Pinellas County Schools

Madeira Beach Fundamental K 8



2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics 3

Purpose and Outline of the SIP 4

School Information 5

Needs Assessment 8

Planning for Improvement 13

Positive Culture & Environment 0

Budget to Support Goals 0

Madeira Beach Fundamental K 8

591 TOM STUART CAUSEWAY, Madeira Beach, FL 33708

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

Demographics

Principal: Ateek Christopher

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2010

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School KG-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2021-22 Title I School	No
2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	22%
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Asian Students Black/African American Students Economically Disadvantaged Students English Language Learners Hispanic Students Multiracial Students Students With Disabilities White Students
School Grades History	2021-22: A (69%) 2020-21: (67%) 2018-19: A (74%) 2017-18: A (75%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
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.

Madeira Beach Fundamental will provide a rigorous student-centered learning environment to ensure 100% student success and promote college readiness by working collaboratively with all faculty, staff, and community stakeholders.

Provide the school's vision statement.

100% Student Success

School Leadership Team

Membership
For each member of the school leadership team, select the employee name and email address from the dropdown. Identify the position title and job duties/responsibilities.**:**

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Ateek, Christopher	Principal	
Altenore, Carolyn	Assistant Principal	
Crandall, Brooke	Assistant Principal	
Vermillion, Kristin	Guidance Counselor	
Motte, Malinda	Guidance Counselor	

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Thursday 7/1/2010, Ateek Christopher

Number of teachers with a 2022 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

Number of teachers with a 2022 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
77

Total number of students enrolled at the school
1,335

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2021-22 school year.
10

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2022-23 school year.
10

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

Using prior year's 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	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	70	73	72	72	87	88	294	289	298	0	0	0	0	1343
Attendance below 90 percent	8	8	11	12	19	12	58	66	81	0	0	0	0	275
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	5	1	0	0	0	0	8
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	2
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	1	9	2	18	36	27	0	0	0	0	93
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	1	8	3	20	28	17	0	0	0	0	77
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level who have 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	1	2	29	26	30	0	0	0	0	88

Using current year data, complete the table below with the number of students identified as being "retained.":

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	1	1	3	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 7/5/2022

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	
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	6	8	5	6	7	25	23	25	0	0	0	0	105
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	2	1	0	0	0	0	13

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	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

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	1	0	1	0	0	2	6	5	0	0	0	0	15
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	6	8	5	6	7	25	23	25	0	0	0	0	105
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	2	1	0	0	0	0	13

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	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

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	1	0	1	0	0	2	6	5	0	0	0	0	15
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data Review
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	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	70%			72%			76%	70%	61%
ELA Learning Gains	57%			59%			63%	63%	59%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	44%			44%			58%	56%	54%
Math Achievement	81%			78%			83%	72%	62%
Math Learning Gains	68%			58%			71%	63%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	59%			47%			63%	54%	52%
Science Achievement	73%			72%			76%	64%	56%
Social Studies Achievement	89%			89%			93%	81%	78%

Grade Level Data Review - State Assessments
NOTE: This data is raw data and includes ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019	82%	56%	26%	58%	24%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	72%	56%	16%	58%	14%
Cohort Comparison		-82%				

ELA						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
05	2022					
	2019	70%	54%	16%	56%	14%
Cohort Comparison		-72%				
06	2022					
	2019	76%	51%	25%	54%	22%
Cohort Comparison		-70%				
07	2022					
	2019	72%	51%	21%	52%	20%
Cohort Comparison		-76%				
08	2022					
	2019	81%	55%	26%	56%	25%
Cohort Comparison		-72%				

MATH						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019	83%	62%	21%	62%	21%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	84%	64%	20%	64%	20%
Cohort Comparison		-83%				
05	2022					
	2019	83%	60%	23%	60%	23%
Cohort Comparison		-84%				
06	2022					
	2019	70%	44%	26%	55%	15%
Cohort Comparison		-83%				
07	2022					
	2019	90%	60%	30%	54%	36%
Cohort Comparison		-70%				
08	2022					
	2019	63%	31%	32%	46%	17%
Cohort Comparison		-90%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
05	2022					

