Lake Weir Middle School

2018-19 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Lake Weir Middle School

10220 SE SUNSET HARBOR RD, Summerfield, FL 34491

[no web address on file]

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	**2017-18 Title I School**	**2017-18 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
Middle School 6-8	Yes	85%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	49%

School Grades History

Year	2017-18	2016-17	2015-16	2014-15
Grade	C	C	D	D*

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Marion County School Board.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a school improvement plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F.

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 (see page 4). For schools receiving a grade of A, B, or C, the district may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at https://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.

Lake Weir Middle School exists to prepare middle school students, within three years, for participation in rigorous academic and vocational programs at any secondary school.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Lake Weir Middle School will be a safe and caring school environment that equips students with knowledge, skills, and a desire to succeed. Students will leave with Lakeside Pride prepared for a future that includes high school graduation, college and workforce readiness, and citizenship that promotes positive social change.

School Leadership Team

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

Name	Title
Greene, Brian	Principal
Hicks, Brandon	Assistant Principal
Crawford, Beth	Assistant Principal
Godwin, April	Instructional Coach
Carpenter, Constance	Instructional Coach
Hamel, Helen	Instructional Coach
Kutz, Laura	Instructional Media
McCleery, Jessica	Administrative Support
Brooks, Michelle	School Counselor
Reyes, Vicky	School Counselor
Styles, Jennifer	School Counselor
Turner, Miranda	Dean
Casciato, Cristina	Dean

Duties

Describe the roles and responsibilities of the members, including how they serve as instructional leaders and practice shared decision making.

The leadership of Lake Weir Middle will serve the educational community through a focused mission. Leadership team members facilitate organizational development through research, practice, and program evaluation. Leadership team members ensure a safe, positive, and caring learning environment. Teachers are involved in decision making through committees and collaboration with the administrative team.

Early Warning Systems

Year 2017-18

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	122	119	78	0	0	0	0	319
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	128	133	82	0	0	0	0	343
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	16	27	0	0	0	0	61
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	166	167	158	0	0	0	0	491

The number of students identified by the system as exhibiting two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students exhibiting two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	168	182	183	0	0	0	0	533

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	
Retained Students: Previous Year(s)	0	0	0	0	0	0	44	28	20	0	0	0	0	92

Date this data was collected

Wednesday 8/15/2018

Year 2016-17 - 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	28	46	61	0	0	0	0	135
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	72	35	0	0	0	0	123
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students identified by the system as exhibiting two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students exhibiting two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	56	86	49	0	0	0	0	191

Year 2016-17 - 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	28	46	61	0	0	0	0	135
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	72	35	0	0	0	0	123
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	106	143	159	0	0	0	0	408

The number of students identified by the system as exhibiting two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students exhibiting two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	56	86	49	0	0	0	0	191

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

Assessment & Analysis
Consider the following reflection prompts as you examine any/all relevant school data sources, including those in CIMS in the pages that follow.

Which data component performed the lowest? Is this a trend?

ELA achievement. Low performing ELA achievement has been a trend.

Which data component showed the greatest decline from prior year?

Acceleration.

Which data component had the biggest gap when compared to the state average?

ELA achievement.

Which data component showed the most improvement? Is this a trend?

ELA Bottom Quartile Learning Gains. No, this is not a trend.

Describe the actions or changes that led to the improvement in this area.

Provided bottom quartile students additional reading support through Intensive Reading class placement. Ensured placement of these students into the proper leveled reading intervention based on screening and testing data through their Intensive Reading coursework.

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	2018			2017		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	37%	47%	53%	34%	44%	52%
ELA Learning Gains	46%	50%	54%	41%	46%	53%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	44%	45%	47%	38%	39%	45%

