

Polk County Public Schools

Lawton Chiles Middle Academy



2018-19 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	3
School Information	4
Needs Assessment	6
Planning for Improvement	10
Title I Requirements	13
Budget to Support Goals	14

Lawton Chiles Middle Academy

400 FLORIDA AVE N, Lakeland, FL 33801

<http://www.lcmaknightsonline.com/>

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	No	43%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	52%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Polk County School Board on 1/15/2019.

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.

We are an internationally-minded community committed to fostering curious minds in an educational environment that produces resilient, respectful and empathetic students, empowering them to exemplify academic integrity and exhibit responsiveness to our ever-changing global community.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The Lawton Chiles Middle Academy family, consisting of students, faculty, staff, parents, and the community are partners in guiding our students' education by:

- Developing a high interest in all academic areas with an emphasis on math, science, and technology;
- Enabling students to maximize the development of their talents in music and the arts;
- Providing a safe and orderly environment that is student-centered;
- Promoting high expectations academically, socially and technologically;
- Equipping students to work at their highest capability;
- Stressing verbal and written communication;
- Focusing on the development of critical thinking and problem-solving skills;
- Integrating real world situation into the classrooms;
- Encouraging an acceptance of cultural differences, ideas, feelings and talents through cooperative learning and social skills development;
- Linking technology to learning in the classroom and developing proficiency in computer usage; and
- Demonstrating strong parent support and commitment for the education of their child.

School Leadership Team

Membership

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

Name	Title
Andrews, Brian J.	Principal
Price, Angela	Assistant Principal
Kallan, Susie	Instructional Coach
DiGioia, Michelle	Teacher, K-12
Tregler, Debbie	Teacher, K-12
Goleno, Jennifer	Other
MacDonald, Susan	Other
Lavelle, Erin	Teacher, K-12
Gibson, Theresa	Teacher, K-12
Simpson, Michael	Dean
Castillo, Raquel	Teacher, K-12

Duties

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

The School Leadership Team at Lawton Chiles Middle Academy is comprised of people holding the following positions: principal, assistant principal, MYP coordinator/Academic Coach, subject chairpersons, testing coordinator, media specialist, and dean. Our team meets monthly and more often as needed. During these meetings, we review, discuss, and determine revisions to our curriculum, to IB implementation, to safety issues, to our school improvement plan, and to our school's underachieving students. Members of the leadership team are responsible for sharing information and outcomes from these meetings with their respective departments and committees.

The team meets on a regular basis to guide and support weekly PLCs with teachers by subject area. Plans for promoting a rigorous yet attainable curriculum is discussed prior to meeting with weekly PLC groups and throughout the year. Data is a strong component of the team's efforts as they plan how they will assist classroom teachers in implementing standards while encouraging interdisciplinary units as appropriate.

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	18	16	21	0	0	0	0	55
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	17	11	0	0	0	0	42
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	3	0	0	0	0	7
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	26	24	8	0	0	0	0	58

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

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	8	9	12	0	0	0	0	29
Retained Students: Previous Year(s)	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	9	12	0	0	0	0	29

Date this data was collected

Tuesday 7/17/2018

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	4	2	0	0	0	0	13
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	9	12	0	0	0	0	32
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	6	7	0	0	0	0	16

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	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	4	2	0	0	0	0	13
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	9	12	0	0	0	0	32
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	6	7	0	0	0	0	16

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	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1

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?

The data component that performed the lowest was 6th grade ELA at 68% proficiency rate. There seems to be a trend with 6th grade students performing the lowest, however, last year 6th grade math had the lowest performance.

Which data component showed the greatest decline from prior year?

6th grade ELA showed the greatest decline from last year. A decrease of 13 points from 81% proficient to 68% proficient.

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

LCMA scored higher than the state average in every area. One area that can be focused on is learning gains. LCMA learning gains in ELA was 58% compared to the state's 54%. Lowest 25% learning gains for LCMA was 52% compared to the state's 47%.

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

6th grade math was the data component that showed the most improvement. LCMA made a 12 point increase from 71% proficient to 83% proficient.

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

Actions and changes that lead to 6th grade math improvement included teachers knowing students' data and using it to tutor students in deficiency areas. After school tutoring played a role in improving this area. Another strategy that was used was adding support staff to the math classrooms on daily basis from December to the testing window. Support staff included paraprofessional, ESOL para, LEA facilitator, testing coordinator, and school counselors. Imagine Math was also incorporated into the math classrooms.

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	77%	46%	53%	83%	48%	52%
ELA Learning Gains	58%	47%	54%	63%	51%	53%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	52%	42%	47%	59%	46%	45%
Math Achievement	87%	49%	58%	86%	47%	55%
Math Learning Gains	77%	51%	57%	74%	49%	55%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	77%	51%	51%	65%	45%	47%
Science Achievement	77%	47%	52%	75%	44%	50%
Social Studies Achievement	93%	86%	72%	96%	61%	67%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)			Total
	6	7	8	
Attendance below 90 percent	18 (0)	16 (0)	21 (0)	55 (0)
One or more suspensions	14 (7)	17 (4)	11 (2)	42 (13)
Course failure in ELA or Math	0 (11)	4 (9)	3 (12)	7 (32)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	26 (3)	24 (6)	8 (7)	58 (16)

