

Lake County Schools

Gray 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	11
Planning for Improvement	17
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	21

Gray Middle School

205 E MAGNOLIA ST, Groveland, FL 34736

<https://gms.lake.k12.fl.us/>

Demographics

Principal: Melissa Frana

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2014

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Middle School 6-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2018-19 Title I School	No
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	98%
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 Asian Students Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: B (58%) 2017-18: B (58%) 2016-17: B (58%) 2015-16: B (54%) 2014-15: B (57%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	

Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TS&I
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here .	

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F. This plan is also a requirement for Targeted Support and Improvement (TS&I) and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CS&I) schools pursuant to 1008.33 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

To be designated as TS&I, a school must have one or more ESSA subgroup(s) with a Federal Index below 41%. This plan shall be approved by the district. There are three ways a school can be designated as CS&I:

1. have a school grade of D or F
2. have a graduation rate of 67% or lower
3. have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

For these schools, the SIP shall be approved by the district as well as the Bureau of School Improvement.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F, or a graduation rate 67% or less. Districts may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing for schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at www.floridacims.org.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	11
Planning for Improvement	17
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	21

Gray Middle School

205 E MAGNOLIA ST, Groveland, FL 34736

<https://gms.lake.k12.fl.us/>

School Demographics

<p>School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Middle School 6-8</p>	<p>2018-19 Title I School</p> <p>No</p>	<p>2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p>79%</p>
<p>Primary Service Type (per MSID File)</p> <p>K-12 General Education</p>	<p>Charter School</p> <p>No</p>	<p>2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p>56%</p>

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F (see page 4). For schools receiving a grade of A, B, or C, the district may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at <https://www.floridacims.org>.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

Gray Middle School's mission is to provide a safe, supportive learning environment with opportunities for all students to develop the skills and knowledge to become a responsible citizen in a global society.

La misión es proporcionar un ambiente de aprendizaje seguro y de apoyo con oportunidades para todos los estudiantes a desarrollar las habilidades y conocimientos para ser un ciudadano responsable en una sociedad global.

La mission est de fournir un environnement sûr et d'un grand soutien à l'apprentissage avec des opportunités pour tous les élèves à développer les compétences et les connaissances nécessaires pour devenir un citoyen responsable dans une société mondialisée.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Gators are...
Gifted
Always in Attendance
Task Oriented
Over Achievers
Respectful
Striving to move Gray from Good to Great!

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
Chateaufneuf, Pam	Principal	Principals manage the operations of the school and act as the instructional leader. They are responsible for ensuring their school runs smoothly, remains safe, and provides an excellent learning environment for all.
Smallridge, Greg	Assistant Principal	Assistant Principal - They assist the building principal in organizing and fostering a positive, safe environment that is conducive to best meeting the needs of all students, staff and parents. This includes providing teachers with instructional support and feedback.
Skelton, William	Assistant Principal	Assistant Principal - They assist the building principal in organizing and fostering a positive, safe environment that is conducive to best meeting the needs of all students, staff and parents. This includes providing teachers with instructional support and feedback.
Rhodes, Stephanie	Assistant Principal	Assistant Principal - They assist the building principal in organizing and fostering a positive, safe environment that is conducive to best meeting the needs of all students, staff and parents. This includes providing teachers with instructional support and feedback.
Miller, Matthew	Instructional Coach	Instructional Coach - He works closely with the TQR administrator and the principal in designing, developing, and implementing PD and other services to provide teachers the needed skills and strategies for success. Department Chair - They serve as instructional leaders in their respective departments. Part of their responsibilities include meeting with their department and being prepared to discuss department data at each Leadership Meeting.
Marshburn, Bridgitte	Instructional Media	Media Specialist: She works to help students and staff members find materials and learn to do research and complete projects. She is responsible for maintaining and organizing books, magazines, technology, and other resources. She teaches and provides support to teachers who want to integrate the digital world into the classroom and throughout the curriculum.
Roca, Yamilisa	School Counselor	Counselor: The counselors are members of the leadership team. They help all students in the areas of academic achievement, personal/social development and career development, ensuring today's students become the productive, well-adjusted adults of tomorrow. They provide support with many of the programs, such as MTSS, 504, ELL, etc.
Curry, Denise	Other	ESE School Specialist - The ESE School Specialist acts as a coach, mentor, teacher trainer for differentiating instruction, adapting assessments and behavioral interventions.

