

Florida School for the Deaf & the Blind

# Deaf Middle School (Fsdb)



## 2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

---

## **Table of Contents**

---

<b>School Demographics</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>Positive Culture &amp; Environment</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>18</b>

## Deaf Middle School (FsdB)

207 SAN MARCO AVE, St Augustine, FL 32084

[ no web address on file ]

### Demographics

**Principal: Angela Saunders**

Start Date for this Principal: 5/1/2018

<b>2019-20 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Middle School 6-8
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	Special Education
<b>2018-19 Title I School</b>	Yes
<b>2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	<i>[Data Not Available]</i>
<b>2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups in orange are below the federal threshold)	<span style="color: orange;">Black/African American Students</span> <span style="color: orange;">Economically Disadvantaged Students</span> <span style="color: orange;">Hispanic Students</span> <span style="color: orange;">Students With Disabilities</span> <span style="color: orange;">White Students</span>
<b>School Grades History</b>	2018-19: No Grade  2017-18: No Grade  2016-17: No Grade  2015-16: No Grade
<b>ESSA Status</b>	CS&I

### School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the FSDB 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](http://www.floridacims.org).

### **Purpose and Outline of the SIP**

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

## Part I: School Information

### School Mission and Vision

#### **Provide the school's mission statement.**

The mission of the Florida School for the Deaf and the Blind is to utilize all available talent, energy and resources to provide free appropriate public education for eligible sensory impaired students of Florida. As a school of academic excellence, the School shall strive to provide students an opportunity to access education services in a caring, safe, unique learning environment to prepare them to be literate, employable and independent life-long learners. The School shall provide outreach services that include collaboration with district school boards and shall encourage input from students, staff, parents and the community. As a diverse organization, the School shall foster respect and understanding for each individual.

#### **Provide the school's vision statement.**

The Florida School for the Deaf and the Blind will prepare each student for a lifetime of success.

At Deaf Middle School we believe that as we prepare our students for a lifetime of success, we will work to help our students to value who they are. We believe that our students are: Learners, Leaders, Partners, and Achievers.

Learners: Our students will discover their learning potential in a language rich environment.

Leaders: Our students will know that leadership is a shared responsibility and that everyone has the right to leadership.

Partners: Our students will know the importance of community. They will be given the challenge to reach beyond themselves to make a difference in their community.

Achievers: Our students will recognize and celebrate their successes.

We will intentionally work to help students envision their potential. As they start to understand who they are, that vision will drive them to achieve their goals.

### School Leadership Team

#### **Membership**

Identify the name, email address, position title, and job duties/responsibilities for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Newton, Karen	Assistant Principal	<p>The Assistant Principal serves as the instructional leader in their respective educational unit and is responsible for supervision of staff and students in a classroom setting. The incumbent ensures compliance with all federal, state, Board of Trustee, and Administrative mandates, guidelines, and rules within their respective unit. Responsible for serving as an instructional team member, communicating with administrators, parents, and students regarding issues related to their department and the respective employees and/or students. The position is supervised by the Principal of the Department. 35% - Supervise and assist in the instructional program by visiting classrooms, conducting formal and informal observations, conducting individual teacher conferences, conducting departmental meetings, reviewing individual teachers' lesson plans, and to assure compliance with state adopted curriculum/course frameworks. Supervise and monitor student behavior, student behavior programming, and student behavior plans. 15% - Coordinate the completion of Individual Education Plans for students enrolled in the respective supervisory unit and communicate related issues and problems to the immediate supervisor. 15% - Participate in departmental meetings, student management team meetings, file reviews, and student staffings when appropriate, prepare reports, prepare budget request, develop student/teacher schedules in a timely manner. Ensure coordination of activities with other programs i.e. residential, physical education, athletics, health care, and related services. Order supplies, textbooks, and materials in a timely manner and manage budget allocations appropriately. Report needed building repairs and safety hazards to the appropriate departments. 10% - Gather and analyze data on student performance. 10% - Review assessments, observe and provide professional input on specific children for purposes of class placement, identification of specific problems and referral for additional diagnostic or related evaluations. 10% - Serve as a positive professional role model for instructional staff and students. Supervise Instructional Assistants, Administrative Assistant, and other staff assigned to the process to develop goals and priorities which lead to a quality instructional program, provide for the efficient use of fiscal and human resources and efficient use of physical facilities. Participate in staff development activities and training as assigned. 5% - Other duties as assigned.</p>
Harwell, Robin	Other	
Clark, Sue	Instructional Coach	
Pyle, Kathy	Instructional Coach	
Douglas, Silke	Psychologist	

