

The School Board of Highlands County

# Lake Placid Middle School



## 2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

## Table of Contents

<b>School Demographics</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>Title I Requirements</b>	<b>20</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>22</b>

# Lake Placid Middle School

201 S TANGERINE AVE, Lake Placid, FL 33852

<http://www.highlands.k12.fl.us/~lpm/>

## Demographics

**Principal: Hillary Hathaway**

Start Date for this Principal: 9/3/2019

<b>2019-20 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Middle School 6-8
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2018-19 Title I School</b>	Yes
<b>2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
<b>2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students* White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students*
<b>School Grades History</b>	2018-19: C (42%) 2017-18: C (50%) 2016-17: C (48%) 2015-16: C (50%) 2014-15: C (49%)
<b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>	
<b>SI Region</b>	Southwest
<b>Regional Executive Director</b>	
<b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>	N/A
<b>Year</b>	
<b>Support Tier</b>	

ESSA Status	TS&I
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, <a href="#">click here</a> .	

### School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Highlands County School Board on 10/8/2019.

### 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](http://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.

---

## Table of Contents

---

<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>Title I Requirements</b>	<b>20</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>22</b>

## Lake Placid Middle School

201 S TANGERINE AVE, Lake Placid, FL 33852

<http://www.highlands.k12.fl.us/~lpm/>

### School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2018-19 Title I School	2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Middle School 6-8	Yes	76%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	57%

### School Grades History

Year	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17	2015-16
Grade	C	C	C	C

### School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Highlands County School Board on 10/8/2019.

### 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.

With support from community stakeholders, parents, teachers, peers, and individual determination, EVERY student will graduate from LPMS, ready for high school, in three years.

#### Provide the school's vision statement.

What starts here, changes the world!

### 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
Sanchez, Jenn	Principal	Instructional Leader
Von Merveldt, Robyn	Instructional Coach	
McCarta, Susan	Instructional Coach	
Ridgeway, Elizabeth	Teacher, K-12	
McCabe, Lindsey	Teacher, K-12	
Morgan, Jesse	Teacher, K-12	
Cornell, Jenny	Assistant Principal	
Moran, Alecia	Teacher, K-12	
Simons, Beth	Teacher, K-12	
Johnson, Jeffery	Teacher, ESE	

### 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	268	232	191	0	0	0	0	691	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	54	54	47	0	0	0	0	155	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5	7	0	0	0	0	18	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	21	11	0	0	0	0	42	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	74	67	79	0	0	0	0	220	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		

**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	31	40	0	0	0	0	0	71

**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	17	12	2	0	0	0	0	31
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	19	3	0	0	0	0	38

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

47

**Date this data was collected or last updated**

Tuesday 9/3/2019

**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	21	21	28	0	0	0	0	70
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	60	73	70	0	0	0	0	203
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	4	3	0	0	0	0	13
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	64	73	45	0	0	0	0	182

**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	43	41	56	0	0	0	0	140

**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	21	21	28	0	0	0	0	70
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	60	73	70	0	0	0	0	203
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	4	3	0	0	0	0	13
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	64	73	45	0	0	0	0	182

**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	43	41	56	0	0	0	0	140

## 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	38%	45%	54%	43%	46%	52%
ELA Learning Gains	43%	47%	54%	48%	50%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	28%	36%	47%	33%	37%	44%
Math Achievement	47%	52%	58%	48%	51%	56%
Math Learning Gains	52%	52%	57%	48%	53%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	40%	40%	51%	46%	47%	50%
Science Achievement	33%	42%	51%	36%	37%	50%
Social Studies Achievement	57%	63%	72%	61%	58%	70%

### EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)			Total
	6	7	8	
Number of students enrolled	268 (0)	232 (0)	191 (0)	691 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	54 (21)	54 (21)	47 (28)	155 (70)
One or more suspensions	6 (60)	5 (73)	7 (70)	18 (203)
Course failure in ELA or Math	10 (6)	21 (4)	11 (3)	42 (13)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	74 (64)	67 (73)	79 (45)	220 (182)
	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
	0 (0)	0 (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.

