**The School District of Palm Beach County** 

# **Lantana Middle School**



2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

# **Table of Contents**

| School Demographics            | 3  |
|--------------------------------|----|
|                                |    |
| Purpose and Outline of the SIP | 4  |
|                                |    |
| School Information             | 7  |
|                                |    |
| Needs Assessment               | 10 |
|                                |    |
| Planning for Improvement       | 16 |
|                                |    |
| Title I Requirements           | 18 |
|                                |    |
| Budget to Support Goals        | 20 |

# **Lantana Middle School**

1225 W DREW ST, Lantana, FL 33462

https://lanm.palmbeachschools.org

# **Demographics**

Principal: Edward Burke

| Start Date for this F | Principal | l: 7/7/2008 |
|-----------------------|-----------|-------------|
|-----------------------|-----------|-------------|

| 2019-20 Status<br>(per MSID File)   | Active  |
|---|---|
| School Type and Grades Served<br>(per MSID File)  | Middle School<br>6-8  |
| Primary Service Type<br>(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 below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Native American Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students |
| School Grades History   | 2018-19: B (55%)<br>2017-18: B (55%)<br>2016-17: C (50%)<br>2015-16: C (51%)<br>2014-15: B (54%)  |
| 2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Info  | rmation*  |
| SI Region   | Southeast   |
| Regional Executive Director   | LaShawn Russ-Porterfield  |
| Turnaround Option/Cycle   | N/A   |
| Year  |   |
| Support Tier  |   |

| ESSA Status  | TS&I                             |
|--|----------------------------------|
| * As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. Fo | or more information, click here. |

### **School Board Approval**

This plan is pending approval by the Palm Beach 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 <a href="https://www.floridacims.org">www.floridacims.org</a>.

### **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**

| Purpose and Outline of the SIP | 4  |
|--------------------------------|----|
|                                |    |
| School Information             | 7  |
|                                |    |
| Needs Assessment               | 10 |
|                                |    |
| Planning for Improvement       | 16 |
|                                |    |
| Title I Requirements           | 18 |
|                                |    |
| Budget to Support Goals        | 20 |

### **Lantana Middle School**

1225 W DREW ST, Lantana, FL 33462

https://lanm.palmbeachschools.org

### **School Demographics**

| School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File) | 2018-19 Title I School | Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)              |
|---|------------------------|---|
| Middle School<br>6-8                          | Yes                    | 93%   |
| Primary Service Type<br>(per MSID File)       | Charter School         | 2018-19 Minority Rate<br>(Reported as Non-white<br>on Survey 2) |
| K-12 General Education                        | No                     | 90%   |
| School Grades History                         |                        |   |

2017-18

В

2016-17

C

2015-16

C

### **School Board Approval**

Year

**Grade** 

This plan is pending approval by the Palm Beach County School Board.

2018-19

В

### **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 <a href="https://www.floridaCIMS.org">https://www.floridaCIMS.org</a>.

### 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.

Lantana Community Middle School Mission Statement

The mission of Lantana Middle Community School is to promote academic excellence, encourage an appreciation of our multi-cultural society and respect for others, develop lifelong learning skills, facilitate increased technological literacy, cultivate school and community partnerships, and foster growth among faculty and administrators in a positive, safe environment;

In order to achieve our mission, the school will become a learning center where:

- 1. Students will demonstrate mastery of basic skills taught by teachers using the Florida state standards.
- 2. Staff and students will encourage and demonstrate problem solving and critical thinking skills.
- 3. Staff and students will have access to and become proficient in using technology.
- 4. Administration will offer classes on a wide variety of levels to meet the needs of all students.
- 5. Staff will participate in a wide variety of professional growth opportunities to help meet the needs of our changing population.
- 6. Staff will encourage community involvement to develop community and school partnerships.

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

Lantana Middle School Vision Statement

Lantana Middle School subscribes to the vision of the School District of Palm Beach County, of a dynamic collaborative multicultural community where education and lifelong learning are valued and supported, and all learners reach their highest potential and succeed in the global economy.