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2019	73%	54%	19%	53%	20%
Cohort Comparison						
06	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		-73%				
07	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2022					
	2019	77%	51%	26%	48%	29%
Cohort Comparison		0%				

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019					

CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	93%	68%	25%	71%	22%

HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019					

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	93%	55%	38%	61%	32%

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	100%	56%	44%	57%	43%

Subgroup Data Review

2022 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 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21
2021 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 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
SWD	37	35	28	44	34	24	28	81	42		
ELL	79	64		79	50						
ASN	85	69		93	71		80	100	96		
BLK	47	50	17	59	43	21	50				
HSP	76	64	50	78	65	56	85	83	84		
MUL	66	56	27	71	41	27	67		83		
WHT	72	58	45	79	58	48	71	89	83		
FRL	60	51	36	63	50	43	56	86	71		
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 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	49	60	54	58	62	47	30	76			
ELL	33	60	54	53	67	64					
ASN	86	69	67	93	73		85	100	95		
BLK	52	47	35	61	60	59	54				
HSP	72	58	48	78	73	57	72	88	82		
MUL	73	77	70	76	74			88			
WHT	77	63	59	84	71	64	77	93	82		
FRL	64	57	50	74	66	58	64	85	85		

ESSA Data Review

This data has not been updated for the 2022-23 school year.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	69
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	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	621
Total Components for the Federal Index	9
Percent Tested	99%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	42

Students With Disabilities	
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	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0

Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	80
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	52
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	73
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	58
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	69
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	58
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis
Answer the following analysis questions using the progress monitoring data and state assessment data, if applicable.

What trends emerge across grade levels, subgroups and core content areas?

The major trends that emerged is that in general, English Language Arts (ELA) scores were lower than Mathematics scores at most grade levels. In addition, gains for ELA were lower overall and lower in our L25 students than gains for Math.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

The data components, based off progress monitoring, that demonstrates the greatest need for improvement is English Language Arts.

What were the contributing factors to this need for improvement? What new actions would need to be taken to address this need for improvement?

The middle grades monitoring data for English Language Arts is based only on Write Scores data, which primarily assesses the students' writing ability, but also includes a reading component. This provides a limited picture of overall expected performance in English Language Arts at grades 6 - 8.

Elementary grades monitoring data included MAP testing, which focused on Reading data.

New actions that need to be taken are to include a more robust system of progress monitoring in English Language Arts through the F.A.S.T. progress monitoring data that address all components, including reading and writing.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

The data components that showed the most improvement was our overall Mathematics and Science data at the 5th grade level.
In 2022, the school average for proficiency in Mathematics on the FSA was 81%. This is an improvement of 3% from the 2021 school average of 78% proficient in mathematics. In addition, 69% of students made gains in Math in 2022, an increase from 58% of students making gains in 2021, and 57% of our

L25 students made gains in Math in 2022, an increase from 47% of L25 students making gains in 2021.

Science data at the 5th grade level also improved on the 2022 Statewide Science Assessment to 86% proficient, an increase from 73% proficient on the 2021 Statewide Science Assessment.

What were the contributing factors to this improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

The improvement in scores could be affected by the nature of the assessments. The progress monitoring data in both mathematics and science was based on MAP or cycle assessments. The cycle assessments measure the students' performance on current benchmarks in their course rather than the cumulative testing on the FSA Mathematics and SSA.

Gifted clusters were implement at the elementary (grades 1-5) level, and this could also have contributed to improvement in math and science.

What strategies will need to be implemented in order to accelerate learning?

The strategies that need to be implement to accelerate learning are to improve implementation of gifted clusters, continue to focus on differentiation to be sure all students are successful, and focusing on writing with explicit instruction, consistent monitoring of student performance, and meaningful and timely feedback.

Based on the contributing factors and strategies identified to accelerate learning, describe the professional development opportunities that will be provided at the school to support teachers and leaders.

We will design PLCs to be more effective in analyzing student data and designing a plan for improvement.
Professional development will focus on AVID strategies to increase rigor in the classrooms and Culturally Relevant Teaching strategies to be sure to create an environment that is inclusive of all our stakeholders.