School Grade Component	2018			2017		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
Math Achievement	42%	52%	58%	36%	47%	55%
Math Learning Gains	56%	61%	57%	43%	50%	55%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	44%	52%	51%	36%	38%	47%
Science Achievement	39%	46%	52%	33%	45%	50%
Social Studies Achievement	51%	66%	72%	57%	58%	67%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)			Total
	6	7	8	
Attendance below 90 percent	122 (28)	119 (46)	78 (61)	319 (135)
One or more suspensions	128 (0)	133 (0)	82 (0)	343 (0)
Course failure in ELA or Math	18 (16)	16 (72)	27 (35)	61 (123)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	166 (0)	167 (0)	158 (0)	491 (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	2018	35%	44%	-9%	52%	-17%
	2017	36%	44%	-8%	52%	-16%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2018	37%	43%	-6%	51%	-14%
	2017	31%	42%	-11%	52%	-21%
Same Grade Comparison		6%				
Cohort Comparison		1%				
08	2018	40%	49%	-9%	58%	-18%
	2017	38%	48%	-10%	55%	-17%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison		9%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2018	33%	42%	-9%	52%	-19%
	2017	23%	37%	-14%	51%	-28%
Same Grade Comparison		10%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2018	47%	49%	-2%	54%	-7%
	2017	41%	47%	-6%	53%	-12%

MATH

Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Same Grade Comparison		6%				
Cohort Comparison		24%				
08	2018	31%	43%	-12%	45%	-14%
	2017	34%	43%	-9%	46%	-12%
Same Grade Comparison		-3%				
Cohort Comparison		-10%				

SCIENCE

Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2018	41%	46%	-5%	50%	-9%
	2017					
Cohort Comparison						

BIOLOGY EOC

Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2018					
2017					

CIVICS EOC

Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2018	50%	64%	-14%	71%	-21%
2017	51%	64%	-13%	69%	-18%
Compare		-1%			

HISTORY EOC

Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2018					
2017					

ALGEBRA EOC

Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2018	88%	57%	31%	62%	26%
2017	97%	53%	44%	60%	37%
Compare		-9%			

GEOMETRY EOC

Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2018					

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2017	0%	48%	-48%	53%	-53%

Subgroup Data

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 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	16	35	34	17	47	42	20	19			
ELL	11	33	40	29	41	27	11	41			
BLK	28	38	34	29	49	42	22	46			
HSP	29	38	37	40	54	33	29	50	42		
MUL	40	59	60	37	54		29	53			
WHT	43	51	51	48	58	50	47	55	69		
FRL	35	44	43	40	55	43	37	49	62		
2017 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	8	30	28	13	43	38	8	29			
ELL	17	33	20	20	38	40	21	30			
BLK	25	39	38	24	43	30	25	29	61		
HSP	31	36	21	41	58	51	32	56	70		
MUL	33	39	9	43	56	50	33	60			
WHT	41	46	31	43	52	50	45	57	74		
FRL	32	41	29	36	49	41	33	48	68		

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Develop specific plans for addressing the school's highest-priority needs by identifying the most important areas of focus based on any/all relevant school data sources, including the data from Section II (Needs Assessment/Analysis).

Areas of Focus:

Activity #1	
Title	What: Literacy (Reading, Writing, Speaking, Reasoning) within a Supportive School Environment
Rationale	As 21st century learners we must prepare students for skills beyond high school that can be applied to college and/or the workforce. Lake Weir Middle School is part of the Instructional Center for Leadership in Education. To develop 21st century learners is not limited in literacy to reading and writing, but the ability to also speak and reason. These skills collectively develop learners for success through rigor and relevance in the world around them. However, quality instruction and learner achievement is impacted if learners are not in a safe, demanding, and orderly learning environment. Being in a supportive school environment is central to relationships and student success.
Intended Outcome	If rigorous and relevant literacy skills are applied across all subjects, then learners will be better equipped to apply the skills of reading, writing, speaking, and reasoning in their learning objectives and mastery of the standards. Learners will apply these skills to intended outcomes within and beyond the school environment. For reading the intended outcome is 40% or greater proficiency, 50% or greater learning gains, and 50% or greater learning gains of the bottom quartile. For math the intended outcome is 45% or greater proficiency, 60% or greater learning gains, and 48% or greater learning gains of the bottom quartile. If we provide a supportive school environment, then higher rates of achievement will occur. In addition to attaining our academic goals, a supportive environment will result in increased attendance by 2%, the ability for effective rigor and relevance within all lessons, and a 5% reduction of discipline incidents will occur.
Point Person	Brian Greene (brian.greene@marion.k12.fl.us)
Action Step	
Description	1. Create a writing committee tasked with developing a cross curricular literacy initiative. 2. Apply the committee's literacy initiatives across all subject matter (actions and activities learners should demonstrate throughout course lessons). 3. Training workshops for literacy implementation, as well as individual literacy integration support based on teacher need. 4. Develop a schedule of writing integration across all subject content teachers. 5. Implementation of the Learning Profile within MYP (character traits) through morning show, teacher lessons, visual aids around campus, and in the language we use while working with learners. 6. Student Services review of all policies for alignment to the benchmarks of a supportive school environment. 7. Leadership meeting focus for ongoing implementation of those practices to improve upon a safe, demanding, and orderly learning environment.
Person Responsible	Constance Carpenter (constance.carpenter@marion.k12.fl.us)
Plan to Monitor Effectiveness	
Description	1. Monitoring schedule following literacy PD. 2. Additoinal literacy training for teachers who demonstrate a need based on classroom walkthrough data and the review of learner work. 3. Ongoing reveiw of district and diagnostic assessment data. 4. Weekly leadership meetings, 20 day (monthly) training plan for inclusion of workshops built around providing a supportive environment, teacher and student survey input.