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Milczarski, Alesia	Other	
Williams, Wendy	Other	Licensed Mental Health Counselor/School Social Worker

**Demographic Information**

**Principal start date**

Tuesday 5/1/2018, Angela Saunders

**Number of teachers with a 2019 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.*

1

**Number of teachers with a 2019 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.*

8

**Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school**

14

**Demographic Data**

<b>2020-21 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Middle School 6-8
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	Special Education
<b>2018-19 Title I School</b>	Yes
<b>2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	[Data Not Available]
<b>2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups in orange are below the federal threshold)	Black/African American Students Economically Disadvantaged Students Hispanic Students Students With Disabilities White Students
<b>School Grades History</b>	2018-19: No Grade 2017-18: No Grade 2016-17: No Grade

	2015-16: No Grade
<b>ESSA Status</b>	CS&I

**Early Warning Systems**

**Current Year**

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	35	27	0	0	0	0	80
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	2	0	0	0	0	6
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	3
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 ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	20	21	0	0	0	0	54
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

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

**The number of students identified as retainees:**

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

**Date this data was collected or last updated**

Tuesday 8/18/2020

**Prior Year - As Reported**

**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	24	22	29	0	0	0	0	75
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	3	2	0	0	0	0	9
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	2
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	19	11	0	0	0	0	44

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

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

**The number of students identified as retainees:**

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

**Prior Year - Updated**

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	24	22	29	0	0	0	0	75
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	3	2	0	0	0	0	9
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	2
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	19	11	0	0	0	0	44

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

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

**The number of students identified as retainees:**

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

## Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

### School Data

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school, or combination schools).

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	0%	0%	54%	0%	0%	53%
ELA Learning Gains	0%	0%	54%	0%	0%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	0%	0%	47%	0%	0%	47%
Math Achievement	0%	0%	58%	0%	0%	58%
Math Learning Gains	0%	0%	57%	0%	0%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	0%	0%	51%	0%	0%	51%
Science Achievement	0%	0%	51%	0%	0%	52%
Social Studies Achievement	0%	0%	72%	0%	0%	72%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey				
Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)			Total
	6	7	8	
	(0)	(0)	(0)	0 (0)

### Grade Level Data

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

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2019	4%	6%	-2%	54%	-50%
	2018	0%	21%	-21%	52%	-52%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	0%	25%	-25%	52%	-52%
	2018	14%	26%	-12%	51%	-37%
Same Grade Comparison		-14%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2019	15%	30%	-15%	56%	-41%
	2018	6%	17%	-11%	58%	-52%
Same Grade Comparison		9%				
Cohort Comparison		1%				

<b>MATH</b>						
<b>Grade</b>	<b>Year</b>	<b>School</b>	<b>District</b>	<b>School-District Comparison</b>	<b>State</b>	<b>School-State Comparison</b>
06	2019	13%	8%	5%	55%	-42%
	2018	0%	14%	-14%	52%	-52%
Same Grade Comparison		13%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	13%	32%	-19%	54%	-41%
	2018	10%	21%	-11%	54%	-44%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison		13%				
08	2019	39%	38%	1%	46%	-7%
	2018	24%	28%	-4%	45%	-21%
Same Grade Comparison		15%				
Cohort Comparison		29%				

<b>SCIENCE</b>						
<b>Grade</b>	<b>Year</b>	<b>School</b>	<b>District</b>	<b>School-District Comparison</b>	<b>State</b>	<b>School-State Comparison</b>
08	2019	15%	17%	-2%	48%	-33%
	2018	3%	15%	-12%	50%	-47%
Same Grade Comparison		12%				
Cohort Comparison						

<b>BIOLOGY EOC</b>					
<b>Year</b>	<b>School</b>	<b>District</b>	<b>School Minus District</b>	<b>State</b>	<b>School Minus State</b>
2019					
2018					

<b>CIVICS EOC</b>					
<b>Year</b>	<b>School</b>	<b>District</b>	<b>School Minus District</b>	<b>State</b>	<b>School Minus State</b>
2019	24%	59%	-35%	71%	-47%
2018	13%	50%	-37%	71%	-58%
Compare		11%			