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Hacker, Megan	Teacher, K-12	Department Chairs - They serve as instructional leaders in their respective departments. Part of their responsibilities include meeting with their department and being prepared to discuss department data at each Leadership Meeting.
Wentzell, Jennifer	School Counselor	Counselor: The counselors are members of the leadership team. They help all students in the areas of academic achievement, personal/social development and career development, ensuring today's students become the productive, well-adjusted adults of tomorrow. They provide support with many of the programs, such as MTSS, 504, ELL, etc.
Gismonde, Chelsey	Teacher, K-12	Department Chairs - They serve as instructional leaders in their respective departments. Part of their responsibilities include meeting with their department and being prepared to discuss department data at each Leadership Meeting.
Gismonde, Anthony	Teacher, Career/ Technical	Department Chairs - They serve as instructional leaders in their respective departments. Part of their responsibilities include meeting with their department and being prepared to discuss department data at each Leadership Meeting.
Kuritz, Andrew	Teacher, K-12	Department Chairs - They serve as instructional leaders in their respective departments. Part of their responsibilities include meeting with their department and being prepared to discuss department data at each Leadership Meeting.
Vergara, Erika	Teacher, K-12	PASS Teacher - Our PASS teacher is responsible for students who have behavioral issues that exclude them from regularly scheduled classes. She uses Restorative Practices while assisting with academics while students are in her class.
Webster, Sandra	Other	Mental Health Liaison - The MHL works with students and employees who demonstrate at-risk behaviors. She works closely with all stakeholders.
Laljie, Nadia	Teacher, K-12	AVID Teacher - They work with our students to teach them strategies to be life long learners. Part of their responsibilities include attending the Leadership Teams and being prepared to discuss AVID data.

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	344	306	346	0	0	0	0	996
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	35	54	52	0	0	0	0	141
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	51	57	0	0	0	0	120
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	51	113	70	0	0	0	0	234
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	94	90	104	0	0	0	0	288

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	105	144	172	0	0	0	0	421

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	4	3	1	0	0	0	0	8
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	10	5	0	0	0	0	19

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

54

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 8/15/2019

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	70	47	58	0	0	0	0	175
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	44	41	36	0	0	0	0	121
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	29	20	13	0	0	0	0	62
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	207	130	136	0	0	0	0	473
	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	251	186	191	0	0	0	0	628

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	70	47	58	0	0	0	0	175
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	44	41	36	0	0	0	0	121
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	29	20	13	0	0	0	0	62
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	207	130	136	0	0	0	0	473
	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	251	186	191	0	0	0	0	628

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	51%	50%	54%	52%	47%	52%
ELA Learning Gains	54%	52%	54%	58%	50%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	48%	44%	47%	49%	39%	44%
Math Achievement	62%	56%	58%	61%	54%	56%
Math Learning Gains	58%	55%	57%	60%	56%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	50%	46%	51%	50%	45%	50%
Science Achievement	61%	49%	51%	56%	46%	50%
Social Studies Achievement	72%	70%	72%	72%	72%	70%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)			Total
	6	7	8	
Number of students enrolled	344 (0)	306 (0)	346 (0)	996 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	35 (70)	54 (47)	52 (58)	141 (175)
One or more suspensions	12 (44)	51 (41)	57 (36)	120 (121)
Course failure in ELA or Math	51 (29)	113 (20)	70 (13)	234 (62)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	94 (207)	90 (130)	104 (136)	288 (473)

