

Lake County Schools

Mt. Dora 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	9
Planning for Improvement	14
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	17

Mt. Dora Middle School

1405 LINCOLN AVE, Mount Dora, FL 32757

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

Demographics

Principal: Jennifer Farnsworth

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2019

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)	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* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students* White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (53%) 2017-18: B (55%) 2016-17: C (46%) 2015-16: C (50%) 2014-15: C (48%)
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	9
Planning for Improvement	14
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	17

Mt. Dora Middle School

1405 LINCOLN AVE, Mount Dora, FL 32757

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

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2018-19 Title I School	2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Middle School 6-8	No	80%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	50%

School Grades History

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

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.

Recognizing that all students are unique, the mission of Mt. Dora Middle School is to ensure that all students feel loved, respected, and encouraged while being inspired, educated, and prepared to achieve their fullest potential as lifelong learners and productive citizens in our global society.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Mt. Dora Middle School will create and support a safe, caring learning environment in which all students and adults feel welcomed, respected, and an important part of the school community. We believe each student deserves to be successful. Our family centered environment strives to develop confidence in students as we learn together and support one another, value differences in others, and become responsible citizens.

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
Frazier, Chad	Principal	
Williams, Charlotte	Assistant Principal	
Stuart, Edward	Instructional Coach	
Feld, Charles	Assistant Principal	
McCulloch, Heidi	Teacher, ESE	
Cornwell, Miranda	Instructional Technology	
Lashley, Collin	School Counselor	
Randolph, Shena	Other	
Curtis, Leigh	School Counselor	

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	288	285	277	0	0	0	0	850	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	30	48	33	0	0	0	0	111	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	41	33	0	0	0	0	94	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	37	18	21	0	0	0	0	76	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	54	55	47	0	0	0	0	156	

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	77	143	107	0	0	0	0	327

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	4	3	0	0	0	13

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

48

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 8/26/2019

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	40	22	33	0	0	0	0	95
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	24	28	0	0	0	0	68
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	67	111	100	0	0	0	0	278
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	46	61	56	0	0	0	0	163

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	137	164	154	0	0	0	0	455

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	40	22	33	0	0	0	0	95
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	24	28	0	0	0	0	68
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	67	111	100	0	0	0	0	278
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	46	61	56	0	0	0	0	163

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	137	164	154	0	0	0	0	455	

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	53%	50%	54%	50%	47%	52%
ELA Learning Gains	52%	52%	54%	46%	50%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	39%	44%	47%	33%	39%	44%
Math Achievement	62%	56%	58%	55%	54%	56%
Math Learning Gains	48%	55%	57%	51%	56%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	41%	46%	51%	38%	45%	50%
Science Achievement	48%	49%	51%	41%	46%	50%
Social Studies Achievement	63%	70%	72%	56%	72%	70%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)			Total
	6	7	8	
Number of students enrolled	288 (0)	285 (0)	277 (0)	850 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	30 (40)	48 (22)	33 (33)	111 (95)
One or more suspensions	20 (16)	41 (24)	33 (28)	94 (68)
Course failure in ELA or Math	37 (67)	18 (111)	21 (100)	76 (278)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	54 (46)	55 (61)	47 (56)	156 (163)

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	50%	52%	-2%	54%	-4%
	2018	50%	47%	3%	52%	-2%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	46%	49%	-3%	52%	-6%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	47%	48%	-1%	51%	-4%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison		-4%				
08	2019	58%	54%	4%	56%	2%
	2018	56%	55%	1%	58%	-2%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison		11%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2019	52%	53%	-1%	55%	-3%
	2018	56%	49%	7%	52%	4%
Same Grade Comparison		-4%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	54%	58%	-4%	54%	0%
	2018	59%	59%	0%	54%	5%
Same Grade Comparison		-5%				
Cohort Comparison		-2%				
08	2019	46%	39%	7%	46%	0%
	2018	40%	39%	1%	45%	-5%
Same Grade Comparison		6%				
Cohort Comparison		-13%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2019	47%	49%	-2%	48%	-1%
	2018	46%	51%	-5%	50%	-4%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison						

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	0%	66%	-66%	67%	-67%
2018					
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	61%	71%	-10%	71%	-10%
2018	62%	70%	-8%	71%	-9%

CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
Compare		-1%			
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	92%	52%	40%	61%	31%
2018	95%	62%	33%	62%	33%
Compare		-3%			
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	100%	49%	51%	57%	43%
2018	0%	50%	-50%	56%	-56%
Compare		100%			

Subgroup Data

2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	17	36	33	27	41	38	24	33			
ELL	23	38	30	33	48	43	17	52			
ASN	60	40		90	80						
BLK	42	30	19	41	38	33	39	55	58		
HSP	46	50	34	49	45	36	35	56	69		
MUL	41	62	58	62	54		54	40	58		
WHT	62	57	49	74	52	46	56	72	75		
FRL	43	47	36	49	47	40	36	49	64		
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	32	28	22	49	47	15	37			
ELL	30	58	52	41	66	61		9			
ASN	83	71		92	86						
BLK	29	35	31	31	49	58	26	61	42		
HSP	42	47	43	52	54	47	29	52	39		
MUL	42	40	29	57	54	53	38	60			
WHT	62	55	46	72	71	68	58	70	65		

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
FRL	41	46	41	51	60	58	36	57	48		
2017 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2015-16	C & C Accel 2015-16
SWD	12	30	25	16	33	26	6	15			
ELL	13	32	38	15	32	29	20	15			
ASN	71	79		79	57						
BLK	29	28	26	32	40	34	15	28	17		
HSP	39	42	33	46	47	38	33	45	42		
MUL	51	52		50	50	40	38	38			
WHT	59	49	38	63	54	40	49	67	49		
FRL	38	40	31	45	48	37	26	47	37		

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	54
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	59
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	537
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	33
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	38
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	

Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	68
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	39
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	48
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	54
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	60
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	48
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.

ELA lowest quartile learning gains & Math lowest quartile learning gains. Contributing factors appear to be a lack of structure during intervention time as well as a lack of strategic focus on these students during instructional time.

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

Math lowest quartile learning gains. Contributing factors appear to be a lack of structure during intervention time as well as a lack of strategic focus on these students during instructional time.

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.

Math lowest quartile learning gains. Contributing factors appear to be a lack of structure during intervention time as well as a lack of strategic focus on these students during instructional time.

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

The acceleration rate showed the most improvement moving from 60 to 72. There was a strategic focus on students placed into acceleration opportunities and progress was monitored for each student.

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

The amount of students failing a course is concerning with 248 students. The amount of students missing 10% of school at 111 students. The amount of students scoring a level 1 on the ELA/Math FSA with 156 level 1 students.

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

1. Math lowest quartile learning gains
2. ELA lowest quartile learning gains
3. Math learning gains
4. ELA learning gains
5. Science achievement

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	Based on the lowest quartile data in ELA and Math from the Needs Assessment/Analysis section list interventions for the lowest quartile is one of our most critical areas of focus.
Rationale	This Area of Focus was identified as a critical area of need because students in the lowest quartile dropped a combined total of 19 points in ELA & Math which impacts their ability to be success on statewide assessments. There are also three sub-groups performing under the required 41% in Students with disabilities, African American, English Language Learners.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	By focusing on this area, we expect to see increases in state level data from 41% to 44% in Math lowest quartile learning gains and 39% to 42% in ELA lowest quartile learning gains. We expect to see all sub-groups performing at or above the required 41% by ESSA.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Chad Frazier (frazierc@lake.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	A structured intervention time will be used to increase the lowest quartile learning gains in ELA from 39% to 42% and the lowest quartile learning gains in Math from 41% to 44%. The intervention time will also address our identified sub-groups performing below the required 41%. To monitor this strategy school/state/district level data, EWS data, and classroom walk-through data will be analyzed quarterly by the teacher support team.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	If we implement, monitor, and support a structured intervention time then there will be an increase in our lowest quartile data evidenced in school/state/district level data.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Create a structured intervention plan support by non-load bearing staff to implement ELA/Math interventions for students identified in the lowest quartile in ELA & Math. 2. Implement the usage of ALEKS to support quality instruction during Math & Intervention/ Acceleration block. 3. Offer before/after-school tutoring for level 1 & level 2 students to provide prescriptive assistance for students in need. 4. Purchase additional Chromebooks to support invention/acceleration with our level 1 & level 2 students. <p>Who: Administration and Literacy Coach When: Start 9/3/19, End 5/28/19 Frequency: Reevaluate quarterly Evidence: school/state/district level data.</p>
Person Responsible	Edward Stuart (stuarte@lake.k12.fl.us)