Provide a description of the additional services that will be implemented to ensure sustainability of improvement in the next year and beyond.

Additional services that will be implemented are mentors for teachers who are new to the program or working to improve their practice and a restructuring of our school-based leadership team to be more focused on individual student success.

Areas of Focus
Identify the key Areas of Focus to address your school's highest priorities based on any/all relevant data sources.

:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.	By focusing on rigorous instruction to engage students in complex tasks in English Language Arts, we will improve the proficiency level of all students. Teachers will focus on instructional practices that identify critical content and engage students in complex tasks in order to improve student learning and increase the overall level of proficiency in ELA across all grade levels.
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	The percent of all students achieving ELA proficiency will increase from 69% to 73%, as measured by the Spring 2023 Progress Monitoring assessment (F.A.S.T.)
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	Progress Monitoring assessment (F.A.S.T.) data in windows 1 and 2 Write Scores Data (grades 6-8) STAR (K-2) Cambium (3-5)
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Brooke Crandall (crandallb@pcsb.org)
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.	Gain a deep understanding of the B.E.S.T. Standards/NGSSS as a non-negotiable for improving student outcomes. Enhance staff capacity to identify content from the BEST Benchmarks that will create opportunities for collaboration around higher order thinking questions and allow students to enter a productive struggle during each lesson.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for	Overall, ELA proficiency dropped at most grade levels from 2021 to 2022. In 2021, the school was 72% proficient, while in 2022, only 69% of our students were proficient. The percentage of students making learning gains in ELA dropped to 57% in 2022 from 59% in 2021. Learning gains among our L25 students also dropped to 42% in 2022, down from 44% in 2021. By implementing strategies focusing on rigorous instruction in English Language Arts, we should be able to increase both learning gains and overall proficiency.by May 2023.

selecting this strategy.

Action Steps to Implement
List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Administrators monitor and support the implementation of the use of grade-appropriate B.E.S.T. complex texts and connected tasks like higher order thinking questions in reading and ELA classrooms through classroom observation.

Person Responsible Brooke Crandall (crandallb@pcsb.org)

ELA and reading teachers receive professional development around B.E.S.T. Benchmarks, HOT Questions, and collaborative structures.

Person Responsible Brooke Crandall (crandallb@pcsb.org)

Teachers meet in PLCs at least once per month to share ways they are incorporating HOT Qs and collaboration into their lessons and what effect placing students in the productive struggle is having on student growth. In PLCs teachers also share ways to support students who continue to struggle with engagement in collaboration around complex tasks like HOT Qs.

Person Responsible Brooke Crandall (crandallb@pcsb.org)

Regularly assess (formally and informally) and utilize data to modify and adjust instruction, including utilizing the Assessment platform for collecting and assessing writing, reviewing student data and guiding instruction.

Person Responsible Brooke Crandall (crandallb@pcsb.org)

Teachers monitor and provide timely and specific feedback to students based on mastery of standards to support learning.

Person Responsible Brooke Crandall (crandallb@pcsb.org)

Employ instructional practices to motivate and deepen student engagement including, but not limited to: positive expectations for success; novel tasks or other approaches to stimulate curiosity; meaningful tasks related to student interests & cultural backgrounds; opportunities for students to ask their own questions, set their own goals, and make their own choices.

Person Responsible Brooke Crandall (crandallb@pcsb.org)

Teachers utilize systemic documents (adopted curriculum, pacing guides, etc.) to effectively plan for Reading/ELA units that incorporate appropriate B.E.S.T. complex texts and connected tasks for rigorous instruction in language arts.

