Leon County Schools

William J Montford III 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 8

Planning for Improvement 14

Title I Requirements 0

Budget to Support Goals 17

William J Montford III Middle School

5789 PIMLICO DR, Tallahassee, FL 32309

https://www.leonschools.net/montford

Demographics

Principal: Lewis Blessing

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2012

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	No
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	29%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups in orange are below the federal threshold)	Asian Students Black/African American Students Economically Disadvantaged Students English Language Learners Hispanic Students Multiracial Students Students With Disabilities White Students
School Grade	2018-19: A
School Grades History	2017-18: A 2016-17: A 2015-16: A 2014-15: A 2013-14: A
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	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 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

The mission of William J. Montford, III Middle School is to establish a culture of respect and responsibility; engage students in an active, emotionally, and physically safe learning environment; model enthusiasm for and love of learning; and prepare students to contribute and care for the community and the environment by providing opportunities to explore interests and creatively solve problems.

Provide the school's vision statement

The school's vision is to be recognized as the highest performing middle school where students, staff, and families enjoy learning, take pride in contributing to the community, and enjoy the highest levels of success in all we do.

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
Blessing, Lewis	Principal	The Montford Middle School LeadershipTeam is responsible for intentionally shaping our school vision for academic success for all students. Our vision in the decision making process is to be recognized as the highest performing middle school where students, staff, and families enjoy learning, take pride in contributing to the community, and enjoy the highest levels of success. We do this by using best practices in instructional leadership strategies which involves setting clear goals, managing curriculum, monitoring lesson plans, allocating resources and evaluating teachers regularly to promote student learning and growth.
Thomas, Deborah	Assistant Principal	
Shultz, Rebecca	Assistant Principal	
Stallworth, Stacy	Assistant Principal	
Molinaro, Dan	Dean	
Hanna, Christy	Teacher, K-12	
Taylor, Wendy	Teacher, K-12	
Gitlin, Sonja	Guidance Counselor	
Scott, Monica	Teacher, K-12	
Dietzen, Beth	Teacher, K-12	
Allen, Katie	Teacher, ESE	
Drew, Jodi	Teacher, K-12	
Hirst, Elizabeth	Guidance Counselor	
Loggins, Paige	Teacher, K-12	
Thompson, Fred	Teacher, K-12	
Thompson, Stacy	Teacher, K-12	
Ward, Tiffany	Teacher, K-12	

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Wood, Robin	Teacher, K-12	
Chrestensen, Gail	Teacher, K-12	
Madsen, Joyce	Teacher, K-12	

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	329	355	338	0	0	0	0	1022
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	3	2	0	0	0	0	11
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	30	14	30	0	0	0	0	74
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	44	40	33	0	0	0	0	117

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	11	13	6	0	0	0	0	30

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	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

56

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 8/19/2019

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	6	5	7	0	0	0	0	18
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	29	35	35	0	0	0	0	99
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	3
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	28	29	37	0	0	0	0	94

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	15	23	28	0	0	0	0	66

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	6	5	7	0	0	0	0	18
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	29	35	35	0	0	0	0	99
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	3
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	28	29	37	0	0	0	0	94

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	15	23	28	0	0	0	0	66

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	77%	55%	54%	75%	56%	53%
ELA Learning Gains	65%	53%	54%	61%	54%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	56%	42%	47%	49%	48%	47%
Math Achievement	85%	59%	58%	85%	59%	58%
Math Learning Gains	77%	58%	57%	73%	59%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	69%	47%	51%	71%	52%	51%
Science Achievement	72%	49%	51%	72%	53%	52%
Social Studies Achievement	93%	75%	72%	91%	72%	72%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)			Total
	6	7	8	
Number of students enrolled	329 (0)	355 (0)	338 (0)	1022 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	6 (6)	3 (5)	2 (7)	11 (18)
One or more suspensions	30 (29)	14 (35)	30 (35)	74 (99)
Course failure in ELA or Math	0 (1)	0 (0)	1 (2)	1 (3)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	44 (28)	40 (29)	33 (37)	117 (94)

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	74%	54%	20%	54%	20%
	2018	75%	57%	18%	52%	23%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	77%	56%	21%	52%	25%
	2018	73%	54%	19%	51%	22%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison		2%				
08	2019	79%	59%	20%	56%	23%
	2018	79%	62%	17%	58%	21%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		6%				

MATH

Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2019	77%	53%	24%	55%	22%
	2018	77%	59%	18%	52%	25%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	90%	60%	30%	54%	36%
	2018	88%	55%	33%	54%	34%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison		13%				
08	2019	80%	45%	35%	46%	34%
	2018	75%	44%	31%	45%	30%
Same Grade Comparison		5%				
Cohort Comparison		-8%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
08	2019	71%	44%	27%	48%	23%
	2018	72%	49%	23%	50%	22%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison						