#### 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   |
|---------------------|------------------------|---|
| Burke,<br>Edward    | Principal              | Provide strategic direction in the school system. Develop standardized curricula, assess teaching methods, monitor student achievement, encourage parent involvement, revise policies and procedures, administer the budget, hire and evaluate staff and oversee facilities. Other important duties entail developing safety protocols and emergency response procedures.   |
| Rodriguez,<br>Jose  | Assistant<br>Principal | Assists the principal in the discharge of his/her duties at all times and acts in the capacity of the principal during the principal's absence from the school. Monitor student achievement; encourage parent involvement; oversee facilities; entail developing safety protocols and emergency response procedures; counseling; and discipline. Assists in the role of instructional leader to promote student behavior that is supportive, and conducive, to the implementation of the school's instructional programs and goals. |
| Vazquez,<br>David   | Assistant<br>Principal | Assists the principal in the discharge of his/her duties at all times and acts in the capacity of the principal during the principal's absence from the school. Monitor student achievement; encourage parent involvement; oversee facilities; entail developing safety protocols and emergency response procedures; counseling; and discipline. Assists in the role of instructional leader to promote student behavior that is supportive, and conducive, to the implementation of the school's instructional programs and goals. |
| Simmonds,<br>Janina | Assistant<br>Principal | Assists the principal in the discharge of his/her duties at all times and acts in the capacity of the principal during the principal's absence from the school. Monitor student achievement; encourage parent involvement; oversee facilities; entail developing safety protocols and emergency response procedures; counseling; and discipline. Assists in the role of instructional leader to promote student behavior that is supportive, and conducive, to the implementation of the school's instructional programs and goals. |
| Davis,<br>Nicole    | Instructional<br>Coach | Develop, lead and evaluate school core content standards/programs, and identify and analyze math content/lessons to support data driven decisions in professional learning committees meetings. Identify systematic patterns of student need to identify appropriate intervention strategies. Design and implement progress monitoring, data collection, and data analysis; participate in the design and delivery of professional development; and provide support for assessment and implementation monitoring.                   |
| Peterson,<br>Jordan | Instructional<br>Coach | Provide teachers with instructional leadership and support for the continuous academic improvement in accordance with Florida Standards. The coach provides modeling and coaching for small group instruction. Additionally, the coach will assist in the implementation of progress monitoring, data collection, and data analysis; participate int he design and delivery of professional development; and provide support for assessment and implementation monitoring. The coach will guide teachers in effectively using       |

| Name                   | Title               | Job Duties and Responsibilities   |
|------------------------|---------------------|---|
|                        |                     | data to make adjustments to instruction and successful alignment and implementation of school improvement decisions.  |
| Scuillo,<br>Mary Ellen | Teacher,<br>ESE     | Responsible for scheduling and conducting change of placements, eligibility staffing's, and Individual Education Plan (IEP) meetings. Monitors the school's compliance with rules and regulations. Conducts FBA's on students referred by SBT/RTI process.  |
| Cohen,<br>Nicole       | School<br>Counselor | Responsible for the school choice, transfer, and student assignment processes, including planning, communication, implementation, record-keeping, and evaluation of services. Assist families with school choice, student assignment, and enrollment processes. Work collaborativelyy with administrators, school psychologists, instructional coaches, teachers, parents and staff to design, implement, and monitor interventions designed to help students achieve academic success.   |
| Wilson,<br>Fred        | Dean                | Responsible for attendance, discipline, safety, and related student personnel services and performs the duties within the authority and responsibility delegated by the Principal. Investigate, adjudicate, and monitor minor infractions of the school code in the form of progressive discipline such as detentions, classroom referrals, and in-school suspension. Serves as the Afterschool Director, where he responsible for maintaining the coordination, implementation, and administration of all enrichment, academic, and recreational programs. |

# **Early Warning Systems**

### **Current Year**

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

| Indicator                       |   | Grade Level |   |   |   |   |     |     |     |   |    |    |    |       |  |
|---------------------------------|---|-------------|---|---|---|---|-----|-----|-----|---|----|----|----|-------|--|
| mulcator                        | K | 1           | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6   | 7   | 8   | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total |  |
| Number of students enrolled     | 0 | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 312 | 281 | 314 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 907   |  |
| Attendance below 90 percent     | 0 | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 31  | 38  | 470 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 539   |  |
| One or more suspensions         | 0 | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 51  | 67  | 105 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 223   |  |
| Course failure in ELA or Math   | 0 | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 63  | 50  | 68  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 181   |  |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0 | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 115 | 136 | 125 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 376   |  |