<b>HISTORY EOC</b>					
<b>Year</b>	<b>School</b>	<b>District</b>	<b>School Minus District</b>	<b>State</b>	<b>School Minus State</b>
2019					
2018					

<b>ALGEBRA EOC</b>					
<b>Year</b>	<b>School</b>	<b>District</b>	<b>School Minus District</b>	<b>State</b>	<b>School Minus State</b>
2019	0%	22%	-22%	61%	-61%

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2018					
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	0%	16%	-16%	57%	-57%
2018					

**Subgroup Data**

2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17

2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2015-16	C & C Accel 2015-16

**ESSA Data**

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

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	CS&I
OVERALL Federal Index - All Students	30
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	YES
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	5
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	240
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	97%

**Subgroup Data**

Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	30
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	1

English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	

<b>English Language Learners</b>	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
<b>Asian Students</b>	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
<b>Black/African American Students</b>	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	21
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	2
<b>Hispanic Students</b>	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	26
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	1
<b>Multiracial Students</b>	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
<b>Native American Students</b>	
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
<b>Pacific Islander Students</b>	
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
<b>White Students</b>	
Federal Index - White Students	30
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	1

Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	28
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	2

**Analysis**

**Data Reflection**

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

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

When looking at FSA data, our lowest performing area is in English Language, specifically our 7th grade cohort. . This is true for our district data using Measures of Academic Progress assessment. Contributing factors could include the following: 1. We added an intensive math course which reduced the number of minutes for ELA instruction to a 90 minute block. 2. Many of our students experience language delays and are therefore not reading on grade level but are required to take grade level assessments. 3. We gave the end of year MAP assessment with less instructional time between the winter and spring test dates.

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

Our 7th grade cohort showed the greatest decline in ELA when lookin g at just our school data using FSA. We went from 14% to 0% FROM 2018 to 2019 in students at level 3 or above. When looking at the reading subsection on Measure of Academic Progress, our class of 2025 cohort had the biggest decline in students making any growth going from 76% in 2019-2019 to 45% in 2019-2020. Contributing factors could include the following: 1. We added an intensive math course which reduced the number of minutes for ELA instruction to a 90 minute block. 2. Many of our students experience language delays and are therefore not reading on grade level but are required to take grade level assessments. 3. We gave the end of year MAP assessment with less instructional time between the winter and spring test dates. .

**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.**

Our biggest gap when compared with the state average was the 7th grade cohort in ELA. They were at a -52% when compared with the state. Contributing factors could include the following: 1. We added an intensive math course which reduced the number of minutes for ELA instruction to a 90 minute block. 2. Many of our students experience language delays and are therefore not reading on grade level but are required to take grade level assessments. 3. We did not have consistent teachers in the grade level throughout the school year due to maternity leave and struggling to fill a position. Although these were not in the ELA area, it impacted the students overall.

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

When looking at FSA, Math was our biggest area of growth. Each cohort improved with an overall improvement of 29%. There was also a decrease from 2018 to 2019 in how far behind we are in the school state comparison. Our school added an intensive math class for all students for the 2019-2020 school year. Students had an additional 45 minutes of math instruction focused on the IEP goals and their weaknesses.

**Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern?**

As is the case most often, one of the biggest concerns is how many students we have scoring level 1 on state assessments. Again we know some of the contributing factors, but would like to see this number reduced.

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

1. ELA improvement on either FSA or MAP testing
2. Maintain math improvement and increase number of students meeting targeted growth on MAP

## Part III: Planning for Improvement

### Areas of Focus:

**#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups**

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** When looking at FSA data from 2018 to 2019, our 7th grade cohort had a decrease in 14% of the students obtaining a level 3 or higher. When looking at MAP data, over the last three years there has been a steady decrease in students making any growth as well as in students meeting targets in reading.

**Measurable Outcome:** By the end of the 2020-2021 school year, The class of 2025 cohort will go from 45% of students making any growth on the Reading MAP test to 50%. The class of 2026 cohort will maintain 69% of student making any growth.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** Karen Newton (newtonk@fsdbk12.org)

**Evidence-based Strategy:** Data chats, PLCs, Data analysis, professional development in best practices

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** PLCs: In an effective PLC, the mission, vision, values, and goals are all shared. Teams work together and engage in collective inquiry to find what works in terms of teaching and learning. When collaboration is happening in our PLCs, teachers will possess a greater (shared) understanding of student data, be able to develop more creative lesson plans, and reduce their sense of professional isolation. This will lead to more ambitious instruction  
 Data Chats with students: Effective data chats with students lead to increased motivation. This will also help teachers analyze areas of weakness in order to improve instruction  
 Professional Development: Allows teachers to hone their skills and continue to learn best practices in teaching.