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	**School**	**District**	**School Minus District**	**State**	**School Minus State**
2019	100%	70%	30%	67%	33%
2018	100%	69%	31%	65%	35%
Compare		0%			

CIVICS EOC					
Year	**School**	**District**	**School Minus District**	**State**	**School Minus State**
2019	92%	75%	17%	71%	21%
2018	91%	73%	18%	71%	20%
Compare		1%			

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	99%	71%	28%	62%	37%
Compare		0%			

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	32	52	42	42	58	51	35	73	10		
ELL	47	71	58	74	65						
ASN	59	58		81	80		50				
BLK	52	56	44	66	67	62	47	82	52		
HSP	71	62	59	79	58	53	62	85	76		
MUL	68	69	79	68	68	62	50	100	40		
WHT	83	67	58	90	81	75	79	96	62		
FRL	61	60	50	72	69	63	54	88	43		

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	33	39	38	51	57	51	28	88	33		
ELL	25	25		75	58						
ASN	59	53	20	84	77		75	82	86		
BLK	55	52	54	63	66	64	40	81	58		
HSP	57	53	38	80	65	73	50	83	50		
MUL	68	53	10	86	82		73	70	78		
WHT	81	64	51	89	75	74	81	95	76		
FRL	54	48	41	68	71	72	32	82	40		

ESSA Data

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

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	73
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	656
Total Components for the Federal Index	9
Percent Tested	99%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	44
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	63
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0

Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	66
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	59
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	67
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	67
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	77
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	62
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Analysis

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

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

The ELA lowest 25th percentile is lowest data component. When compared to last year percentage the the number is up, but is still the lowest scoring component. Yes, it is moving in the direction of improving overtime when compared to the other components.

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

Our Middle School Acceleration component showed the greatest decline. This is due to the fact that the state calculation says 8th grade students should be "accelerated" and placed in high school courses if they earn a Level 3 on their FSA Math as 7th graders. We use multiple factors to determine who will be successful in high school courses, and do not force all of our 8th grade Level 3's into high school credit classes if their parents do not wish to place them into those courses if they aren't ready.

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

Geometry EOC is the data component with the largest gap when compared to the state average by 43 percent in a positive direction for Montford Middle School students. Outstanding performance by our students who scored 100 percent for level 3 or higher.

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

The ELA lowest 25th percentile is the data component showing the most improvement. Faculty and staff mentoring and having one on one data discussions with students in lowest 35 percentile about their scores in this area to prepare them to become better test taker for the next assessment.We also used the Achieve 3000 Reading Program for our level 1 and level 2 students.

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

After reflecting on the EWS data a potential area of concern is the number of students who are not reading on grade level and are getting more than one referral for discipline.

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

1. Student achievement will increase by 2% in ELA bottom 25% learning gains.
2. Student achievement will increase by 2% in Math bottom 25% learning gains.
3. Student achievement will increase by 2% in Science.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	Teachers will integrate ELA strategies across all core subjects in order to increase student achievement for all groups and specifically the lowest 25%.
Rationale	ELA teachers will continue increasing proficiency across the grade levels and raise the lowest 25% learning gains. Teachers will implement highly effective strategies of instruction/best teaching practices such as engagement activities, modeling, guided practice sessions, and reflection. The department will continue to collaborate to monitor rigor, proficiency and student growth.
State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve	Student achievement will increase by 2% in ELA bottom 25% learning gains.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Joyce Madsen (madsenj@leonschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy	Classroom observations, lesson plan monitoring/feedback, student progress monitoring, teacher growth plans(DPP/SLO s).
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Documentation will occur through data and notes from the evaluation platform.
Action Step	
Description	1. Collaborate monthly to monitor student progress, (specifically targeted groups) in order to drive instructional practices 2. Individual team members will continuously analyze student data to make decisions that will increase achievement. 3. Teachers will plan innovative, rigorous, standards-based lessons.
Person Responsible	Lewis Blessing (blessingl@leonschools.net)

#2	
Title	Math teachers will implement highly effective strategies to deliver instruction based on math Florida Standards in order to increase student proficiency.
Rationale	In order to increase proficiency across grade levels and the lowest 25% learning gains specifically, teachers will implement highly effective strategies of instruction (Modeling, Reinforcement, Reflection, Engagement Activities) and work as a department to coach and collaborate to ensure data and assessments reflect growth.
State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve	Student achievement will increase by 2% in Math bottom 25% learning gains.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Wendy Taylor (taylorw@leonschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy	Classroom observations, lesson plan monitoring/feedback, student progress monitoring, teacher growth plans((DPP/SLO s).
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Documentation will occur through data and notes from the evaluation platform.
Action Step	
Description	1. Math Department meet to locate and analyze the test item specifications and identify the critical concepts with vertical alignment. 2. Members will analyze data individually and collaboratively to create goals and develop high quality proficiency scales. 3. The data used will consist of test item specification, school wide student data, and specific grade level data at least quarterly.
Person Responsible	Lewis Blessing (blessingl@leonschools.net)