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	46%	52%	-6%	54%	-8%
	2018	42%	47%	-5%	52%	-10%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	44%	49%	-5%	52%	-8%
	2018	55%	48%	7%	51%	4%
Same Grade Comparison		-11%				
Cohort Comparison		2%				
08	2019	61%	54%	7%	56%	5%
	2018	62%	55%	7%	58%	4%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison		6%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2019	49%	53%	-4%	55%	-6%
	2018	41%	49%	-8%	52%	-11%
Same Grade Comparison		8%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	61%	58%	3%	54%	7%
	2018	69%	59%	10%	54%	15%
Same Grade Comparison		-8%				
Cohort Comparison		20%				
08	2019	59%	39%	20%	46%	13%
	2018	52%	39%	13%	45%	7%
Same Grade Comparison		7%				
Cohort Comparison		-10%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2019	61%	49%	12%	48%	13%
	2018	58%	51%	7%	50%	8%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison						

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018	0%	61%	-61%	65%	-65%
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	71%	71%	0%	71%	0%
2018	79%	70%	9%	71%	8%
Compare		-8%			
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	94%	52%	42%	61%	33%
2018	92%	62%	30%	62%	30%
Compare		2%			
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	0%	49%	-49%	57%	-57%
2018					

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	22	43	41	30	46	42	23	39	30		
ELL	18	41	44	31	53	50	35	34	50		
ASN	57	57		61	62						
BLK	46	49	48	45	44	48	53	59	50		
HSP	47	52	49	54	56	53	48	61	54		
MUL	65	64		62	58		75	85	92		
WHT	55	54	48	73	62	46	73	83	65		
FRL	42	49	47	51	55	52	48	62	54		

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	15	39	39	27	47	45	17	48			
ELL	13	43	44	20	47	54	8	56			
ASN	55	76		68	67						
BLK	49	57	54	47	56	50	57	74	40		
HSP	42	50	48	49	50	41	44	77	49		
MUL	77	72		61	59			100			
WHT	63	59	57	71	60	65	72	84	60		
FRL	47	52	51	52	52	43	53	77	40		
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	11	41	43	23	46	38	23	41			
ELL	16	34	31	19	42	40		14			
ASN	56	68		76	72		69		73		
BLK	39	53	52	43	48	44	37	70	54		
HSP	42	52	44	51	61	52	43	63	54		
MUL	70	64		70	50		90	60	60		
WHT	61	63	53	70	61	47	66	80	70		
FRL	42	51	45	50	57	51	44	62	56		

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	60
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	84
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	602
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	35
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	44
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	
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	59
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	49
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	56
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	72
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	62
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	54
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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.

Compared to the 2018 data the following areas performed lower than the previous year: ELA Achievement (down 3%); ELA Learning Gains (down 2%); ELA Lowest 25% (down 5%); Social Studies Achievement (down 9%). This is the 2nd year in a row that ELA Learning Gains dropped 2%. New ELA teachers, attendance, and discipline are possible contributing factors.

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

ELA lowest 25th percentile showed a five percentage points decline and social studies achievement showed a nine percentage point decline. The factors that contributed to this decline are first year teachers to content, attendance, and discipline.

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.

ELA Achievement had the greatest gap dropping 3%. The contributing factors are first year teachers to content area, attendance, and discipline. No trend noted.

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

Math Achievement (+3%). Collaboration time became a part of the weekly routine. Data was analyzed, lessons adjusted, and remediation was offered during R&A. Students also had the opportunity to attend Grade Recovery and the YMCA after school program for remediation.

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

Two potential areas of concern in our EWS data are course failures in ELA or math and one or more suspension. We will continue to work with our students during R&A, grade recovery, tutoring, YMCA, and PASS to improve on course failures and out-of-school suspensions.

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

1. Students having multiple opportunities throughout the day to read, write, think, and talk through authentic literacy by using modeling, guided instruction, PURPOSE, and collaborative and independent learning.