Person Responsible [no one identified]

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.	By focusing on instruction and differentiation of practice in Mathematics, we will improve the proficiency level of all students. Teachers will focus on instructional practices that identify critical content and will organize students to interact with content in manners which differentiates/scaffolds instruction to meet the needs of each student.in order to improve student learning and increase the overall level of proficiency in Mathematics across all grade levels.
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	The percent of all students achieving Mathematics proficiency will increase from 81% to 85%, as measured by the 2022-2023 F.A.S.T Mathematics Achievement as reported on the School Grade Report.
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	Classroom observations, teacher/administrator conversations, utilizing progress monitoring assessments and tools, and teacher collaboration in common planning/PLCs. STAR (K-2) Cambium (3-5) Cycle Assessment Data (Grades 6-8) F.A.S.T. Progress Monitoring Data (Grades 3-8)
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Carolyn Altenore (altenorec@pcsb.org)
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.	1. Enhance staff capacity to identify critical content from the B.E.S.T. Standards in alignment with district resources. 2. Support staff to utilize data to organize students to interact with content in manners which differentiates/scaffolds instruction to meet the needs of each student.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.	Overall, Mathematics proficiency decreased from 83% proficient in 2019 to 78% proficient in 2021, but increased to 81% proficient in 2022. The percentage of students making learning gains in Mathematics increased from 58% of students making learning gains in 2021 to 69% of students making learning gains in 2022.. In addition, the percent of L25 students making learning gains also increased from 47% in 2021 to 57% in 2022. By identifying critical content, teachers can ensure mastery of all content areas to boost student proficiency levels to the target of 84% proficient. Although student performance data is used to ensure proper placement of students into math courses, within courses, students have a variety of needs to be successful. By implementing differentiation and scaffolding, we will be able to ensure all students reach proficiency in content standards.

Action Steps to Implement
List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

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.

Person Responsible Carolyn Altenore (altenorec@pcsb.org)

Teachers 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.

Person Responsible Carolyn Altenore (altenorec@pcsb.org)

Teachers utilize IXL's Diagnostic Arena to have students address mathematical skills gaps from their individualized Action Plans with an emphasis on utilizing the program outside of the school day to extend learning beyond the classroom.

Person Responsible Carolyn Altenore (altenorec@pcsb.org)

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.

Person Responsible Carolyn Altenore (altenorec@pcsb.org)

Teachers regularly assess (formally and informally) and utilize data to modify and adjust instruction through differentiation and scaffolding and provide feedback to students to support learning.

Person Responsible Carolyn Altenore (altenorec@pcsb.org)

Administrators monitor teacher practice and provide feedback to support teacher growth in identifying critical content and providing differentiation and scaffolding. Administrators regularly observe mathematics lessons and provide feedback, with mathematics coach support as requested.

Person Responsible Carolyn Altenore (altenorec@pcsb.org)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: **Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.**	By focusing on instruction, data, and differentiation practice in Science, we will improve the proficiency level of all students. Teachers will focus on instructional practices that identify critical content while differentiating and scaffolding instruction in order to improve student learning and increase the overall level of proficiency in Science across all grade levels.
Measurable Outcome: **State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.**	The percent of all students achieving Science proficiency will increase from 73% to 77%, as measured by the Statewide Science Assessment in May 2023.
Monitoring: **Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.**	Classroom observations, teacher/administrator conversations, utilizing progress monitoring assessments and tools, and teacher collaboration in common planning/ PLCs Cycle Assessment Data
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Christopher Ateek (ateekc@pcsb.org)
Evidence-based Strategy: **Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.**	Support staff to utilize data to organize students to interact with content in manners which differentiates/scaffolds instruction to meet the needs of each student.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: **Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.**	Overall, Science proficiency increased from 72% in 2021 to 73% in 2022. However, science proficiency at the 8th grade level has decreased over recent years, from 76% proficient in 2019, to 70% proficient in 2021, and now 69% proficient in 2022. By using data-focused strategies for differentiation and scaffolding, we will be able to continue the gains made at the 5th grade level in proficiency (an increase from 72% to 86%), and address the drop in proficiency seen at 8th grade, and work toward increased proficiency percentages by May 2023.

Action Steps to Implement
List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

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.

Person Responsible Christopher Ateek (ateekc@pcsb.org)

Use data to plan instruction that ensures differentiation, intervention and enrichment while scaffolding learning to increase student performance.

Person Responsible Christopher Ateek (ateekc@pcsb.org)

Conduct regular, monthly, Professional Learning Communities (PLCs) inclusive of ‘data chats’ to review student responses to tasks and formative assessments and plan for instructional lessons that include text dependent questions, close and critical reading and skill/strategy-based groups to implement during core instruction to support success with complex texts.