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	37%	44%	-7%	54%	-17%
	2018	32%	44%	-12%	52%	-20%
Same Grade Comparison		5%				

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	32%	40%	-8%	52%	-20%
	2018	39%	39%	0%	51%	-12%
Same Grade Comparison		-7%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2019	40%	46%	-6%	56%	-16%
	2018	55%	53%	2%	58%	-3%
Same Grade Comparison		-15%				
Cohort Comparison		1%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2019	37%	44%	-7%	55%	-18%
	2018	34%	44%	-10%	52%	-18%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	39%	49%	-10%	54%	-15%
	2018	52%	48%	4%	54%	-2%
Same Grade Comparison		-13%				
Cohort Comparison		5%				
08	2019	47%	44%	3%	46%	1%
	2018	35%	36%	-1%	45%	-10%
Same Grade Comparison		12%				
Cohort Comparison		-5%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2019	31%	41%	-10%	48%	-17%
	2018	47%	43%	4%	50%	-3%
Same Grade Comparison		-16%				
Cohort Comparison						

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

CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	55%	60%	-5%	71%	-16%
2018	58%	54%	4%	71%	-13%
Compare		-3%			
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	98%	52%	46%	61%	37%
2018	68%	53%	15%	62%	6%
Compare		30%			
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018	100%	56%	44%	56%	44%

## 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 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	17	28	20	20	29	25	23	39			
ELL	8	33	31	21	31	38		40			
BLK	21	37	26	15	32	32	18	33			
HSP	33	43	32	43	51	40	27	53	31		
MUL	50	38		50	50						
WHT	48	45	24	59	58	46	41	69	52		
FRL	32	41	28	40	49	40	26	51	30		
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	19	44	50	23	44	33	17	22			
ELL	14	35	31	24	31	43	9	20			
BLK	25	54	50	28	42	50	32	41			
HSP	35	44	47	45	47	47	40	53	58		
MUL	46	46		46	54						
WHT	53	51	55	54	51	49	57	68	52		
FRL	35	45	48	42	46	47	37	51	53		

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	12	36	33	15	45	43	18	20			
ELL	18	39	29	18	29	29	20	36			
BLK	25	40	36	30	45	44	10	53	67		
HSP	38	44	28	42	50	50	35	52	81		
MUL	75	67		75	67						
WHT	48	51	36	55	48	42	43	68	69		
FRL	36	45	32	41	47	45	30	54	73		

### 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	42
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	5
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	33
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	415
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	25
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	29
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	
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%	

Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	27
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	39
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	47
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	
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%	
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	49
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	37
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

## 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 data component showing the lowest performance was in seventh grade ELA with 32% proficiency. One significant issue was that the curriculum used, Springboard, lacked alignment to the state standards, particularly in the grade seven textbook and accompanying resources. We had one new teacher at the seventh grade level. In addition, our literacy coach, who is a very strong, supportive team leader was out on extended leave. LPM had only one teacher in the entire content area returning to a grade level in which they had experience and each teacher struggled independently and as a group fully grasping the content, standards, and other requirements of the content area.

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

The data component that showed the greatest decline from the previous year was 8th grade science. The factors contributing to this decline are a bit ambiguous. The curriculum remained the same, the teachers remained the same, there were no major schedule changes from the previous year. With the exception of the science team leader being out on extended maternity leave which left a leadership gap in the department, there were no other significant changes or diminished resources.

**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.**

The data component showing the lowest performance was in seventh grade ELA with 32% proficiency. One significant issue was that the curriculum used, Springboard, lacked alignment to the state standards, particularly in the grade seven textbook and accompanying resources. We had one new teacher at the seventh grade level. In addition, our literacy coach, who is a very strong, supportive team leader was out on extended leave. LPM had only one teacher in the entire content area returning to a grade level in which they had experience and each teacher struggled independently and as a group fully grasping the content, standards, and other requirements of the content area.

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

The data component that showed the most improvement was Algebra 1. There were several factors that contributed this improvement. 1) all students going into Algebra 1 were required to complete a summer math course that included needed standards that had not been taught in their previous math curriculum 2) there was consistent monitoring and quick intervention for students who were struggling or whose work revealed gaps in learning 3) a 30-minute advisory class was built into the master schedule and students needing assistance had an opportunity each day to get assistance on an as-needed basis and were placed in this support class as needed by teachers, self, and/or math coach

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

The two largest areas of concern are the number of students with more than one suspension and the number of students achieving at level one on a statewide assessment.

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

1. Increase student exposure to complex, grade level text and engage in text dependent, frequent, interactive tasks.
2. Severely limit professional development initiatives and keep all such activities specifically and explicitly aligned to school goals (student academic achievement, building relationships through restorative practices, curriculum aligned to standards).
3. Implement restorative practices to increase positive student relationships and decrease discipline practices that remove students from instructional time with qualified teachers.
4. Consistent, authentic use of the Instructional Practice Guides (IPG) in content area classroom coaching, modeling, and observations.
- 5.