2. Professional development to support number 1.
3. Weekly collaborate time for grade level/content area teachers

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	Interventions-Based on Federal Index, SWD is our most critical area. By providing students the support necessary to meet high expectations as evident through rigorous and grade level instruction, RWTT, and focusing on teacher clarity.
Rationale	Students will become assessment-capable learners and show an effect size of 1.44, equaling approximately three years of progress within one academic year. When students have the clarity to answer the following three questions: 1) What am I learning? 2) Why am I learning it? and 3) How will I know when I have learned it? (Larry Ainsworth's Teacher Clarity Professional Learning Series) they will be Empowered for Excellence.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	By focusing on this area, we expect to see an increase of 3 percentage points not only in the students with disabilities subgroups but all subgroups as evidenced by FSA/State Testing. Students with Disabilities (35 to 38%) English Language Learners (44 to 47%) Economically Disadvantaged (54 to 57%) White (62 to 65%) Black/African American (49 to 52%) Hispanic (56 to 59%) Asian (59 to 62%) Multiracial (72 to 75%)
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Pam Chateaufneuf (chateaufneuf@lake.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	To develop great teachers by building skills to effectively utilize the following strategies: modeling thinking, guided instruction, collaborative learning, independent learning, and purpose. ("Better Learning Through Structured Teaching" by Douglas Fisher and Nancy Frey, "The Teacher Clarity Playbook" by Douglas Fisher, Nancy Frey, Olivia Amador and Joseph Assof) In using these strategies, we will increase the subgroup students with disabilities from 35 to 38%. To monitor this LSA and FSA data will be analyzed quarterly during the data chats (administration, ESE school specialist, support facilitation teachers).
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	If we implement, monitor and support the strategies, students will become assessment-capable learners and show an effect size of 1.44, equaling approximately three years of progress within one academic year. When students have the clarity to answer the following three questions: 1) What am I learning? 2) Why am I learning it? and 3) How will I know when I have learned it? (Larry Ainsworth's Teacher Clarity Professional Learning Series, "The Teacher Clarity Playbook" by Douglas Fisher, Nancy Frey, Olivia Amador and Joseph Assof, and "Better Learning Through Structured Teaching" by Douglas Fisher and Nancy Frey)
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. To build Repair and Accelerate (R&A) class to create a more conducive atmosphere for student learning. To build our Students are assigned based on ability in the math and ELA R&A. 2. To provide Regional 3 level support to our Support Facilitation teachers to better serve the students in math and ELA classes and in learning strategies. 3. To provide PD for the Support Facilitation teachers in the areas of math and ELA. 4. To provide time for the Support Facilitation teachers to participate in quarterly data chats with administration.

5. To provide a quarterly, after school Grade Recovery program for students in danger of failing at the end of the year or who failed the previous quarter.

Person Responsible Pam Chateauneuf (chateauneufp@lake.k12.fl.us)

#2

Title

School Culture - To provide every student, especially our students with disabilities based on the Federal Index, a positive and comprehensive understanding of cultural, social, and behavioral expectations.

Rationale

If we implement, monitor, and support PBIS using Restorative Practices, PASS, and the Mental Health Liaison, then more students will be actively engaged which will increase attendance and reduce suspensions.
If expectations are defined, explained, and reviewed with both students and teacher, then we will see an increase in a positive, collaborative, and productive school culture.

State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve

By focusing on this area, we expect to see an overall decrease of 3% in attendance below 90 percent (14% to 11%) and in the number of one or more out-of-school suspensions (12% to 9%) as evidenced in the Early Warning Signs (EWS) data.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome

Stephanie Rhodes (rhodess@lake.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy

To implement a Positive Alternative to School Suspension (PASS) Program to support the acceptable student behavior policies. PASS provides and creates the conditions that reduce the potential for misbehavior through structured supports to meet the academic, social-emotional and behavioral needs of the students (restorative practice and PBIS). Author Anne Wheelock asserts that ISS "should be one part of a school-wide strategy for creating and sustaining a positive, nurturing school climate, based on respectful relationships between teachers and students, teachers and teachers and students and students." She continues to say "Such a strategy would acknowledge that conflicts of all kinds occur in schools and should be based on a thoughtful set of approaches to resolving conflict and solving problems."

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy

If we implement, monitor and support a successful PASS program by creating a school that has a student-centered atmosphere, social-emotional support, use of best practices to support literacy, an alignment of curriculum and assessment, and availability of supplemental supports within general education structures, as well as special education services, then there will be a decrease of 3 percentage points in attendance and out-of-school suspensions.

Action Step

Description

1. To implement the PASS program.
2. To provide support, training, and monitoring of the PASS program.
3. To build on our PBIS and restorative practice by providing PD at monthly meeting
4. To provide training and supplies for our PBIS program.

