

Leon County Schools

Fairview Middle School



2019-20 School Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	5
Needs Assessment	6
Planning for Improvement	12
Title I Requirements	15
Budget to Support Goals	17

Fairview Middle School

3415 ZILLAH ST, Tallahassee, FL 32305

<https://www.leonschools.net/fairview>

Demographics

Principal: Rusty Edwards

Start Date for this Principal: 9/4/2019

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Middle School 6-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2018-19 Title I School	Yes
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups in orange are below the federal threshold)	Asian Students Black/African American Students Economically Disadvantaged Students English Language Learners Hispanic Students Multiracial Students Students With Disabilities White Students
School Grade	2018-19: B
School Grades History	2017-18: C 2016-17: C 2015-16: B 2014-15: A 2013-14: B
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northwest
Regional Executive Director	Jeff Sewell
Turnaround Option/Cycle	
Year	

Support Tier	NOT IN DA
ESSA Status	TS&I
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here .	

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Leon 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

Fairview Middle School is committed to critically-thinking young men and women who are engaged citizens in their school and in the community at large.

Provide the school's vision statement

Fairview Middle School will provide opportunities for our students to engage with technology, collaborative learning, and self-directed projects in order for them to achieve their full potential as twenty-first century global citizens.

School Leadership Team

Membership

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

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Edwards, Rusty	Principal	
Weismantel, Mark	Instructional Technology	
Battle, Laura	Teacher, K-12	
Mayer, Eileen	Assistant Principal	
Zackery, Pat	Assistant Principal	

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	53	45	50	0	0	0	0	148
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	22	41	14	0	0	0	0	77
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	130	68	87	0	0	0	0	285

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	46	37	30	0	0	0	0	113

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	0
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

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

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 9/4/2019

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
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	35	43	28	0	0	0	0	106
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	1	0	0	0	0	7
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	19	18	0	0	0	0	39
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	101	75	99	0	0	0	275

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	19	29	22	0	0	0	0	70

Prior Year - Updated

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

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	35	43	28	0	0	0	0	106
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	1	0	0	0	0	7
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	19	18	0	0	0	0	39
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	101	75	99	0	0	0	275

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	19	29	22	0	0	0	0	70

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	53%	55%	54%	51%	56%	53%
ELA Learning Gains	55%	53%	54%	52%	54%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	37%	42%	47%	35%	48%	47%
Math Achievement	56%	59%	58%	53%	59%	58%
Math Learning Gains	60%	58%	57%	55%	59%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	39%	47%	51%	36%	52%	51%
Science Achievement	45%	49%	51%	47%	53%	52%
Social Studies Achievement	63%	75%	72%	58%	72%	72%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)			Total
	6	7	8	
Number of students enrolled	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	53 (35)	45 (43)	50 (28)	148 (106)
One or more suspensions	1 (1)	0 (5)	0 (1)	1 (7)
Course failure in ELA or Math	22 (2)	41 (19)	14 (18)	77 (39)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	130 (0)	68 (101)	87 (75)	285 (176)

Grade Level Data

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

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

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2019	49%	54%	-5%	54%	-5%
	2018	48%	57%	-9%	52%	-4%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	51%	56%	-5%	52%	-1%
	2018	50%	54%	-4%	51%	-1%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison		3%				
08	2019	57%	59%	-2%	56%	1%
	2018	56%	62%	-6%	58%	-2%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison		7%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2019	51%	53%	-2%	55%	-4%
	2018	56%	59%	-3%	52%	4%
Same Grade Comparison		-5%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	52%	60%	-8%	54%	-2%
	2018	37%	55%	-18%	54%	-17%
Same Grade Comparison		15%				
Cohort Comparison		-4%				
08	2019	40%	45%	-5%	46%	-6%
	2018	42%	44%	-2%	45%	-3%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison		3%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2019	19%	44%	-25%	48%	-29%
	2018	29%	49%	-20%	50%	-21%
Same Grade Comparison		-10%				
Cohort Comparison						

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	98%	70%	28%	67%	31%
2018	97%	69%	28%	65%	32%
Compare		1%			

CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	63%	75%	-12%	71%	-8%
2018	59%	73%	-14%	71%	-12%
Compare		4%			

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

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	99%	69%	30%	61%	38%
2018	98%	71%	27%	62%	36%
Compare		1%			

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	100%	67%	33%	57%	43%
2018	100%	60%	40%	56%	44%
Compare		0%			

Subgroup Data

2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	23	39	25	28	44	35	18	27			
ELL	30										
ASN	95	84		99	92		100	96	100		
BLK	39	46	35	44	51	37	28	52	56		
HSP	61	70		50	55				50		
MUL	48	57		48	59						
WHT	86	72		86	76		82	90	86		
FRL	39	46	35	42	51	35	29	50	56		

2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2015-16	C & C Accel 2015-16
SWD	16	41	47	19	32	23	9	19			
ELL	56	53		68	78						
ASN	94	88		98	95		91	100	100		
BLK	37	41	36	39	44	36	30	45	51		
HSP	51	61	27	54	58		40	70	38		
MUL	61	71		69	77						
WHT	79	71	27	80	72	33	85	90	89		
FRL	35	42	35	38	45	33	25	47	32		

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)	TS&I
OVERALL Federal Index - All Students	54
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO

ESSA Federal Index	
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	482
Total Components for the Federal Index	9
Percent Tested	98%

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%	2

English Language Learners	
----------------------------------	--

Federal Index - English Language Learners	30
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	1

Asian Students	
-----------------------	--

Federal Index - Asian Students	95
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	43
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	57
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	53
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	83
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	43
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Analysis

Data Reflection

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

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

ELA Lowest 25 Percentile was our lowest performing data component. This was also the case last year and this component has been historically low for Fairview. It was slightly increased from last year though.