#3	
Title	Science teachers will facilitate science learning opportunities, growth, and performance outcomes in students.
Rationale	To increase the number of 8th grade students scoring at proficiency or above on state assessment in science. We need to improve background knowledge and student's interest in science in each student.
State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve	Student achievement will increase by 2% in Science.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Christy Hanna (hannac@leonschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy	Classroom observations, lesson plan monitoring/feedback, student progress monitoring, teacher growth plans(DPP/SLO s).
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Documentation will occur through data and notes from the evaluation platform.
Action Step	
Description	1. Science teachers will use LCS Progress Monitoring data and MMS Science Department Pre-Test to determine needs and weaknesses to group students accordingly for increasing performance. 2. Science teachers will have opportunities to collaborate with other peers school wide, district wide, and across the state about mentor-ship and best practices for middle school students.
Person Responsible	Lewis Blessing (blessingl@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)

Student achievement will increase by 8% in Middle School Acceleration.

Here are the following ways we are providing opportunities for our MMS students:

1. Leon County Schools provides opportunities for qualified middle school students to enroll in high school credit courses. These courses begin the sequence of college preparatory coursework and count toward high school graduation credits. Montford offers high school credit courses in Algbera I, Algebra I Honors, Geometry Honors, Earth Space Honors, Biology Honors, Spanish 1 and 2, Music Theatre 1 and 2, and 3D Art.

To qualify for Algebra I or Algebra I Honors, students will take a prognosis test at the end of the year in their mathematics class. That score will determine their eligiblity for Algebra I or Algebra I Honors, which also opens up the door to take Earth Space Honors (you must take Algebra I Honors in order to take Earth Space Honors). Students will also take a prognosis test in the Spring semester to determine their eligiblity for Spanish 1. Their prognosis test

along with a recommendation from their Language Arts teacher determines their eligiblity. Music Theatre and 3D Art have application processes with each of the respective classroom teachers.

2. Adobe Certification and Programming - 8th Grade only
Students earn an industry level certification in Adobe In-Design. Aimed at those who plan careers as professional designers, printers, advertisers, or publishers. Sets the industry standard in desktop publishing for print and digital page layout.

Web Essentials - 7th Grade only
Students earn digital tools certification in Gaming Essentials, Multimedia Essentials, Web Design Essentials, and Computing Essentials. After the completion of the certificates, students will explore computer pgoramming.

Part V: Budget

1	**III.A**	**Areas of Focus: Teachers will integrate ELA strategies across all core subjects in order to increase student achievement for all groups and specifically the lowest 25%.**				**$1,760.00**
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20
	5100	390-Other Purchased Services	1201 - William J Montford III Middle School	School Improvement Funds	1025.0	$900.00
			Notes: Using Data for Equity in the Classroom (Quick Reference Guide) Pamphlet -			
	5100	140-Substitute Teachers	1201 - William J Montford III Middle School	School Improvement Funds	1025.0	$860.00
			Notes: PLC Substitutes for 10 ELA teachers to collaborate on understanding school data			
2	**III.A**	**Areas of Focus: Math teachers will implement highly effective strategies to deliver instruction based on math Florida Standards in order to increase student proficiency.**				**$1,394.00**
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20
	5100	140-Substitute Teachers	1201 - William J Montford III Middle School	School Improvement Funds	1025.0	$744.00
			Notes: Using Data for Equity in the Classroom (Quick Reference Guide) Pamphlet - PLC Substitutes for 9 Math teachers to collaborate on understanding school data			
	7300	132844-TRAINING - EXPENSE	1201 - William J Montford III Middle School	School Improvement Funds	1025.0	$650.00
			Notes: The 2019 Educational Strategies & Student Engagement Institute (ESSEI) unites professionals from school districts, agencies and other sectors of the community to build knowledge and enhance skills on educational strategies proven to promote student achievement and college and career readiness. Attendees learn, share, network and identify tools to help counter and prevent academic struggles, school disengagement, and dropout. The Florida Department of Education coordinates efforts to provide an extensive and meaningful event for all. Attendees at ESSEI represent exceptional student			

			education, career and technical education, juvenile justice, dropout prevention, federal programs for at-risk student populations, attendance and truancy, social work, volunteer programs, higher education, faith and community-based organizations, and family engagement. Funds will cover registration and hotel cost.			
3	**III.A**	**Areas of Focus: Science teachers will facilitate science learning opportunities, growth, and performance outcomes in students.**				**$744.00**
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20
	5100	140-Substitute Teachers	1201 - William J Montford III Middle School	School Improvement Funds	1025.0	$744.00
			Notes: Using Data for Equity in the Classroom (Quick Reference Guide) Pamphlet - PLC Substitutes for 9 Science teachers to collaborate on understanding school data			
					Total:	**$3,898.00**