Person Responsible	Brian Greene (brian.greene@marion.k12.fl.us)

Activity #2	
Title	How: Middle Years Program instructional framework within the Rigor, Relevance, and Relationship-Student Engagement model
Rationale	The school is starting year 1 of a 3-year accreditation path towards becoming an International Baccalaureate (IB) program. This is known as the Middle Years Program (MYP) and is a philosophy framework organized around the curriculum of collaborative planning (planning the curriculum, including horizontal and vertical articulation of the written curriculum through subject-group overviews and Approaches to Learning planning), written curriculum by way of developing MYP units, teaching and learning approaches to teaching, and assessment for learning. MYP is the framework of instruction that will be applied through the rigor, relevance, and relationship/student engagement model. Planning and instruction will be applied with rigor and relevance daily lessons. This will be further accomplished through the relationships teachers build with learners for greater engagement.
Intended Outcome	If we achieve effective student engagement through critical thinking skills and real-world relevance through the application of global thinking (MYP) and the ability to look at and solve real-world predicable and unpredictable problems, then learners will apply these skills toward meeting the school's mission of preparing them, within three years, for participation in rigorous academic and vocational programs at any secondary school. Learners will also be prepared to achieve the school's vision of equipping them with knowledge, skills, and a desire to succeed, preparing them for a future that includes high school graduation, college and workforce readiness, and citizenship that promotes positive social change. The intended outcome will be increased attendance by 2% school-wide, reduction of discipline referrals by 5%, and a reduction of unit deficient learners by 25%.
Point Person	Brian Greene (brian.greene@marion.k12.fl.us)
Action Step	
Description	1. Monthly (20 day) ongoing plan of MYP implementation, focusing year 1 on the Learner Profile and unit plans. 2. Monthly (20 day) ongoing plan of Rigor, Relevance, Relationship-Student Engagement planning implementation; focusing year 1 on the three staff identified components of the nine component rubric. 3. Planning professional development focused on allignment to the MYP framework with a focus on Rigor, Relevance, and Student Engagement.
Person Responsible	Brian Greene (brian.greene@marion.k12.fl.us)
Plan to Monitor Effectiveness	
Description	Weekly instructional focus meetings to monitor implementation, build professional development, and plan for ongoing teacher support.
Person Responsible	Brian Greene (brian.greene@marion.k12.fl.us)