### **Part III: Planning for Improvement**

**Areas of Focus:**

#1	
<b>Title</b>	Building a Culture of Literacy
<b>Rationale</b>	Student achievement, both with regard to proficiency and learning gains (overall and in lowest quartile) are below state average levels.
<b>State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve</b>	Our goal is a 3-5% increase in all content areas assessed by statewide assessments in proficiency and learning gains (overall and in the lowest quartile).
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome</b>	Robyn Von Merveldt (vonmervr@highlands.k12.fl.us)
<b>Evidence-based Strategy</b>	Use grade-level, complex text on a consistent basis in all content areas. Complex text should be used to create rigorous, text-dependent and text-specific tasks specific to the chosen text(s).
<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy</b>	According to a research study by education non-profit, TNTP, "The Opportunity Myth", students will comply with teachers and complete work that is asked of them. One of the biggest impediments to academic achievement is that teachers frequently assign work that does not require students to work at grade level on rigorous, text-based tasks. As a result, students are completing low-rigor, below grade level practice and are consequently not successful on statewide and nationwide assessments.. This impediment, according to the research, is more significant in minority sub-population groups.
<b>Action Step</b>	
<b>Description</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Train staff to build and maintain an effective professional learning community</li> <li>2. Implement components of "Focus" by Mike Schmoker</li> <li>3. Review work with TNTP (processes and results)</li> <li>4. Continue work with TNTP's "The Opportunity Myth"</li> <li>5. Continually monitor, assess, and adjust during weekly coaching PLC meetings and through consistent review of lesson plans for inclusion and classroom use of complex, grade level texts and related text-dependent tasks</li> </ol>
<b>Person Responsible</b>	Jenn Sanchez (sanchezj@highlands.k12.fl.us)



#2	
<b>Title</b>	Grade-Level, Standards-Based Curriculum
<b>Rationale</b>	Student achievement in all content areas, both with regard to proficiency and learning gains (overall and in lowest quartile) are below state average levels.
<b>State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve</b>	<p>Our goal is a 5% increase in all content areas assessed by statewide assessments in proficiency and learning gains (overall and in the lowest quartile). Example of proficiency scores below.</p> <p>ELA Proficiency            SWD 17 to 22%            ELL 8 to 13%            BLK/AA 21 to 26%            HSP 33 to 38%            EDS 32 to 37%</p> <p>Math Proficiency            SWD 20 to 25%            ELL 21 to 26%            BLK/AA 15 to 21%            HSP 43 to 48%            EDS 40 to 45%</p>
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome</b>	Robyn Von Merveldt (vonmervr@highlands.k12.fl.us)
<b>Evidence-based Strategy</b>	Professional Learning Communities are a source of frequent, consistent professional development, increasing the opportunity to develop, augment, and refine curriculum, and continually assess learning through the use of common assessment, student data and artifact analysis, monitoring, and adjustment for improved learning.
<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy</b>	LPM is in year six of PLC implementation. This year, we've added one day (minimum) of coaching PLC with additional days as needed in grade level, common content groups. Our master schedule reflects our commitment to the PLC model by including common planning periods for all same content grade level teachers. "Learning by Doing" by Rick DuFour and "Focus" by Mike Schomker serve as our guides for understanding and furthering our work with curriculum and instruction that is standards-based and measurable.
<b>Action Step</b>	
<b>Description</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Train PLC model during in county-wide training</li> <li>2. Train whole-school on "Focus" by Mike Schmoker</li> <li>3. Whole-staff development of school-wide goals for the purpose of common understanding and common commitment to achievement goals</li> <li>4. Work weekly in PLCs to review curriculum, instruction, and assessment data in order to monitor and make data-based adjustments to improve student academic achievement.</li> <li>5. Continued use of "Learning by Doing" by Rick DuFour as a guide for PLC growth</li> </ol>
<b>Person Responsible</b>	Jenn Sanchez (sanchezj@highlands.k12.fl.us)