Person Responsible Christopher Ateek (ateekc@pcsb.org)

#4. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Social Studies	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.	By focusing on instruction and differentiation of practice in Social Studies, we will improve the proficiency level of all students. Teachers will focus on instructional practices that identify critical content and engage students in complex tasks in order to improve student learning and increase the overall level of proficiency in Social Studies across all grade levels.
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	The percent of students achieving proficiency on the Civics EOC will increase from 89% to 93%, as measured by the spring 2023 administration of the Civics EOC. The percent of students in all grade levels scoring in the "green" on Social Studies cycle assessments will be 75% or higher on all cycle assessments during the 2022-2023 school year.
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	Support staff to utilize data to organize students to interact with content in manners which differentiates/scaffolds instruction to meet the needs of each student. Strengthen staff ability to engage students in complex tasks.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Christopher Ateek (ateekc@pcsb.org)
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.	Support staff to utilize data to organize students to interact with content in manners which differentiates/scaffolds instruction to meet the needs of each student. Strengthen staff ability to engage students in complex tasks.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.	Overall, Social Studies proficiency remained constant at 89% proficient as measured by the Civics EOC assessment. The strategies of using data for differentiation and scaffolding and engaging students in complex tasks have been implemented in recent years and we will continue with implementation in 2022-2023 to continue to increase learning gains, but also to show increased overall proficiency by May 2023.

Action Steps to Implement
List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Conduct regular, monthly Professional Learning Communities (PLCs) inclusive of 'data chats' to review student responses to tasks and formative assessments to plan for instructional lessons that meet the remediation and enrichment needs of students.

Person Responsible Christopher Ateek (ateekc@pcsb.org)

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

Person Responsible Christopher Ateek (ateekc@pcsb.org)

Use data to plan instruction that ensures differentiation, intervention and enrichment while scaffolding learning to increase student performance.

Person Responsible Christopher Ateek (ateekc@pcsb.org)

Encourage productive-struggle for students as they work throughout the year and ensure they have the time to struggle through document analysis.

Person Responsible Christopher Ateek (ateekc@pcsb.org)

Utilize supplemental resources, regularly include shorter, challenging and technical passages that elicit close and critical reading and re-reading. Using materials from 6-8 SS SharePoint Site, Canvas, or highlighted in the curriculum guide.

Person Responsible Christopher Ateek (ateekc@pcsb.org)

#5. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Career & Technical Education	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.	Teachers will implement rigorous instructional practices to ensure that students are prepared for success in courses on the Advanced Course Pathway in middle school. Once students understand the opportunities available to them, they will be more likely to enroll in advanced courses and to seek the supports to help them be successful in these courses.
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	The level of performance will increase from 84% in 2022 to 88% by May 2023 as measured by the Acceleration Rate in our School Grade calculation.
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	Classroom observations, teacher/administrator conversations, utilizing progress monitoring assessments and tools, and teacher collaboration in common planning/PLCs
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Kristin Vermillion (vermillionk@pcsb.org)
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.	Deepen critical thinking on campus by creating a culture of inquiry.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.	Overall, the Acceleration Rate maintained at 84% in 2021 to 2022. The strategy of utilizing questioning to help with elaboration were beginning to be implemented, and will continue with implementation in 2022-2023 to continue to increase student access to advanced/acceleration coursework, to increase the overall level of acceleration, and to increase success of students working on the Advanced Course Pathways.

Action Steps to Implement
List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Teachers use lesson planning to plan purposeful questions based on anticipated student solutions and misconceptions.

Person Responsible Christopher Ateek (ateekc@pcsb.org)

Offer enrichment opportunities through STEM Club and other after-school opportunities.

Person Responsible Christopher Ateek (ateekc@pcsb.org)

Utilize brain-based research, neuroscience and culturally relevant instruction when planning and implementing lessons.

Person Responsible Christopher Ateek (ateekc@pcsb.org)

Promote and emphasize the belief that all students are capable learners and the importance of ‘effort’ as a key component in success.