### The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

| Indicator                            | Grade Level |   |   |   |   |   |    |    |     |   |    |    |    | Total |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|-----|---|----|----|----|-------|
| mulcator                             | 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 | 70 | 78 | 100 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 248   |

### The number of students identified as retainees:

| Indicator                           | Grade Level |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |    |    | Total |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
| 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 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 2     |
| Students retained two or more times | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 2     |

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

81

### Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 9/11/2019

### Prior Year - As Reported

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

| Indicator                       |   | Grade Level |   |   |   |   |     |     |     |   |    |    |    |       |  |
|---------------------------------|---|-------------|---|---|---|---|-----|-----|-----|---|----|----|----|-------|--|
| indicator                       | K | 1           | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6   | 7   | 8   | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total |  |
| Attendance below 90 percent     | 0 | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 37  | 42  | 49  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 128   |  |
| One or more suspensions         | 0 | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 49  | 63  | 71  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 183   |  |
| Course failure in ELA or Math   | 0 | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 91  | 97  | 53  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 241   |  |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0 | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 142 | 127 | 117 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 386   |  |

### The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

| Indicator                            |   |   |   |   |   | ( | Grad | e Le | vel |   |    |    |    | Total |
|--------------------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|------|------|-----|---|----|----|----|-------|
| 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 | 92   | 92   | 81  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 265   |

### **Prior Year - Updated**

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

| Indicator                       |   |   |   |   |   |   | Grac | le Lev | el  |   |    |    |    | Total |
|---------------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|------|--------|-----|---|----|----|----|-------|
| Indicator                       | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6    | 7      | 8   | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total |
| Attendance below 90 percent     | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 37   | 42     | 49  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 128   |
| One or more suspensions         | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 49   | 63     | 71  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 183   |
| Course failure in ELA or Math   | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 91   | 97     | 53  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 241   |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 142  | 127    | 117 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 386   |

### The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

| Indicator                            | Grade Level |   |   |   |   |   |    |    |    |   |    | Total |    |       |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|---|----|-------|----|-------|
| 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 | 92 | 92 | 81 | 0 | 0  | 0     | 0  | 265   |

# 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).

| Sahaal Crada Company        |        | 2019     |       |        | 2018     |                             |
|-----------------------------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-----------------------------|
| School Grade Component      | School | District | State | School | District | 52% 54% 44% 56% 57% 50% 70% |
| ELA Achievement             | 46%    | 58%      | 54%   | 41%    | 56%      | 52%                         |
| ELA Learning Gains          | 59%    | 56%      | 54%   | 53%    | 57%      | 54%                         |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile  | 53%    | 49%      | 47%   | 39%    | 48%      | 44%                         |
| Math Achievement            | 47%    | 62%      | 58%   | 47%    | 61%      | 56%                         |
| Math Learning Gains         | 50%    | 60%      | 57%   | 51%    | 61%      | 57%                         |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 46%    | 53%      | 51%   | 39%    | 52%      | 50%                         |
| Science Achievement         | 44%    | 52%      | 51%   | 37%    | 53%      | 50%                         |
| Social Studies Achievement  | 68%    | 75%      | 72%   | 63%    | 76%      | 70%                         |

# **EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey**

| Indicator                       | Grade Le  | Grade Level (prior year reported) |           |           |  |  |  |  |  |
|---------------------------------|-----------|-----------------------------------|-----------|-----------|--|--|--|--|--|
| indicator                       | 6         | 7                                 | 8         | Total     |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number of students enrolled     | 312 (0)   | 281 (0)                           | 314 (0)   | 907 (0)   |  |  |  |  |  |
| Attendance below 90 percent     | 31 (37)   | 38 (42)                           | 470 (49)  | 539 (128) |  |  |  |  |  |
| One or more suspensions         | 51 (49)   | 67 (63)                           | 105 (71)  | 223 (183) |  |  |  |  |  |
| Course failure in ELA or Math   | 63 (91)   | 50 (97)                           | 68 (53)   | 181 (241) |  |  |  |  |  |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 115 (142) | 136 (127)                         | 125 (117) | 376 (386) |  |  |  |  |  |