Person Responsible

Stephanie Rhodes (rhodess@lake.k12.fl.us)

#3	
Title	To provide every student, especially our SWD based on Fed Index, great teachers who have high expectations as evident through rigorous instruction, grade level assignments and opportunity to RWTT through authentic literacy by focusing on teacher clarity.
Rationale	All students will become assessment-capable learners and show an effect size of 1.44, equaling approximately three years of progress within one academic year. When students have the clarity to answer the following three questions: 1) What am I learning? 2) Why am I learning it? and 3) How will I know when I have learned it? (Larry Ainsworth's Teacher Clarity Professional Learning Series) they will be Empowered for Excellence.
	By focusing on this area, we expect to see an overall increase of 3 percentage points in all tested areas and subgroups as evidenced by FSA/State Testing/Federal Index.
	<p>ELA</p> <p>Achievement (51 to 54%)</p> <p>Learning Gains (54 to 57%)</p> <p>Lowest 25% (48 to 51%)</p> <p>Math</p> <p>Achievement (62 to 65%)</p> <p>Learning Gains (58 to 61%)</p> <p>Lowest 25% (50 to 53%)</p> <p>Civics Achievement (72 to 75%)</p> <p>Acceleration (62 to 65%)</p> <p>Science Achievement (61 to 64%)</p> <p>Algebra 1 Achievement (94 to 97%)</p> <p>Students with Disabilities (35 to 38%)</p> <p>English Language Learners (44 to 47%)</p> <p>Economically Disadvantaged (54 to 57%)</p> <p>White (62 to 65%)</p> <p>Black/African American (49 to 52%)</p> <p>Hispanic (56 to 59%)</p> <p>Asian (59 to 62%)</p> <p>Multiracial (72 to 75%)</p>
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Pam Chateaufneuf (chateaufneuf@lake.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	To create and provide professional development (PD), monitoring, and support to our teachers to effectively utilize the following strategies: modeling thinking, guided instruction, collaborative learning, independent learning, and purpose. The book "Better Learning Through Structured Teaching" by Douglas Fisher and Nancy Frey. "The Teacher Clarity Playbook" by Douglas Fisher, Nancy Frey, Olivia Amador and Joseph Assof, and district level PD for our literacy coach and administration will guide our professional development. These strategies will be used to increase our overall school 3 percentage points. We will

monitor this by using learning walk data, LSA data, state level data, and during quarterly data chats.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy

If we implement, monitor, and support the Instructional Framework strategies, then students will become assessment-capable learners and show an effect size of 1.44, equaling approximately three years of progress within one academic year. When students have the clarity to answer the following three questions: 1) What am I learning? 2) Why am I learning it? and 3) How will I know when I have learned it? (Larry Ainsworth's Teacher Clarity Professional Learning Series, "The Teacher Clarity Playbook" by Douglas Fisher, Nancy Frey, Olivia Amador and Joseph Assof, and "Better Learning Through Structured Teaching" by Douglas Fisher and Nancy Frey)

Action Step

1. Continue to provide weekly collaborative planning with a focus on the four questions from "Better Learning":
 - a. Targets - What do we want students to know and be able to do?
 - b. Evidence - How will we know if they get it or can do it?
 - c. Action - How will we respond when they don't learn? and How will we respond when they do learn, or already know it?
2. To provide PD that aligns with the Instructional Framework strategies: purpose, guided instruction, collaborative learning, independent learning and modeling thinking ("Better Learning")
3. To provide PD for "The Teacher Clarity Playbook".
4. To provide on-going coaching for additional support in moving forward with the Instructional Framework strategies.
5. To provide a quarterly, after school Grade Recovery program for students in danger of failing at the end of the year or who failed the previous quarter.
6. To provide AVID tutors.
7. To provide additional technology to support the students.
8. To utilize core teachers to cover the planning period of the PASS teacher to provide academic content.