**Action Steps to Implement**

1. Meet monthly with the ELA team to analyze data focused specifically on subgroups: black, economically disadvantaged, hispanic students, students with disabilities and white students.

**Person Responsible** Kathy Pyle (pylek@fsdbk12.org)

After each MAP testing session, provide time and support for ELA teachers to analyze data and make plans to use the data to drive instruction

**Person Responsible** Karen Newton (newtonk@fsdbk12.org)

Provide PD related to best practices in reading instruction

**Person Responsible** Karen Newton (newtonk@fsdbk12.org)



**#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups**

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** Based on FSA data from 2018 and 2019, DMS showed a 29% increase in the number of students level 3 or higher. On MAP more than 65% of students in each cohort made growth in the 2019-2020 school year. Math projected growth was farthest from target but was much closer at winter time. The percent of students meeting target growth needs to increase.

**Measurable Outcome:** By the end of the 2020-2021 school year, each cohort will improve the number of students meeting target growth on MAP by 2 %.  
 Class of 2026 from 34% to 36%  
 Class of 2025 from 43% to 45%

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** Karen Newton (newtonk@fsdbk12.org)

**Evidence-based Strategy:** Data chats, PLCs, Data analysis, professional development in best practices

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:**  
 PLCs: In an effective PLC, the mission, vision, values, and goals are all shared. Teams work together and engage in collective inquiry to find what works in terms of teaching and learning. When collaboration is happening in our PLCs, teachers will possess a greater (shared) understanding of student data, be able to develop more creative lesson plans, and reduce their sense of professional isolation. This will lead to more ambitious instruction  
 Data Chats with students: Effective data chats with students lead to increased motivation. This will also help teachers analyze areas of weakness in order to improve instruction  
 Professional Development: Allows teachers to hone their skills and continue to learn best practices in teaching.

**Action Steps to Implement**

Meet monthly with the Math team to analyze data focused specifically on subgroups: black, economically disadvantaged, hispanic students, students with disabilities and white students.

**Person Responsible** Sue Clark (clarks@fsdbk12.org)

After each MAP testing session, provide time and support for Math teachers to analyze data and make plans to use the data to drive instruction

**Person Responsible** Karen Newton (newtonk@fsdbk12.org)

Provide PD related to best practice in math instruction

**Person Responsible** Karen Newton (newtonk@fsdbk12.org)

Continue Intensive math courses with a focus on MAP areas of opportunity

**Person Responsible** Karen Newton (newtonk@fsdbk12.org)

**Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities**

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities.

**Through continuous discussion and the use of our School SUBSAC team and data chats with the department, the rest of the needs will be monitored.**

## Part IV: 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 to employ school improvement strategies that impact the positive school culture and environment are critical. 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.

Stakeholders play a key role in school performance and addressing equity. Consulting various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment ensuring all stakeholders are involved.

Family involvement is a powerful influence on a child's achievement in school. When families work together with schools to support learning, children are inclined to succeed academically and throughout life. Parents/legal guardians are encouraged to participate as informed partners with school personnel in implementing school programs in an effort to encourage lifelong learning and improve student academic achievement. FSDB strives to provide families and staff with capacity building opportunities to increase our abilities to support our students' academic and personal growth.

FSDB strives to provide families and staff with capacity building opportunities to increase their ability to support student academic progress and personal growth. Title I schools will host quarterly subSAC meetings, with a portion of the meeting dedicated to Title I matters in concordance with each school's SIP, such as review of Title I program progress in achieving application goals. Title I Assistant Principals will work in collaboration with the Parent Services Department and FSDB's Grant Coordinator to create and implement effective activities for parent and family engagement.

Positive Behavior Intervention and Support is used to create a positive school culture.

### **Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link**

The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.

## Part V: Budget

<b>1</b>	<b>III.A.</b>	<b>Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups</b>	<b>\$0.00</b>
<b>2</b>	<b>III.A.</b>	<b>Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups</b>	<b>\$0.00</b>

	<b>Total: \$0.00</b>
--	----------------------