### **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-<br>District<br>Comparison | State | School-<br>State<br>Comparison |
| 06           | 2019      | 41%    | 58%      | -17%                              | 54%   | -13%                           |
|              | 2018      | 36%    | 53%      | -17%                              | 52%   | -16%                           |
| Same Grade C | omparison | 5%     |          |                                   |       |                                |
| Cohort Com   | parison   |        |          |                                   |       |                                |
| 07           | 2019      | 45%    | 53%      | -8%                               | 52%   | -7%                            |
|              | 2018      | 40%    | 54%      | -14%                              | 51%   | -11%                           |
| Same Grade C | omparison | 5%     |          |                                   |       |                                |
| Cohort Com   | parison   | 9%     |          |                                   |       |                                |
| 08           | 2019      | 46%    | 58%      | -12%                              | 56%   | -10%                           |
|              | 2018      | 51%    | 60%      | -9%                               | 58%   | -7%                            |
| Same Grade C | omparison | -5%    |          |                                   |       |                                |
| Cohort Com   | parison   | 6%     |          |                                   | •     |                                |

|              |           |        | MATH     |                                   |       |                                |
|--------------|-----------|--------|----------|-----------------------------------|-------|--------------------------------|
| Grade        | Year      | School | District | School-<br>District<br>Comparison | State | School-<br>State<br>Comparison |
| 06           | 2019      | 35%    | 60%      | -25%                              | 55%   | -20%                           |
|              | 2018      | 40%    | 56%      | -16%                              | 52%   | -12%                           |
| Same Grade C | omparison | -5%    |          |                                   |       |                                |
| Cohort Com   | parison   |        |          |                                   |       |                                |
| 07           | 2019      | 14%    | 35%      | -21%                              | 54%   | -40%                           |
|              | 2018      | 18%    | 39%      | -21%                              | 54%   | -36%                           |
| Same Grade C | omparison | -4%    |          |                                   |       |                                |
| Cohort Com   | parison   | -26%   |          |                                   |       |                                |
| 08           | 2019      | 56%    | 64%      | -8%                               | 46%   | 10%                            |
|              | 2018      | 50%    | 65%      | -15%                              | 45%   | 5%                             |
| Same Grade C | omparison | 6%     | '        |                                   | · ·   |                                |
| Cohort Com   | parison   | 38%    |          |                                   |       |                                |

|              | SCIENCE   |        |          |                                   |       |                                |  |  |  |  |
|--------------|-----------|--------|----------|-----------------------------------|-------|--------------------------------|--|--|--|--|
| Grade        | Year      | School | District | School-<br>District<br>Comparison | State | School-<br>State<br>Comparison |  |  |  |  |
| 80           | 2019      | 41%    | 51%      | -10%                              | 48%   | -7%                            |  |  |  |  |
|              | 2018      | 39%    | 54%      | -15%                              | 50%   | -11%                           |  |  |  |  |
| Same Grade C | omparison | 2%     |          |                                   |       |                                |  |  |  |  |
| Cohort Com   | parison   |        |          |                                   |       |                                |  |  |  |  |

|      |        | BIOLO    | GY EOC                      |       |                          |
|------|--------|----------|-----------------------------|-------|--------------------------|
| Year | School | District | School<br>Minus<br>District | State | School<br>Minus<br>State |
| 2019 |        |          |                             |       |                          |
| 2018 |        |          |                             |       |                          |
|      |        | CIVIC    | CS EOC                      |       |                          |
| Year | School | District | School<br>Minus<br>District | State | School<br>Minus<br>State |
| 2019 | 65%    | 72%      | -7%                         | 71%   | -6%                      |
| 2018 | 58%    | 72%      | -14%                        | 71%   | -13%                     |
| Co   | ompare | 7%       |                             |       |                          |
|      |        | HISTO    | RY EOC                      |       |                          |
| Year | School | District | School<br>Minus<br>District | State | School<br>Minus<br>State |
| 2019 |        |          |                             |       |                          |
| 2018 |        |          |                             |       |                          |
|      |        | ALGE     | BRA EOC                     | _     |                          |
| Year | School | District | School<br>Minus<br>District | State | School<br>Minus<br>State |
| 2019 | 76%    | 64%      | 12%                         | 61%   | 15%                      |