#3	
<b>Title</b>	Building Relationships
<b>Rationale</b>	LPMS has a significant number of students with 1 or more suspensions that remove them from instruction by a qualified instructor.
<b>State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve</b>	Reduce overall suspensions by 10% by the end of the school year.
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome</b>	Jenny Cornell (cornellj@highlands.k12.fl.us)
<b>Evidence-based Strategy</b>	Work with Rufus Lott III to implement and execute changes to traditional disciplinary responses by initiating restorative practice components and applying them in the decision-making process.
<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Rufus Lott, trainer, Restorative Practices</li> <li>2. Small group book club "Better Than Sticks or Carrots" by Dominique Smith, Fisher, and Frey</li> <li>3. Small group book club "Lost at School" by Ross Greene</li> </ol>
<b>Action Step</b>	
<b>Description</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Attend initial training with Rufus Lott III</li> <li>2. Implement preliminary restorative practice components such as relationship contracts and circle time questioning</li> <li>3. Follow-up training for administrators with Rufus Lott</li> <li>4. Day-long staff training with Rufus Lott, followed by continued implementation of restorative</li> <li>5. Apply coaching model in classroom observations and follow-up conversations to monitor and adjust classroom implementation</li> </ol>
<b>Person Responsible</b>	Jenn Sanchez (sanchezj@highlands.k12.fl.us)

#4	
<b>Title</b>	Increase Achievement in Sub-Populations
<b>Rationale</b>	Student achievement, both with regard to proficiency and learning gains (overall and in lowest quartile) are below state average levels in the following sub-populations per ESSA caluculations: Students with Disabilities, English Language Learners, Black/African American Students, Hispanic Students, and Economically Disadvantaged Students. Scores will increase by 5%-7% in each area.
<b>State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve</b>	SWD 25 to 30% ELL 29 to 34% BLK/AA 27 to 34% HSP 39 to 46% EDS 37 to 42%
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome</b>	Jenny Cornell (cornellj@highlands.k12.fl.us)
<b>Evidence-based Strategy</b>	Professional Learning Community (PLCs) with common planning time School-wide reading initiative Focused advisory time with data-based remediation
<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy</b>	PLCs - Professional Learning Communities are a source of frequent, consistent professional development, increasing the opportunity to develop, augment, and refine curriculum, and continually assess learning through the use of common assessment, student data and artifact analysis, monitoring, and adjustment for improved learning. Reading Initiative - Students will be provided with 90-minutes weekly of reading time in order to build stamina in reading longer, more complex selections Advisory time - Students with remediation needs will be provided with 40+ minutes weekly in a specifically selected, small group remediation with a certified teacher.
<b>Action Step</b>	
<b>Description</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Train PLC model during in county-wide training and determine placements for 1st cycle advisories.</li> <li>2. Train whole-school on "Focus" by Mike Schmoker and review best practices for small group remediation</li> <li>3. Whole-staff development of school-wide goals for the purpose of common understanding and common commitment to achievement goals</li> <li>4. Work weekly in PLCs to review curriculum, instruction, and assessment data in order to monitor and make data-based adjustments to improve student academic achievement. Use gathered data to inform advisory teachers of progress and gaps</li> <li>5. Continued use of "Learning by Doing" by Rick DuFour as a guide for PLC growth</li> </ol>
<b>Person Responsible</b>	Jenn Sanchez (sanchezj@highlands.k12.fl.us)
<b>Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities (optional)</b>	

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

1.

## Part IV: Title I Requirements

### Additional Title I Requirements

This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A schoolwide program and opts to use the Schoolwide Improvement Plan to satisfy the requirements of the schoolwide program plan, as outlined in the Every Student Succeeds Act, Public Law No. 114-95, 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.**

Lake Placid Middle school employs a variety of structures to build and maintain communication with all stakeholders. We believe in frequent communication with parents. In order to build this strategy, we have several measures in place: a frequently updated webpage, a FaceBook page where we share important information and celebrate student and teacher achievement. We use Blackboard Connect Ed, a calling and texting service that auto-calls all parents on our roster with important upcoming or emergency events.

This year, we are excited to continue with our Parent Volunteer Organization (PVO). We have an active School Advisory Committee (SAC) which we have restructured to support our internal Transformation Teams, each of which focuses on one of the following: Community Outreach, Community and Culture (internal culture building), and PBiS (positive behavior reinforcement). Administration has been very supportive of any and all parent willingness to be involved in the school's success . LPMS keeps parents informed of their students progress by complying with district deadlines for progress reports and report cards and follows-up frequently to ensure that all teachers are current with their grading and uploading of two grades minimum per week.

Data letters go out three times yearly with current progress monitoring data, student/teacher goals, and an explanation of what the data mean and what expectations are for students. Access information for Skyward - LPMS's electronic grade book - is provided on the web page and Facebook page. From Skyward, parents can see real-time grade information from any computer or smart phone with internet access.