Our lowest scoring on the Federal Index was ELL and SWD. As a result, Fairview will use data driven interventions so address these subgroups.

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

All data components increased except for Science Achievement which declined by two percentage points. Factors that contributed to this decline was teacher turnover. One of our two eight grade Science teachers resigned two months into the school year. We were not able to secure a full time replacement until February.

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

Math Lowest 25 Percentile has the greatest gap when compared to the state average. This is not unusual for our school as our highest achieving students who are part of our magnet program begin to take EOCs in the seventh grade. Hence our highest achievers are filtered out of this number. This percentile is a small increase over the previous year.

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

Math Learning Gains and Social Studies Achievement both had an increase of five percentage points and tied for the most improved category. Both the Social Studies and the Civics department were invested in using our district's data parsing platform, Unify, to analyze trends from their baseline through their third quarter assessments. They shared data with their students as well so that they were able to target low areas. Both departments also provided opportunities for tutoring and extra help beyond school hours in the form of after school tutoring and Saturday morning boot camps.

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

I think that both Lowest 25 Percentile categories are potential areas of concern. They are the lowest performing data components and have been consistently.

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

1. Lowest 25 Percentile - Math
2. Lowest 25 Percentile - ELA
3. Science Achievement
4. SWD and ELL Math and ELA

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	Math Lowest 25%
Rationale	Our Math lowest 25% was the largest gap from the state average. This achievement gap is broader than in previous years and thus a priority to halt the rift and span the divide.
State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve	Fairview will show an increase of 5%, on top of our previous year's 2%, for our lowest 25% as measured by Spring FSA Math 2020.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Eileen Mayer (mayere@leonschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy	Fairview will be using Moby Max to monitor grade level math skills.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Moby Max is aligned to the FSA and this allows us to have a continuous source of data to monitor.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Identify the lowest 25% of students and make teachers aware of who these students are. 2. Facilitate data chats with teachers and students - this allows students to know their areas of weakness. 3. Skill based, flexible grouping for the lowest 25% during an elective. 4. Progress monitoring through Moby Max, in addition to district PMRN three times yearly.
Person Responsible	Laura Battle (battlel@leonschools.net)

#2	
Title	ELA Lowest 25%
Rationale	Reading comprehension and language arts are a cornerstone of all academic work. With an increase of achievement level in ELA, we can expect to see growth in other subjects as well, such as Civics and Science that rely heavily on reading comprehension of academic texts.
State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve	Fairview will show an increase of 5%, on top of our 2% earned last year, to our lowest 25% ELA students as measured by the FSA ELA Spring 2020.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Eileen Mayer (mayere@leonschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy	Teachers will progress monitor monthly using STAR Reading.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	STAR Reading is highly correlated with the FSA. Monthly monitoring will help us target the students most in need of additional interventions.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Identify the lowest 25% of students and make teachers aware of who these students are. 2. Facilitate data chats with teachers and students - this allows students to know their areas of weakness. 3. Skill based, flexible grouping for the lowest 25% during an elective. 4. Progress monitoring through STAR Reading, in addition to district PMRN quarterly. 5. Monitor the Achieve 3000 reports monthly.
Person Responsible	Laura Battle (battlel@leonschools.net)

#3	
Title	Science Achievement
Rationale	Our data component that showed the only decline from the previous year was Science achievement.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	50% of the students will score at or above proficiency on the Spring 2020 FCAT 2.0, increasing by 7%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Eileen Mayer (mayere@leonschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy	Teachers are using a backwards design, ensuring their assessments are better aligned with vetted questions from past tests.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Analyzing the data from each assessment, and tracking those benchmarks, allow for a better alignment of what students have mastered.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Teachers are participating in a data retreat. 2. Teachers administered a baseline to all students. 3. Data focused monthly department meetings. 4. Progress monitoring through three times yearly.
Person Responsible	Laura Battle (battlel@leonschools.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities (optional)

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

Part IV: Title I Requirements

Additional Title I Requirements
 This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A schoolwide program and opts to use the Schoolwide Improvement Plan to satisfy the requirements of the schoolwide program plan, as outlined in the Every Student Succeeds Act, Public Law No. 114-95, § 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

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

Previous School Climate Surveys have shown parents to be overwhelmingly pleased with the home-school connection, but there is always room for growth. During the 2014-2015 school year Fairview moved to Edmodo as a form of communication with parents. Since that date, Fairview has continued to branch out and utilizes other LMSs as well, including Microsoft Teams and Remind. The district's move to FOCUS gives parents and students real time information about a child's attendance, grades, and discipline.