|      |        | ALGEE    | RA EOC                      |       |                          |
|------|--------|----------|-----------------------------|-------|--------------------------|
| Year | School | District | School<br>Minus<br>District | State | School<br>Minus<br>State |
| 2018 | 91%    | 62%      | 29%                         | 62%   | 29%                      |
| С    | ompare | -15%     |                             |       |                          |
|      |        | GEOME    | TRY EOC                     |       |                          |
| Year | School | District | School<br>Minus<br>District | State | School<br>Minus<br>State |
| 2019 | 94%    | 60%      | 34%                         | 57%   | 37%                      |
| 2018 | 90%    | 57%      | 33%                         | 56%   | 34%                      |
| C    | ompare | 4%       |                             |       |                          |

# **Subgroup Data**

|           |             | 2019      | SCHO              | DL GRAD      | E COMF     | PONENT             | S BY SU     | JBGRO      | UPS          |                         |                           |
|-----------|-------------|-----------|-------------------|--------------|------------|--------------------|-------------|------------|--------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|
| Subgroups | ELA<br>Ach. | ELA<br>LG | ELA<br>LG<br>L25% | Math<br>Ach. | Math<br>LG | Math<br>LG<br>L25% | Sci<br>Ach. | SS<br>Ach. | MS<br>Accel. | Grad<br>Rate<br>2017-18 | C & C<br>Accel<br>2017-18 |
| SWD       | 28          | 53        | 47                | 28           | 44         | 37                 | 36          | 49         | 53           |                         |                           |
| ELL       | 28          | 56        | 58                | 34           | 46         | 47                 | 16          | 55         | 65           |                         |                           |
| AMI       | 29          | 54        |                   | 29           | 38         |                    |             |            |              |                         |                           |
| BLK       | 47          | 59        | 49                | 44           | 49         | 49                 | 40          | 69         | 85           |                         |                           |
| HSP       | 41          | 56        | 57                | 46           | 48         | 46                 | 44          | 65         | 78           |                         |                           |
| MUL       | 68          | 71        |                   | 57           | 55         |                    |             | 70         |              |                         |                           |
| WHT       | 64          | 66        | 63                | 58           | 60         | 56                 | 60          | 70         | 73           |                         |                           |
| FRL       | 45          | 58        | 53                | 45           | 48         | 46                 | 42          | 66         | 79           |                         |                           |
|           |             | 2018      | SCHO              | DL GRAD      | E COMP     | ONENT              | S BY SU     | JBGRO      | UPS          |                         |                           |
| Subgroups | ELA<br>Ach. | ELA<br>LG | ELA<br>LG<br>L25% | Math<br>Ach. | Math<br>LG | Math<br>LG<br>L25% | Sci<br>Ach. | SS<br>Ach. | MS<br>Accel. | Grad<br>Rate<br>2016-17 | C & C<br>Accel<br>2016-17 |
| SWD       | 23          | 46        | 47                | 29           | 45         | 40                 | 17          | 38         | 90           |                         |                           |
| ELL       | 17          | 46        | 48                | 25           | 46         | 55                 |             | 41         |              |                         |                           |
| AMI       | 13          | 38        |                   | 33           | 47         |                    |             |            |              |                         |                           |
| BLK       | 42          | 54        | 56                | 44           | 50         | 53                 | 43          | 68         | 87           |                         |                           |
| HSP       | 44          | 54        | 43                | 45           | 54         | 57                 | 37          | 55         | 85           |                         |                           |
| MUL       | 65          | 60        |                   | 70           | 60         |                    |             |            |              |                         |                           |
| WHT       | 55          | 57        | 53                | 62           | 62         | 58                 | 48          | 70         | 96           |                         |                           |
| FRL       | 43          | 54        | 49                | 46           | 53         | 55                 | 40          | 60         | 88           |                         |                           |
|           |             | 2017      | SCHO              | DL GRAD      | E COMF     | ONENT              | S BY SU     | JBGRO      | UPS          |                         |                           |
| Subgroups | ELA<br>Ach. | ELA<br>LG | ELA<br>LG<br>L25% | Math<br>Ach. | Math<br>LG | Math<br>LG<br>L25% | Sci<br>Ach. | SS<br>Ach. | MS<br>Accel. | Grad<br>Rate<br>2015-16 | C & C<br>Accel<br>2015-16 |
| SWD       | 11          | 37        | 32                | 23           | 41         | 37                 | 13          | 25         |              |                         |                           |
| ELL       | 12          | 41        | 39                | 27           | 41         | 40                 | 18          | 43         |              |                         |                           |
| BLK       | 39          | 52        | 45                | 43           | 51         | 47                 | 32          | 69         | 83           |                         |                           |
| HSP       | 38          | 52        | 36                | 48           | 47         | 33                 | 34          | 56         | 78           |                         |                           |
| MUL       | 50          | 63        |                   | 60           | 58         |                    |             |            |              |                         |                           |
| WHT       | 47          | 53        | 29                | 57           | 59         | 35                 | 53          | 55         | 85           |                         |                           |
| FRL       | 38          | 51        | 38                | 45           | 49         | 38                 | 34          | 62         | 73           |                         |                           |