#2	
Title	With high expectations, teachers will understand, plan, deliver, and differentiate standards-based instruction in all content areas for all students while intentionally incorporating purposeful Reading, Writing, Thinking, and Talking.
Rationale	If we implement, monitor, and support common planning, then teachers will have the opportunity to plan for and evaluate student formative assessments/work products in order to increase student achievement.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Increase Reading, Thinking, Talking, and Writing and build capacity in setting the purpose for the lesson as well as teacher clarity. This will be evidenced by quarterly increases from the learning walk tool from baseline to mid-year. Increase student achievement in ELA proficiency from 53% to 56%, ELA learning gains from 53% to 55%, Math proficiency from 62% to 65%, Math learning gains from 48% to 51%, Civics proficiency from 68% to 71%, and Science proficiency from 43% to 46%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Chad Frazier (frazierc@lake.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	Common planning will be used to increase teacher capacity therefore leading to increases in student achievement. To monitor this strategy classroom walk-throughs will be analyzed monthly to ensure transfer into instructional delivery from common planning is occurring.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	If we implement, monitor, and support common planning, then teachers will have the opportunity to plan for and evaluate student formative assessments/work products in order to increase student achievement.
Action Step	
	<p>1. Create and establish a common planning schedule with identified facilitator/coach, clearly defined protocols, planning time frame, and expected products. Who: Administration and literacy coach When: Start 8/12/19, End 5/24/19 Frequency: Re-evaluate quarterly Evidence: Schedule, Norms, List of protocols, and deliverables</p>
Description	<p>2. Create a professional development series that focuses on the district instructional framework. The specific focus for the 2019-2020 school year will be purpose. The staff will also do a book study on "Better Learning Through Structured Teaching" by Douglas Fisher/ Nancy Frey Who: Administration and literacy coach When: Monthly Evidence: Professional development schedule, presentations, sign-in sheets, and CWT data.</p>
Person Responsible	Edward Stuart (stuarte@lake.k12.fl.us)

#3

Title

By utilizing early warning systems data, Mt. Dora Middle will increase attendance, positive student behaviors, and maintain a safe and supportive environment for all students.

Rationale

If we monitor early warning systems data quarterly and work with families to ensure expectations are clear, then we will increase attendance, positive student behaviors, and maintain a safe and supportive environment for all students.

State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve

Reduce the number of students meeting the early warning systems data and maintain 7% or less each quarter. Reduce the the amount of students with 10% or more absences by 10%.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome

Collin Lashley (lashleyc@lake.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy

Implementation of school-wide positive behavior plan to offer incentives for students demonstrating desired positive behaviors and monitor early warning signs to intervene with students displaying at-risk behaviors. Reduce the number of students meeting the early warning systems data and maintain 7% or less each quarter. Reduce the the amount of students with 10% or more absences by 10%.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy

If we monitor early warning systems data and work with families to ensure expectations are clear, then we will increase attendance, positive student behaviors, and maintain a safe and supportive environment for all students.

Action Step**Description**

1. Implementation of school-wide positive behavior plan to offer incentives for students demonstrating desired positive behaviors and monitor early warning signs to intervene with students displaying at-risk behaviors.

Who: Administration and guidance
When: 8/24/19, End 5/24/19

Person Responsible

Charlotte Williams (williamsc1@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: Based on the lowest quartile data in ELA and Math from the Needs Assessment/Analysis section list interventions for the lowest quartile is one of our most critical areas of focus.				\$14,630.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20
	5100	690-Computer Software	0411 - Mt. Dora Middle School	Other		\$8,500.00
			Notes: Purchase ALEKS to support quality instruction to work with level 1 & level 2 students for acceleration and intervention.			
	5100	130-Other Certified Instructional Personnel	0411 - Mt. Dora Middle School	Other		\$3,600.00
			Notes: Extra duty pay for tutoring to support the level 1 & level 2 students for acceleration and intervention.			
	5100	640-Furniture, Fixtures and Equipment	0411 - Mt. Dora Middle School	Other		\$2,530.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: With high expectations, teachers will understand, plan, deliver, and differentiate standards-based instruction in all content areas for all students while intentionally incorporating purposeful Reading, Writing, Thinking, and Talking.				\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: By utilizing early warning systems data, Mt. Dora Middle will increase attendance, positive student behaviors, and maintain a safe and supportive environment for all students.				\$0.00
					Total:	\$14,630.00