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	68%	41%	27%	52%	16%
	2017	81%	45%	36%	52%	29%
Same Grade Comparison		-13%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2018	78%	42%	36%	51%	27%
	2017	85%	45%	40%	52%	33%
Same Grade Comparison		-7%				
Cohort Comparison		-3%				
08	2018	87%	49%	38%	58%	29%
	2017	82%	46%	36%	55%	27%
Same Grade Comparison		5%				
Cohort Comparison		2%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2018	83%	40%	43%	52%	31%
	2017	71%	39%	32%	51%	20%
Same Grade Comparison		12%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2018	78%	40%	38%	54%	24%
	2017	81%	40%	41%	53%	28%
Same Grade Comparison		-3%				
Cohort Comparison		7%				
08	2018	86%	34%	52%	45%	41%
	2017	87%	36%	51%	46%	41%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison		5%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2018	77%	42%	35%	50%	27%
	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	93%	84%	9%	71%	22%
2017	95%	62%	33%	69%	26%
Compare		-2%			
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	100%	60%	40%	62%	38%
2017	100%	43%	57%	60%	40%
Compare		0%			
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2018	100%	41%	59%	56%	44%
2017	100%	34%	66%	53%	47%
Compare		0%			

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	32	33	29	44	71	73					
ELL	31	44	38	47	66	67		63			
ASN	86	61		98	91		91	94	100		
BLK	57	50	49	76	78	84	59	86	56		
HSP	68	55	54	75	73	71	56	86	71		
MUL	78	65		88	69						
WHT	87	61	51	94	76	80	84	99	87		
FRL	62	48	47	76	75	77	58	86	63		
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	47	80	83	33	33	40					
ELL	33	63	61	37	34	27					
ASN	89	78		90	74		87	100	97		
BLK	72	66	65	69	63	69	61	89	25		
HSP	71	63	58	71	54	45	78	92	41		

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
MUL	95	68		95	74						
WHT	90	74	67	91	72	68	91	97	69		
FRL	70	66	63	65	57	55	57	90	38		

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	ELA
Rationale	6th grade ELA was lowest proficiency rate with a decrease of 13 points from 81% to 68%. This cohort of students are our rising 7th graders.
Intended Outcome	Increase overall ELA proficiency rate from 77% to 80%.
Point Person	Susie Kallan (susie.kallan@polk-fl.net)
Action Step	
Description	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- Implement Learning Science International (LSI) practices: LSI team will attend professional learning and create a plan of action for the school to incorporate LSI strategies. LSI empowers schools to strengthen core instruction resulting in student achievement gains.- PLCs for ELA teachers focused on breaking down standards, aligning IB components with standards, and analyzing student work led by academic coach, department head, and administration weekly on Mondays.- Weekly Guided Common Planning to ensure MYP unit plans are aligned with standards led by academic coach, department head, and administration.- Data chats with teachers from administration and testing coordinator. Student data chats with teachers. Data chats occur monthly.- ELA data displayed in secure location.- ELA interdisciplinary strategies: reading strategies across content areas such as science and social studies, meaningful content within the reading classroom that students are currently learning in other subject areas, such as previewing science and civics text for vocabulary and content- Peer observations within department monthly.
Person Responsible	Susie Kallan (susie.kallan@polk-fl.net)
Plan to Monitor Effectiveness	
Description	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- Administrative observations and interactive conversations with teachers regarding individual students.- Individual and group reflections- STAR progress monitoring by teachers, administration and students- Lesson plans- MYP Unit Plans
Person Responsible	Angela Price (angela.price@polk-fl.net)

Activity #2	
Title	Underachieving Gifted Students
Rationale	21% of our gifted students scored a level 2 or 3 on the Spring 2018 FSA ELA.
Intended Outcome	Decrease by 5% of gifted students scoring Level 2 or 3 on FSA ELA.
Point Person	Shelly Fountain (shelley.fountain@polk-fl.net)
Action Step	
Description	Goal: increase 1 level on FSA for underachieving gifted students for all grade levels - Gifted Coach monitor student progress by mentoring and data chats with students once every 4 weeks. - Gifted Coach pull small groups of 66 6th grade students to mentor - Reading strategies in Social Studies cluster classrooms and gifted elective classroom - Gifted Coach model lessons incorporating reading strategies in clustered Social Studies classrooms quarterly
Person Responsible	Shelly Fountain (shelley.fountain@polk-fl.net)
Plan to Monitor Effectiveness	
Description	- Achievement on progress monitoring will be reviewed regularly - Monitoring gifted students grades and growth - Observations
Person Responsible	Brian J. Andrews (brian.andrews@polk-fl.net)

Activity #3

Title ELA Lowest 25% Learning Gains

Rationale 2016-2017 ELA learning gains for the lowest 25% was 64%, 2017-2018 ELA learning gains for the lowest 25% was 52%.

Intended Outcome Increase ELA learning gains for the lowest 25% by 4 points, moving from 52% to 56%.

Point Person Jennifer Goleno (jennifer.goleno@polk-fl.net)

Action Step

Description

- Identify students in the lowest 25% and determine how many cells are affected by them. For example, ELA achievement, ELA learning gains, ELL, etc.)
- Guide teachers during preplanning and Data Day to make connections to lowest 25% data, determine interventions as grade levels of teachers who share these students, and make school-wide recommendations to assist these students.
- Assign teacher mentor to each student in lowest 25%. Teacher build relationship/rapport, mentor, and have data conversations with students twice every nine weeks at minimum.
- Guidance intervention for targeted students, including intentional seating in the classroom and having students set goals on assessments and assignments
- Tutoring opportunities within the school day and after school.

Person Responsible Angela Price (angela.price@polk-fl.net)

Plan to Monitor Effectiveness

Description

- Achievement on STAR progress monitoring will be reviewed by teachers, students, and administration at progress monitoring points
- Monitoring grades weekly by guidance department
- Observations

Person Responsible Brian J. Andrews (brian.andrews@polk-fl.net)

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.

NA

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.

NA

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

NA

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.

NA

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

NA

Part V: Budget

Total:	\$0.00
--------	--------