# **ESSA** Data

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

| 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  | 55   |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students                                    | NO   |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target                                    | 1    |
| Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency | 55   |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index                                       | 548  |
| Total Components for the Federal Index  | 10   |
| Percent Tested  | 99%  |
| Subgroup Data   |      |
| Students With Disabilities  |      |
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities                                      | 42   |
| Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?              | NO   |
| Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%       |      |
| English Language Learners   |      |
| Federal Index - English Language Learners                                       | 46   |
| English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?               | NO   |
| Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%        |      |
| Native American Students  |      |
| Federal Index - Native American Students  | 38   |
| Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?                | YES  |
| 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                                 | 55   |
| Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?         | NO   |
| Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%  |      |

| Hispanic Students  |    |  |  |  |  |  |
|--|----|--|--|--|--|--|
| Federal Index - Hispanic Students  |    |  |  |  |  |  |
| Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?                          |    |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%                   |    |  |  |  |  |  |
| Multiracial Students   |    |  |  |  |  |  |
| Federal Index - Multiracial Students   | 64 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?                       |    |  |  |  |  |  |
| 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?                  |    |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%           |    |  |  |  |  |  |
| White Students   |    |  |  |  |  |  |
| Federal Index - White Students   |    |  |  |  |  |  |
| White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?                             |    |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%                      |    |  |  |  |  |  |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students  |    |  |  |  |  |  |
| Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students                                | 54 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?        |    |  |  |  |  |  |
| 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.

Native American students, specifically Guatemalean students, has the lowest performance. There was a significant drop in Math achievement of 4 percentage points. Many of the students are LY students, first year ELL students entering at various levels.

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

When looking at our grade level data with Algebra I Honors, our school had a 15% decline from 2018. We went from 91% to 76%. Additional all subgroups experienced a decline with Students with Disabilities experiencing the greatest decline with -37% point.

Students in the seventh grade cohort demonstrated a decline of 26% points in Mathematics. Most of those students were taught by a teacher, hired as a science teacher, and moved into math after the eleven day count. Her inexperience with the subject accounts for the major drop for the seventh grade cohort. Also, a small group of seventh grade students originally enrolled in Algebra I honors had to be moved midyear to 7th grade math for instruction due to low achievement in Algebra I Honors according to FSQs, USAs, and classroom assignments.

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 Math achievement gap between the school at 47% and the state at 58% is 11 percentage points. Math achievement has remained stagnant at 47%. Although ELA achievement had a 1% point gain, the state average of 54% is still 8 percentage points above our students. We attribute the Math gap to having to create math sections for our Math Coach in Pre-Algebra, which prevented her from visiting classrooms of new teachers often. Also in ELA, a stellar teacher, who taught many regular and inclusion classes went on maternity leave for the entire Spring Semester.

