Fairview Middle School

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Fairview Middle School

3415 ZILLAH ST, Tallahassee, FL 32305

https://www.leonschools.net/fairview

Demographics

Principal: Rusty Edwards

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2019

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)	
School Grades History	2018-19: B (54%) 2017-18: C (51%) 2016-17: C (53%) 2015-16: B (56%)
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	
* 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.In pursuing this mission, we dedicate ourselves to preparing our students to become confident, self-directed, life-long learners prepared to adapt effectively to the world of the future.

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, position title, and job duties/responsibilities for each member of the school leadership team.**:**

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Edwards, Rusty	Principal	Mr. Edwards serves the school, our students, our teachers, and our staff in his position of school leader; leading the staff, setting school goals, and ensuring our school runs at its maximum ability.
Weismantel, Mark	Instructional Technology	Mr. Weismantel's role is to manage the inventory and communicate best practices for our teachers and staff with regards to class management of 1:1 devices.
Mayer, Eileen	Assistant Principal	Mrs. Mayer is the Assistant Principal for Curriculum. The curriculum must be reshaped each year based on the current student abilities. Mrs. Mayer oversees the progress monitoring to ensure students are on track for promotion.
Zapata, Alejandro	Assistant Principal	Mr. Zapata's role as the Assistant Principal for Discipline will look different in the 2020-2021 school year. His role will act as more of a support for students in teaching the importance of online behavior and being prompt. Both of these are life long skills for citizen success.
Cameron, Lee	Teacher, K-12	Mr. Cameron serves as our IB Prep Coordinator and 8th grade ELA teacher. Mr. Cameron will work specifically with parental support, positive behavior rewards, and community outreach this year.

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Monday 7/1/2019, Rusty Edwards

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.*
3

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.*
7

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
48

Demographic Data

2020-21 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 Grades History	2018-19: B (54%) 2017-18: C (51%) 2016-17: C (53%) 2015-16: B (56%)
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	
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, [click here](#).	

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	21	25	0	0	0	0	0	46
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	19	19	6	0	0	0	0	44
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	93	47	58	0	0	0	0	198
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	90	50	64	0	0	0	0	204

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	83	51	48	0	0	0	0	182

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	21	0	4	0	0	0	0	25
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	0	1	0	0	0	0	10

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 9/14/2020

Prior Year - As Reported

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

Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Number of students enrolled	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	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
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	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
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	0	0	0	0	0	

Prior Year - Updated

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

Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Number of students enrolled	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	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
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	21	0	4	0	0	0	0	25
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	0	1	0	0	0	0	10

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	
	(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	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%				

ELA						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
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
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	
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 in the 2018-2019 school year year and this component has been historically low for Fairview. It was slightly increased from the 2017-2018 school year though.

Our lowest scoring on the Federal Index was ELL and SWD. As a result, Fairview used data driven interventions to address these subgroups in the 2019-2020 school year. Fairview will continue those same interventions and added a Tier 3 support in the form of pullouts for the 2020-2021 school year.

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 2019.

For the 2019-2020 school year, we had all teachers in place and focused on a standards based teaching starting in January 2020. We are continuing with that format for the 2020-2021 school year for measured classes.

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 (2018-2019) school year.

Fairview will continue with quarterly progress monitoring and monthly STAR assessments to ensure our students stay on track in the 2020-2021 school year as we did in the 2019-2020 school 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 in the 2018-2019 school year. 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 in the 2019-2020 school year.

Fairview will continue to use the monitoring for the 2020-2021 school year.

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

Fairview believes 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. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and 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.
Measureable Outcome:	Fairview will show an increase of 5%, on top of our previous tested year's the school plans to 2%, for our lowest 25% as measured by Spring FSA Math 2021.
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 Steps to Implement

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	Eileen Mayer (mayere@leonschools.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and 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.
Measureable Outcome:	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 2021.
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 Steps to Implement

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	Eileen Mayer (mayere@leonschools.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

Fairview will have a heavy focus on building relationships and mental health for the 2020-2021 school year. Given the changes students are facing with the pandemic (location changes, loss of family income, digital learning, etc.), the administrative team feels that building relationships will assist with meeting the needs of our students.

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.

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. In addition, we have made sure to continue to be very active on Social Media in hopes that our activities and information is shared; this allows us to reach more of our stakeholders.

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

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math				$0.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
			0451 - Fairview Middle School	School Improvement Funds		$0.00
			Notes: Math FSA prep sessions & sub coverage for horizontal team meetings during the school year.			
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA				$0.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
			0451 - Fairview Middle School	School Improvement Funds		$0.00
			Notes: ELA FSA prep sessions & sub coverage for horizontal team meetings during the school year.			

	Total:	**$0.00**