Description

Person Responsible

Pam Chateaufneuf (chateaufneuf@lake.k12.fl.us)

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).

n/a

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Interventions-Based on Federal Index, SWD is our most critical area. By providing students the support necessary to meet high expectations as evident through rigorous and grade level instruction, RWTT, and focusing on teacher clarity.	\$0.00
---	--------	--	--------

2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: School Culture - To provide every student, especially our students with disabilities based on the Federal Index, a positive and comprehensive understanding of cultural, social, and behavioral expectations.				\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: To provide every student, especially our SWD based on Fed Index, great teachers who have high expectations as evident through rigorous instruction, grade level assignments and opportunity to RWTT through authentic literacy by focusing on teacher clarity.				\$26,125.38
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20
	5100	100-Salaries	0113 - Gray Middle School	UniSIG		\$7,650.00
			<i>Notes: Notes: SAI Funds to pay Grade Recovery teachers to cover Action Steps #5 in the first and third Areas of Focus. These funds will cover quarters 1, 2, and 3.</i>			
	5100	210-Retirement	0113 - Gray Middle School	UniSIG		\$647.96
			<i>Notes: Notes: SAI Funds to pay Grade Recovery teachers to cover Action Steps #5 in the first and third Areas of Focus. These funds will cover quarters 1, 2, and 3.</i>			
	5100	220-Social Security	0113 - Gray Middle School	UniSIG		\$585.23
			<i>Notes: Notes: SAI Funds to pay Grade Recovery teachers to cover Action Steps #5 in the first and third Areas of Focus. These funds will cover quarters 1, 2, and 3.</i>			
	5100	240-Workers Compensation	0113 - Gray Middle School	UniSIG		\$46.67
			<i>Notes: Notes: SAI Funds to pay Grade Recovery teachers to cover Action Steps #5 in the first and third Areas of Focus. These funds will cover quarters 1, 2, and 3.</i>			
	5100	100-Salaries	0113 - Gray Middle School	UniSIG		\$1,400.00
			<i>Notes: Notes: SAI Funds to pay AVID Tutors to cover Action Step #6 in the third Area of Focus.</i>			
	5100	220-Social Security	0113 - Gray Middle School	UniSIG		\$20.30
			<i>Notes: Notes: SAI Funds to pay AVID Tutors to cover Action Step #6 in the third Area of Focus.</i>			
	5100	240-Workers Compensation	0113 - Gray Middle School	UniSIG		\$8.54
			<i>Notes: Notes: SAI Funds to pay AVID Tutors to cover Action Step #6 in the third Area of Focus.</i>			
	5100	100-Salaries	0113 - Gray Middle School	UniSIG		\$3,600.00
			<i>Notes: Notes: SAI Funds to pay teachers to cover the planning period of the PASS teacher to provide academic content to cover Action Step #8 in the third Area of Focus.</i>			
	5100	210-Retirement	0113 - Gray Middle School	UniSIG		\$304.92
			<i>Notes: Notes: SAI Funds to pay teachers to cover the planning period of the PASS teacher to provide academic content to cover Action Step #8 in the First Area of Focus.</i>			
	5100	220-Social Security	0113 - Gray Middle School	UniSIG		\$275.40
			<i>Notes: Notes: SAI Funds to pay teachers to cover the planning period of the PASS teacher to provide academic content to cover Action Step #8 in the third Area of Focus.</i>			
	5100	240-Workers Compensation	0113 - Gray Middle School	UniSIG		\$21.96
			<i>Notes: Notes: SAI Funds to pay teachers to cover the planning period of the PASS teacher to provide academic content to cover Action Step #8 in the third Area of Focus.</i>			
	5100	644-Computer Hardware Non-Capitalized	0113 - Gray Middle School	UniSIG		\$10,000.00
			<i>Notes: Notes: SAI and SAC Funds to provide additional technology to support the students. This covers Action Step #7 in the third Area of Focus.</i>			
	5100	510-Supplies	0113 - Gray Middle School	UniSIG		\$1,564.40

	<i>Notes: Notes: SAI and SAC Funds to provide supplies to run Grade Recovery and PBIS programs to support the students. This covers Action Step #5 in the third Area of Focus and Action Step #4 in the second Area of Focus.</i>
	Total: \$26,125.38