Falcon Families who do not have access to a home computer or the internet are referred to our guidance counselor for access support.

PFEP Link

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

Describe how the school ensures the social-emotional needs of all students are being met, which may include providing counseling, mentoring and other pupil services

Fairview has always had strong relations with the entire Leon County community. Strong out-reach programs with the Universities, private organizations, fraternities and sororities, and even FMS based programs have added another layer to meeting the social and emotional needs of our students. FMS has long worked with community agencies to provide assistance for our students. Turn About, CCYS, Big Bend Hospice, and Tallahassee Memorial Regional Medical Center are just a few of the groups working with Fairview students. This has manifested itself in many ways: some students have mentors assigned to them through the University Mentor Programs, DREAM TEENS: is a program started over 6 years ago by one of our Fairview staff members. They meet twice a month to speak about character, building/maintaining high self esteem, and academics. Boule' began 14 years ago with a group of professional men in Leon County wanting to make a difference in the lives of young men. Boule' manifested itself into the 100 Black Men organization working with students starting in 6th grade providing tutoring, field trips, academic extension and support, attendance at school events, grooming tips and the steps to get ready for college. The men are College Professors, Lawyers, Psychologist, teachers, Doctors, Pharmacist, and even a Pilot. Since it's origination, it has taken many names but the message has stayed the same. FAMU Trio program: a group of students working with FAMU personnel to get in the mindset of a future, college, preparing/taking the steps for being a productive adult. The group meets twice a month and there are FAMU students from each college to speak. Students are also provided academic tutors and mentors.

Describe the strategies the school employs to support incoming and outgoing cohorts of students in transition from one school level to another

Incoming 6th graders are welcomed to Fairview through a variety of ways. Incoming 6th graders come and take a tour of the school, listen to information about curriculum and activities, and then enjoy lunch at Fairview. Many families visit our Showcase Days through the School Choice Program. This snapshot of the school gives parents the opportunity to learn about Fairview and the Magnet program. Students and parents meet Magnet Faculty members and are able to sign up for activities leading to the School Choice Deadline. Incoming Falcons interested in applying to the IB Prep program are given the opportunity to shadow at Fairview. Students spend the entire day at Fairview with a student in the rising grade. They attend class and participate just as a Fairview student. Incoming Falcons receiving exceptional services meet with a member of the Fairview Faculty during transition IEP meetings. This allows the parent and the student to meet a member of the faculty and develop a relationship before the school year begins. Our 8th graders moving on to high school have the opportunity to meet faculty from the high school on our rising 9th grade articulation day.

Describe the process through which school leadership identifies and aligns all available resources (e.g., personnel, instructional, curricular) in order to meet the needs of all students and maximize desired student outcomes. Include the methodology for coordinating and supplementing federal, state and local funds, services and programs. Provide the person(s) responsible, frequency of meetings, how an inventory of resources is maintained and any problem-solving activities used to determine how to apply resources for the highest impact

The role of the MTSS Team is to review records and documentation, while providing expertise and guidance in developing strategies and interventions for students who have been unsuccessful in the classroom. These students are often not meeting proficiency on FSA. Once specific strategies are identified and success is measured MTSS determines next best steps for student success.

Our school and district funds are used to support the goals of the School Improvement Plan to meet the needs all students as well as professional development for teachers and staff. Collaboration and cooperation are essential in providing an instructional program to assist all students with the development of skills and the knowledge needed to meet the challenging state academic standards and assessments.

The logistics behind the coordination is addressed in the weekly Administrative Team Meetings.

Describe the strategies the school uses to advance college and career awareness, which may include establishing partnerships with business, industry or community organizations

Our students and parents are given a course request form with course descriptions to assist with selecting courses for the upcoming school year. The school Guidance Counselor and Assistant Principal for Curriculum visit feeder elementary schools to explain and promote course selections and school involvement. The Assistant Principal for Curriculum also organizes visits with all district elementary schools to promote the International Baccalaureate Preparatory curriculum and course choices.

Part V: Budget						
1	III.A	Areas of Focus: Math Lowest 25%				\$1,500.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20
			0451 - Fairview Middle School	School Improvement Funds		\$1,500.00
			<i>Notes: Math FSA prep sessions & sub coverage for horizontal team meetings during the school year.</i>			
2	III.A	Areas of Focus: ELA Lowest 25%				\$8,000.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20
		100-Salaries	0451 - Fairview Middle School	School Improvement Funds		\$1,500.00
			<i>Notes: Saturday school tutoring</i>			
			0451 - Fairview Middle School			\$6,500.00
			<i>Notes: REWARDS materials and training for select teachers to build foundations for our students scoring Level 1 on the FSA.</i>			
			0451 - Fairview Middle School			\$0.00

3	III.A	Areas of Focus: Science Achievement				\$1,500.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20
			0451 - Fairview Middle School	School Improvement Funds		\$1,500.00
			<i>Notes: Science FCAT Prep Sessions & sub coverage for horizontal team meetings during the school year.</i>			
					Total:	\$11,000.00