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

Civics went up 7% points, which was attributed to an increase EOC points in seventh grade. All Civics teachers received professional development during their weekly PLCs. Collaborative planning and data driven instruction drove the planning and instructional cycle in their classrooms.

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

When looking at the Early Warning Systems, two potential areas of concern are students with course failures in ELA and/or Math and the number of level 1 students on the statewide assessment.

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

- 1. High School Readiness
- 2. Success with Algebra I with alignment to LTO #3
- 3. Integrate schoolwide initiatives across all content areas to increase classroom literacy
- 4. Implement small group instruction in all classrooms to address differentiation
- 5. Monitor instruction regularly and provide specific feedback

### Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#### #1

### **Title**

Ensure progress towards student achievement in Math and ELA instruction to align with the District's Strategic Plan; LTO#2; Ensure HS Readiness and LTO #3; Increase HS

graduation rate

FY19, students performed at 47% in Math achievement, which was stagnant from FY18, but in comparison to the district, a 12 percentage point difference. FY19, student performed

at 46%

# Rationale

### State the measurable

school plans to achieve

outcome the Improve Math proficiency by 5 percentge points to be on target for the Long Term Outcomes of the strategic plan related to ensuring high school readiness.

### Person responsible

for

Edward Burke (edward.burke@palmbeachschools.org)

### monitoring outcome

# Evidence-

based Strategy

- 1. Tutorials
- 2. Use of digital technology
- 3. Weekly Professional Learning Communities in all content areas
- 4. Implementation of Small Group Inst in all content areas
- 1. Students will be remediated utilizing data from FSQs and USAs to build content knowledge for students.

### Rationale for Evidence-

based

Strategy

- 2. Digital technology in classrooms helps students remain engaged and is an effective way to connect with students of all learning styles.
- 3. Standards-Based planning and instruction ensures accountability. The practice of aligning learning to standards helps to ensure that a higher level of learning is attaining, guiding teams of teachers int he process of assessment, keeping them focused.
- 4. Differentiated small group instruction allows teachers to work mre closely with individual students, with the opportunity to support students and their development fo ELA and Math skills.

### **Action Step**

- In all content Pillars of Effective Instruction-Students are immersed in rigorous tasks encompassing the full intent of the Florida State Standards and content required by Florida State Statute 1003.42 continuing to develop a single school culture and appreciation of the multicultural diversity with a focus on Reading and Writing across the content areas:
- 2. In all content areas, small group remedial instruction will be provided daily to students in need. Focus will be placed on the delivery of instruction within small groups. A protocol/ guide will be provided to assist teachers. Additionally, the rotational instructional model will be utilized in all classes. Digital technology is included in every classroom to support RIM and the adaptive technology programs. Groups will be data driven and ongoing conversations will focus on the implementation in weekly PLCs.

# Description

3. In all content classrooms, teachers will plan differentiated lessons focusing on the time in small group instruction to scaffold reading and writing instructions. Independent practice within the RIM model will be used to analyze teacher feedback and practice areas of need. Writing will be strategically weaved into every lesson. In ELA and classrooms, Students use Reading Plus in accordance with a year long Reading Plus plan. ELL students will

develop language skills through iMagine and develop comprehension skills through Achieve 3000. Math students are enrolled in Study Island.

- 4. Continue to implement PIRATES test taking strategy, TAP/TEACH paragraph response strategy, and 2 T's 4 E's essay writing strategy school-wide. Students, grades 6 8) that are predicted to score a level 5 and 6 in writing will participate in writing boot camp. Academic tutors will be utilized in classrooms for push-ins, pull-outs and double downs in all math, ELA, and civics classrooms.
- 5. PLCs will be held weekly, where teachers of grade-level content specific curriculum, instructional coaches and administration will meet to discuss data and plan instruction.

### Person Responsible

Edward Burke (edward.burke@palmbeachschools.org)

### Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities (optional)

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

Pillars of Effective Instruction: Students are immersed in rigorous task encompassing the full intent of the Florida State Standards and content required by Florida State Statute 1003.42 continuing to develop a single school culture and appreciation of multicultural diversity in alignment to S.B. 2.09 with a focus on reading and writing across all content areas. Our students focus on content and curriculum related to:

The History of the Holocaust

The History of Black and African Americans

The Contributions of Latino and Hispanics

The Contributions of Women

The Sacrifices of Veterans and Medal of Honor recipients within US History.

