership Meetings, and Child Study Meetings.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention (practices/programs) being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes, explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy, and describe how the identified interventions will be monitored for this Area of Focus (ESEA Section 8101(21)(B)).

Description of Intervention #1:

In order to build a positive, productive community to which all stakeholders will feel a connection, we will implement several culture building strategies through our daily 7th period "homeroom". This will provide each student with a connection to an adult at the school so that students and staff will have an opportunity to build a relationship that is not based solely on academics. In addition, opportunities for parents and families to build connections to the school community will be offered through Parent University sessions to provide families with strategies to best support the success of their students. Additional community building events will also take place throughout the year outside of monthly PTA/SAC requirements.

Rationale:

We feel that students have high numbers of absences from school because they, and/or their families, do not feel a connection to the school community. By focusing on opportunities to build a positive, productive community to which all stakeholders feel a connection, students, and families, will want to be present at school and part of the activities offered at the school. This will help reduce the number of students with high absentee rates.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention:

Tier 1 – Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement:

Action Step #1

Person Monitoring:

Eric Krause (krausee@pcsb.org)

By When/Frequency:

Ongoing

Describe the Action to Be Taken and how the school will monitor the impact of this action step:

Teachers build positive relationships and community within their classes from the first day of school to create a positive, safe culture for the school.

Action Step #2

Person Monitoring:

Eric Krause (krausee@pcsb.org)

By When/Frequency:

Monthly

Describe the Action to Be Taken and how the school will monitor the impact of this action step:

"Homeroom groups" are established through the master schedule using 7th period teaching assignments. Students will meet every morning and this time will be targeted for daily literacy as well as team and culture building.

V. Title I Requirements (optional)

A. Schoolwide Program Plan (SWP)

This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A SWP and opts to use the SIP to satisfy the requirements of the SWP plan, as outlined in ESEA Section 1114(b). This section of the SIP is not required for non-Title I schools.

Dissemination Methods

Provide the methods for dissemination of this SIP, UniSIG budget and SWP to stakeholders (e.g., students, families, school staff and leadership, and local businesses and organizations). Please articulate a plan or protocol for how this SIP and progress will be shared and disseminated and to the extent practicable, provided in a language a parent can understand. (ESEA 1114(b)(4))

List the school's webpage where the SIP is made publicly available.

No Answer Entered

Positive Relationships With Parents, Families and other Community Stakeholders

Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission, support the needs of students and keep parents informed of their child's progress.

List the school's webpage where the school's Parental and Family Engagement Plan (PFEP) is made publicly available. (ESEA 1116(b-g))

No Answer Entered

Plans to Strengthen the Academic Program

Describe how the school plans to strengthen the academic program in the school, increase the amount and quality of learning time and help provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum. Include the Area of Focus if addressed in Part II of the SIP. (ESEA Section 1114(b)(7)ii))

No Answer Entered

How Plan is Developed

If appropriate and applicable, describe how this plan is developed in coordination and integration with other Federal, State and local services, resources and programs, such as programs supported under ESSA, violence prevention programs, nutrition programs, housing programs, Head Start programs, adult education programs, career and technical education programs, and schools implementing CSI or TSI activities under section 1111(d). (ESEA Sections 1114(b)(5) and 1116(e)(4))

No Answer Entered

B. Component(s) of the Schoolwide Program Plan

Components of the Schoolwide Program Plan, as applicable

Include descriptions for any additional, applicable strategies that address the needs of all children in the school, but particularly the needs of those at risk of not meeting the challenging state academic standards which may include the following:

Improving Student's Skills Outside the Academic Subject Areas

Describe how the school ensures counseling, school-based mental health services, specialized support services, mentoring services, and other strategies to improve students' skills outside the academic subject areas. (ESEA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(I))

No Answer Entered

Preparing for Postsecondary Opportunities and the Workforce

Describe the preparation for and awareness of postsecondary opportunities and the workforce, which may include career and technical education programs and broadening secondary school students' access to coursework to earn postsecondary credit while still in high school. (ESEA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(II))

No Answer Entered

Addressing Problem Behavior and Early Intervening Services

Describe the implementation of a schoolwide tiered model to prevent and address problem behavior, and early intervening services coordinated with similar activities and services carried out under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. (20 U.S.C. 1400 et seq. and ESEA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(III)).

No Answer Entered

Professional Learning and Other Activities

Describe the professional learning and other activities for teachers, paraprofessionals and other school personnel to improve instruction and use of data from academic assessments, and to recruit and retain effective teachers, particularly in high need subjects. (ESEA section 11149b)(7)(iii)(V)).

No Answer Entered

Strategies to Assist Preschool Children

Describe the strategies the school employs to assist preschool children in the transition from early childhood education programs to local elementary school programs. (ESEA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(V))

No Answer Entered

VI. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review

This section must be completed if the school is identified as ATSI, TSI or CSI (ESEA Sections 1111(d)(1)(B)(4) and (d)(2)(C) and 1114(b)(6)).

Process to Review the Use of Resources

Describe the process to review the use of resources to meet the identified needs of students.

No Answer Entered

Specifics to Address the Need

Identify the specific resource(s), rationale (i.e., data) and plan to address the need(s) (i.e., timeline).

No Answer Entered

VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus

Check if this school is eligible for 2024-25 UniSIG funds but has chosen not to apply.

No

BUDGET	ACTIVITY	FUNCTION/ OBJECT	FUNDING SOURCE	FTE	AMOUNT
Plan Budget Total					0.00