Activity #3	
Title	Through: Professional Development and Instructional Support
Rationale	Teacher time is limited and valuable. This time must be utilized in a way that focuses on learner achievement. Faculty meetings (i.e. trainings) and early release days are literacy and framework workshops focused on ambitious (rigorous) instruction through standards driven planning and teaching. Teachers need individual targeted instructional support around the goals of literacy, MYP, rigor and relevance as they implement those practices aligned to the schools goals. This support is not limited to single trainings, but a range of follow-up professional development based on individual teacher need. Additional support is important and is centered around collaborative teachers through high functioning Professional Learning Communities (PLCs). PLCs include the purpose of planning, reviewing student work, and addressing those students in need of further remediation alongside department and/or grade level peers.
Intended Outcome	If planning and instruction are aligned to the MYP framework and the Rigor, Relevance, Relationship-Student Engagement model, then Lake Weir Middle will have alignment to achieve the mission and vision of the school. The intended outcome is an increase of effective teaching practices as measured by the Marion County Instructional Evaluation System (MCIES) of 25% of the returning teachers, and an increase in effective lesson planning and Common Boards for learner clarity and formative assessment as measured by MCIES for 50% of the teaching staff. If individual teachers are supported based on their individual need of instructional improvement, then their instruction and impact on learner achievement will be more effective through standards-based lesson planning, and through high-quality professional development. The intended outcome is an increase in teacher effectiveness within their instructional practice, as measured by MCIES upon individualized support aligned to teacher Will, Skill, and Professional Development needs.
Point Person	Brian Greene (brian.greene@marion.k12.fl.us)

Action Step	
Description	1. Weekly instructional focus meetings to plan professional development based around the school literacy, MYP, and rigor/relevance/relationship-student engagment goals. 2. Follow-up from all professional development for classroom implementation. 3. Additional professional development developed for deepening planning and implementation of the schools goals. 4. Monitoring plan for each classroom instructor built around weekly, bi-weekly, and monthly teacher support. 5. Individual teacher plan that identifies instructional needs and related support to assist with those needs (i.e. professional development, monitoring, method of feedback). 6. Weekly instructional focus meetings with Content Area Specialists and school leadership to plan for teacher professional development and overall suppoert the teacher is in need of. 7. Weekly assistance with facilitation of PLCs from a leadership team member.
Person Responsible	Brian Greene (brian.greene@marion.k12.fl.us)

Plan to Monitor Effectiveness	
Description	Classroom walkthroughs, teacher lesson plans, and checks for understanding from professional development trainings. As well as a weekly review of the teacher monitoring plan. Planning template aligned to best practice for professional development/workshops

for teacher training. Classroom walkthrough data to support needs for training and follow-up training.

Person Responsible   Brian Greene (brian.greene@marion.k12.fl.us)

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 Pilot SIP to satisfy the requirements of the schoolwide program plan, as outlined in the Every Student Succeeds Act, Public Law No. 114-95, Â§ 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.

Communication through email, phone calls, school website, twitter, newsletters, and conferences. Ongoing professional development centered around the importance of relationship building. Quarterly reviews to identify students in need to plan and keep them on track for progression to high school in 3 years (schools mission).

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.

The school has several mentoring programs:
Deans meet with Tier 2-Tier 3 behavior students on a monthly basis for goal setting and behavior modification.
Daily "check in-check out" procedures are used.
School Counselors and Administration meet with select students on a monthly basis for goal setting and academic conversations.
School Counselors meet individually and in small groups to assist students and families in overcoming barriers to learning, both in and outside of the school.

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

Each incoming student cohort is provided support by the grade-level teachers, the grade-level school counselor (who follows the cohort), academic coaches, deans, and the administration. Teachers meet by team and grade level to ensure that the needs of the cohort are met and that the teachers are proactive in providing resources and support for the students. As each cohort moves throughout middle school, the students are provided support to prepare them for becoming high school students prepared for the level of academic rigor and ready to take advantage of the many opportunities available in high school. Close monitoring of course failures will occur at every leadership team meeting. Additionally a Graduation Coach has been hired with SIG 4 funds to assist student's in getting to high school.

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 focus of school leadership is the creation and maintenance of a safe, orderly, and supportive learning environment and the implementation of research based high effect teaching and learning strategies. Funds are prioritized for personnel followed by professional development. Administration is responsible for creating a year-long meeting schedule that addresses the diversity of faculty and student needs. Technology and media equipment is inventoried on an annual basis and the principal and Title I Instructional Support Personnel (ISP) meet to review how to apply resources for the highest impact.

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

The school recently lost its business partner due to a leadership change with the company. We are working closely with the Public Education Foundation to find another partner in education. Our mission is to prepare students within 3-years for rigorous academic success and industry certification at the high school level. Our mission supports our vision for students to graduate prepared for college and/or career readiness and success.

Part V: Budget	
Total:	**$199,625.00**