Lantana Community Middle School integrates Single School Culture by sharing our Universal Guidelines for Success and communicating these expectations to parents via student protocols, and monitoring SwPBS through data. In alignment, to school board 2.09 and Florida State statue 1003.42 our school highlights multicultural diversity within the curriculum and the arts. Our students participate in activities and studies including, but not limited to, art expos of different cultures and in music our students study music of different eras and countries and in media our library selection is filled with books related to the variety of cultures.

# 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, § 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.

Increase parental attendance to at least 45%. LCM will reach out to families utilizing call outs, the website, student backpacks utilizing their home language. Community Language Facilitators are an integral part of an communication with parents, including facilitating phone calls regarding conferences, discipline, and rewards. Parents are invited in all decision-making in the school.

#### **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.

FCIM is used to apprise each teacher, by subject and grade level of the transitional needs of each class from one grade to the next, at LCMS. The coaches and guidance counselors reach both forward to High schools for our 8th grade students, and backwards for our incoming 6th graders, to ensure that all stakeholders are aware of the transitional needs of all these students.

Incoming 6th graders are visited by the Guidance team in the Spring to introduce LCMS, and prepare students for the transition to middle school.

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

FCIM is used to apprise each teacher, by subject and grade level of the transitional needs of each class from one grade to the next at LCMS. The guidance team reach both forward to high schools for our 8th grade students to choose classes and choice opportunities; and they reach back for our incoming 6th graders to ensure that stakeholders are aware of the transitional needs.

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.

### Title I, Part A

Services are provided to ensure students requiring remediation are assisted through before, during, and after school tutorial programs. Title 1 funds has been used to fund instructional staff and coaches. Instructional coaches provide support to teachers in professional learning communities, enhancing instructional pedagogy

Family Involvement funds are used to increase parental communication. Night activities and trainings are used to increase parental capacity, and support of the education o.

#### Title I, Part C- Migrant

Migrant Liaison provides services and support to students and parents. The liaison coordinates with Title 1 and other programs to ensure student needs are met.

#### Title I. Part D

The district receives funds to support the Educational Alternative Outreach program. Services are coordinated with the district Drop-out Prevention, Alternative Education programs, and the SBT/RTI process.

#### Title II

Technology in classrooms increases the capacity for good learning practices and funds at are used to implement Reading Plus and Study Island to support all students.

#### Title III

Services are provided through the district for diverse educational materials and ELL district support services to improve the education of English Language Learners.

#### Title X -Homeless

District Homeless Social Workers provide resources for students under the McKinney-Vento Act to eliminate barriers for free and appropriate education.

### Violence Prevention Programs

School Wide Positive Behavior Support Program is implemented schoolwide.

#### **Adult Education**

LCMS serves a diverse population in the adult education classes.

#### Career and Technical Education

We offer an industry certification course for high school credits. LCMS partnered with ASPIRA and TRIO programs to support high school and post-secondary readiness.

In alignment to school board 2.09 and Florida State statue 1003.42 our school highlights diversity within the arts. Students participate in activities and studies related to the variety of cultures and contributions of African Americans, Latino and women in US History.

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

All 7th grade students are enrolled in EPEP to learn about their interests and goals setting. LCMS also hosts a HS101 training session for parents, designed to provide resources, information and next steps to guiding/prepare their child to post secondary education.

# Part V: Budget

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

| 1 | III.A.   | Areas of Focus: Ensure progress towards student achievement in Math and ELA instruction to align with the District's Strategic Plan; LTO#2; Ensure HS Readiness and LTO #3; Increase HS graduation rate |                                 |                                |        | \$3,390.00 |
|---|----------|---|---------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------|------------|
|   | Function | Object  | Budget Focus                    | Funding Source                 | FTE    | 2019-20    |
|   | 5000     | 120-Classroom Teachers  | 0761 - Lantana Middle<br>School | School<br>Improvement<br>Funds | 909.0  | \$3,390.00 |
|   |          |   |                                 |                                | Total: | \$3,390.00 |