#### **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 responsive services that we provide that assist students who need immediate help due to social-emotional needs are: Individual and small group counseling, crisis counseling (intervening, debriefing, or teaching prevention strategies), consulting and collaborating (with the students and those who also work with the students), and making referrals (for those students with more serious disorders that require more in-depth or long term counseling). MTSS team meets monthly to discuss students with barriers to academic and social success. Check-in, check-out, and Blackboard Connect Ed policies in place to track attendance and notify parents of absences. LPMS works with the Highlands County School Board Mentorship. This program targets at-risk students and pairs them with trained mentors. The mentors and mentees meet weekly to review grades, attendance, discipline, and other factors that impact achievement. The mentors encourage, explain, and communicate with teachers and parents in an attempt to help students meet their full potential.

We have a monthly Threat Assessment Team meeting to review student behaviors of students with recognized or suspected social and/or emotional issues that are documented and more extreme than typical behaviors. These issues are discussed in terms of progress made and support provided in order

to adjust supports as needed. In addition, all students will be receiving a minimum of 5 hours of instruction on the topics that were identified in legislation for the 2019-2020 school year.

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

Incoming sixth graders have two opportunities to become oriented to LPMS. First, prospective students come with their current 5th grade class for a visit during school hours. Students attend an assembly on academic, behavioral, and attendance expectations given by administration and guidance. During this time band and orchestra students give brief performances. Fifth grade students then do a campus tour with members of NJHS or student government, visiting classrooms and points of interest.

The second opportunity for students to visit LPMS happens in the evening and parent attendance is encouraged. Again, academic, behavioral, and attendance expectations provided in a presentation by administration and guidance during a brief assembly. This is followed by parents and rising sixth graders visiting sixth grade teachers while adhering to a mock schedule. Teachers provide information about individual class expectations and supply lists.

Rising ninth graders have the opportunity to participate in similar activities offered by LPHS. In addition, guidance counselors from the high school make several visits to talk about academic opportunities and choices and programs that vary from the norm, such as the IB programme and the Career Academy. Counselors also come to help students design their schedules and answer questions that students may have about high school in general or LPHS specifically.

LPMS participates in active vertical articulation with our feeder elementary schools that are attended by guidance counselors, teachers, and Exceptional Student Education (ESE) specialists in order to provide information about our rising 6th grade students.

**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 principal, assistant principal, and literacy coaches (math and reading) meet several times weekly to review student artifacts, data, and progress within the curricula. They identify areas of concern and analyze possible solutions for effectiveness and efficiency. LPMS has one coaching Professional Learning Community (PLC) meeting weekly for each content area. These meetings are attended by each grade-level, content team, the resource coach for that team, and an administrator. In these meetings, student artifacts, data, standards alignment to texts, tasks, and goals of the course.

The Curriculum Leadership Team (CLT) members meet once per month to discuss district policy news and adjustments. The team also meets every other Monday (or as needed) to discuss building work and needs. With a large number of new staff this year, LPMS is very focused on providing sufficient support for teachers new to our team.

The district leadership team (iTRT, science, math, reading content area specialists) visits the school on a quarterly and as-needed basis to discuss current data, trends, and student needs based on that information. All parties are immediately accessible by e-mail or phone. Administrators and LCRT have an open-door policy and all parties are encouraged to bring concerns as they arise. LPMS is committed to using student data to guide curriculum and instruction at the school and use the information to increase student achievement. All funds are coordinated through the School Board of Highlands County.

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

Students in all grade levels select electives based on their interests. These courses include: Band, Orchestra, Drama, Art, Agricultural Science, physical education and/or Computer Applications. In

addition, 8th grade students are required to take a Career Planning class that focuses on seeking and sustaining employment. Career Planning also includes the development of a four-year high school plan. Guidance Counselors work with both students and elective teachers in assisting students in developing their four-year plans. Selected students also have the opportunity to participate in LPMS's AVID program. AVID focuses on self-monitoring of self-determined goals. LPMS is using Collections as our Language Arts curriculum. We use the county-adopted Eureka Math for our math curricula (Big Ideas for Algebra). Both are rigorous language arts programs that prepares students for the expectations of college and career. Elective and all other teachers are encouraged to bring in guest speakers and loaned artifacts to support college and career. LPMS is also an Achievement Via Individual Determination (AVID) school and we adhere to the many tenets of that program including open access with regard to advanced and rigorous course work to all students.

## Part V: Budget

**The approved budget does not reflect any amendments submitted for this project.**

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Building a Culture of Literacy	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Grade-Level, Standards-Based Curriculum	\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Building Relationships	\$0.00
4	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Increase Achievement in Sub-Populations	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00