Person Responsible Christopher Ateek (ateekc@pcsb.org)

Foster a positive classroom environment that encourages: curiosity, enthusiasm, praise, effort and encouragement.

Person Responsible Christopher Ateek (ateekc@pcsb.org)

Conduct regular, monthly, Professional Learning Communities (PLCs) inclusive of ‘data chats’ to review student success and struggles and provide interventions as needed to ensure the success of each student.

Person Responsible Christopher Ateek (ateekc@pcsb.org)

#6. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Black/African-American	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.	Our current level of performance is 45% proficient, as evidenced by black students scoring a Level 3 or above on the FSA ELA Assessment. If we identify areas for remediation for corrective instruction in areas of writing and literacy, and instruct students using appropriate culturally relevant teaching, we can increase the level of proficiency by May 2023.
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	The percent of black students achieving ELA proficiency will increase from 45% to 49% as measured by the Spring 2023 Progress Monitoring assessment (F.A.S.T.) in May 2023.
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	Data chats with target students Classroom observations, teacher/administrator conversations, utilizing progress monitoring assessments and tools, and teacher collaboration in common planning/PLCs
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Christopher Ateek (ateekc@pcsb.org)
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.	Implementation of instructional strategies from AVID Culturally Relevant Teaching to increase engagement of diverse learners AVID - tutorials, focused-note taking, collaborative study groups CRT - use a variety of texts and authors to connect to the classroom diversity
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.	Overall, ELA proficiency for black students has decreased from 47% in 2021 to 45% proficient in 2022. Implementing instructional strategies from AVID CRT will allow us to increase proficiency for black students in English Language Arts and help bridge the gap.

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Review student and teacher data for trends and performance of black students and next steps for intervention (creation of progress monitoring plans for all African American students).

Person Responsible Christopher Ateek (ateekc@pcsb.org)

Implementation of instructional strategies from AVID Culturally Relevant Teaching to increase engagement of diverse learners

Person Responsible Christopher Ateek (ateekc@pcsb.org)

Provide extended learning opportunities for African American students, including before school, after school, and summer learning opportunities.

Person Responsible Christopher Ateek (ateekc@pcsb.org)

Implement highly engaging strategies that reach a diverse group of learners in classrooms such as cooperative and small group settings, music and movement, explicit vocabulary instruction, monitoring with feedback and deliberate use of cultural references in lesson plans.

Person Responsible Christopher Ateek (ateekc@pcsb.org)

Provide targeted professional development and coaching to teachers and leaders on culturally relevant strategies to increase engagement and improve pass rates and grade point averages for African American students.

Person Responsible Christopher Ateek (ateekc@pcsb.org)

Positive Culture & Environment

A positive school culture and environment reflects: a supportive and fulfilling environment, learning conditions that meet the needs of all students, people who are sure of their roles and relationships in student learning and a culture that values trust, respect and high expectations. Consulting with various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies that impact the school culture and environment. Stakeholder groups more proximal to the school include teachers, students and families of students, volunteers and school board members. Broad stakeholder groups include early childhood providers, community colleges and universities, social services and business partners.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment.

Our school constantly focuses on building a a positive school culture with all stakeholders. The nature of our fundamental program is a partnership between school staff, students, and families, all with a shared vision of 100% student success. Our administration works hard to develop a positive school culture with staff by maintaining a Leadership Team to work toward our school vision as representatives of each grade level and department area. Our teachers work to build positive relationships and community within their classes from the first day of school to create a positive, safe culture for the school. Teachers and students work together in shared decision making to establish classroom community norms and expectations and hold weekly community circles to emphasize a school wide culture of honesty, respect, responsibility, and self-motivation

Identify the stakeholders and their role in promoting a positive school culture and environment.

Our teachers also focus on building positive relationships with families by maintaining open lines of communication and regularly offering Parent University sessions to keep families aware of strategies to best help the success of their students. Parent University sessions will be offered monthly and aligned to school improvement goals, with a monthly focus on different subject areas.
Our Family and Community Liaison and our PTSA work hard to offer programs and opportunities for families and our community partners to be involved in creating a positive school culture and environment including large community events such as a Fall Festival and an annual Fish Fry.