

Polk County Public Schools

Lake Gibson 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 | 15 |
| Title I Requirements | 19 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 21 |

Lake Gibson Middle School

6901 SOCRUM LOOP RD N, Lakeland, FL 33809

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

Demographics

Principal: Ismael Portillo

Start Date for this Principal: 4/20/2015

| | |
|--|--|
| 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 | 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* Asian Students Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students* Multiracial Students* White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students* |
| School Grades History | 2018-19: C (49%) 2017-18: C (49%) 2016-17: C (41%) 2015-16: C (46%) 2014-15: C (49%) |
| 2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information* | |
| SI Region | Southwest |
| Regional Executive Director | |
| Turnaround Option/Cycle | N/A |
| Year | N/A |
| Support Tier | N/A |

| 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 Polk 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 | 15 |
| Title I Requirements | 19 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 21 |

Lake Gibson Middle School

6901 SOCRUM LOOP RD N, Lakeland, FL 33809

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

School Demographics

| School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File) | 2018-19 Title I School | 2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3) |
|--|------------------------|--|
| Middle School 6-8 | Yes | 76% |
| Primary Service Type (per MSID File) | Charter School | 2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2) |
| K-12 General Education | No | 53% |

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Polk 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.

Lake Gibson Middle School's mission is to develop successful students by providing experiences through college and career pathways.

Provide the school's vision statement.

We believe that:

Success - All students can and will learn, no matter what!

Honesty - Honesty is the best policy.

Achievement - Students will achieve by participating in hands on, interactive learning experiences.

Respect - Everyone will treat each other with respect.

Knowledge - Students will gain knowledge through partnerships with school, families and community.

Safety - Our school environment will be safe.

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 |
|--------------------|---------------------|---------------------------------|
| Douge, Alain | Principal | |
| Hutchinson, Robin | Instructional Coach | |
| Leslie, Gloria | Teacher, ESE | |
| Pages, Neysa | Other | |
| Sullivan, Dena | Instructional Media | |
| Barham, John | Other | |
| Sessoms, Leandrea | Assistant Principal | |
| Wiggs, Carla | Assistant Principal | |
| Pedigo, Jackie | School Counselor | |
| Baine, Melinda | Assistant Principal | |
| Donhauser, Heather | Assistant Principal | |
| Jackson, Joanne | Other | |
| Harris, Becky | Teacher, K-12 | |
| | | |

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 | 432 | 395 | 443 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1270 | |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 49 | 38 | 48 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 135 | |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 1 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 22 | |
| Course failure in ELA or Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 10 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 22 | |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 75 | 63 | 113 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 251 | |

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 | 2 | 14 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 29 |

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 | 77 | 47 | 56 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 180 | |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | |

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

76

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 7/24/2019

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 | 114 | 135 | 125 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 374 | |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 23 | 76 | 60 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 159 | |
| Course failure in ELA or Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 21 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 33 | |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 172 | 190 | 138 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 500 | |

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 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |

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 | 114 | 135 | 125 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 374 | |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 23 | 76 | 60 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 159 | |
| Course failure in ELA or Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 21 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 33 | |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 172 | 190 | 138 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 500 | |

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 | |
| Students with two or more indicators | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

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 | 43% | 48% | 54% | 40% | 48% | 52% |
| ELA Learning Gains | 47% | 52% | 54% | 45% | 51% | 54% |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | 39% | 48% | 47% | 39% | 43% | 44% |
| Math Achievement | 43% | 50% | 58% | 40% | 47% | 56% |
| Math Learning Gains | 42% | 50% | 57% | 42% | 50% | 57% |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 46% | 48% | 51% | 34% | 46% | 50% |
| Science Achievement | 40% | 44% | 51% | 37% | 44% | 50% |
| Social Studies Achievement | 68% | 72% | 72% | 61% | 64% | 70% |

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

| Indicator | Grade Level (prior year reported) | | | Total |
|---------------------------------|-----------------------------------|----------|-----------|-----------|
| | 6 | 7 | 8 | |
| Number of students enrolled | 432 (0) | 395 (0) | 443 (0) | 1270 (0) |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 49 (114) | 38 (135) | 48 (125) | 135 (374) |
| One or more suspensions | 11 (23) | 1 (76) | 10 (60) | 22 (159) |
| Course failure in ELA or Math | 2 (8) | 10 (21) | 10 (4) | 22 (33) |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 75 (172) | 63 (190) | 113 (138) | 251 (500) |

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 | 49% | 48% | 1% | 54% | -5% |
| | 2018 | 40% | 41% | -1% | 52% | -12% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 9% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 07 | 2019 | 38% | 42% | -4% | 52% | -14% |
| | 2018 | 36% | 42% | -6% | 51% | -15% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 2% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | -2% | | | | |
| 08 | 2019 | 39% | 48% | -9% | 56% | -17% |
| | 2018 | 45% | 49% | -4% | 58% | -13% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -6% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 3% | | | | |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|-----------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 06 | 2019 | 47% | 47% | 0% | 55% | -8% |
| | 2018 | 39% | 40% | -1% | 52% | -13% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 8% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 07 | 2019 | 34% | 39% | -5% | 54% | -20% |
| | 2018 | 36% | 40% | -4% | 54% | -18% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -2% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | -5% | | | | |
| 08 | 2019 | 19% | 35% | -16% | 46% | -27% |
| | 2018 | 23% | 34% | -11% | 45% | -22% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -4% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | -17% | | | | |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
|-----------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 08 | 2019 | 38% | 41% | -3% | 48% | -10% |
| | 2018 | 45% | 42% | 3% | 50% | -5% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -7% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |

| BIOLOGY EOC | | | | | |
|-------------|--------|----------|-----------------------|-------|--------------------|
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2019 | 0% | 54% | -54% | 67% | -67% |
| 2018 | 0% | 59% | -59% | 65% | -65% |
| Compare | | 0% | | | |

| CIVICS EOC | | | | | |
|--------------|--------|----------|-----------------------|-------|--------------------|
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2019 | 66% | 70% | -4% | 71% | -5% |
| 2018 | 93% | 84% | 9% | 71% | 22% |
| Compare | | -27% | | | |
| 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 | 77% | 50% | 27% | 61% | 16% |
| 2018 | 73% | 60% | 13% | 62% | 11% |
| Compare | | 4% | | | |
| GEOMETRY EOC | | | | | |
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2019 | 97% | 53% | 44% | 57% | 40% |
| 2018 | 100% | 41% | 59% | 56% | 44% |
| Compare | | -3% | | | |

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 | 16 | 37 | 38 | 22 | 45 | 46 | 14 | 41 | | | |
| ELL | 19 | 42 | 41 | 21 | 46 | 51 | 20 | 65 | | | |
| ASN | 59 | 59 | | 59 | 76 | | | | | | |
| BLK | 27 | 40 | 39 | 24 | 32 | 32 | 14 | 59 | 62 | | |
| HSP | 41 | 48 | 43 | 41 | 41 | 52 | 37 | 67 | 72 | | |
| MUL | 51 | 46 | | 55 | 44 | | | | | | |
| WHT | 49 | 50 | 36 | 50 | 46 | 53 | 51 | 72 | 69 | | |
| FRL | 36 | 46 | 43 | 34 | 41 | 47 | 26 | 61 | 52 | | |
| 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 | 13 | 34 | 30 | 17 | 45 | 41 | 8 | | | | |
| ELL | 15 | 34 | 33 | 27 | 37 | 40 | 33 | | | | |
| ASN | 57 | 50 | | 55 | 44 | | | | | | |
| BLK | 30 | 40 | 37 | 22 | 28 | 29 | 27 | 84 | 46 | | |
| HSP | 38 | 42 | 33 | 40 | 46 | 51 | 48 | 93 | 58 | | |

| 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 |
| MUL | 50 | 35 | | 52 | 46 | | 36 | | 73 | | |
| WHT | 46 | 43 | 31 | 47 | 40 | 47 | 51 | 96 | 60 | | |
| FRL | 34 | 39 | 34 | 34 | 37 | 39 | 40 | 86 | 51 | | |
| 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 | 22 | 17 | 11 | 26 | 25 | 19 | 16 | 30 | | |
| ELL | 18 | 34 | 44 | 23 | 32 | 27 | 13 | 36 | | | |
| ASN | 56 | 59 | | 47 | 56 | | | | | | |
| BLK | 24 | 36 | 37 | 26 | 38 | 33 | 22 | 49 | 27 | | |
| HSP | 36 | 45 | 40 | 36 | 37 | 34 | 31 | 52 | 38 | | |
| MUL | 38 | 42 | 23 | 51 | 47 | | | 63 | | | |
| WHT | 48 | 49 | 41 | 46 | 45 | 35 | 47 | 68 | 36 | | |
| FRL | 30 | 38 | 36 | 32 | 39 | 35 | 33 | 52 | 29 | | |

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 | 48 |
| 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 | 38 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 475 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 10 |
| Percent Tested | 98% |
| Subgroup Data | |
| Students With Disabilities | |
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities | 32 |
| 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 |

| English Language Learners | |
|--|-----|
| 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 | 63 |
| 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 | 37 |
| 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 | 49 |
| 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 | 53 |
| 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 | 42 |
| 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.

The data component that showed the lowest performance was in ELA with the ELL's having 2% proficient and in Math with the ELL's having 11% proficient. A contributing factor was our ESOL para transitioned into a science teaching position and the replacement was not hired until the end of the school year.

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

The data component that showed the greatest decline from the prior year was in Science with the AA declining by 50% proficient and in Math with the ELL's declining by 50% as well. In Science in the past several years there was a great deal of teacher turn over which contributed to the lack of standard based instruction for these 8th graders. In Math there was a lack of support from an ESOL para due to reallocation of staff.

Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends.

The data component that had the greatest gap when compared to the state average is our 8th grade math that had 19% proficiency and the state had 46% proficiency which is a 27 point differential. The factor that contributed was teacher turn over leading to gaps in instruction.

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

The data that showed the most improvement was in Science and Math with our ESE students increasing by 2% in both content areas. An action taken was a more consistent provision of support services in science classes. An action taken in math was increase supplemental exposure of Imagine Math and enrollment in intensive coursework. An action taken for both science and math was our Shark Camp that focused on bottom 25% students.

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

Our potential areas of concerns with the EWS data are SWD, ELL and AA showing less than 40% proficient.

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

1. Increase overall ELA proficiency with a focus on the subgroups of ELL, SWD, and AA.
2. Increase overall Math proficiency with a focus on the subgroups of ELL, SWD, and AA.
3. Decrease our total number of discipline referrals.
4. Decrease excessive absences.
- 5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

| #1 | |
|---|--|
| Title | ELA Proficiency |
| Rationale | Overall ELA proficiency remained stagnate at 42% for the 2018-2019 school year. The ELL subcategory was 2% proficient, SWD was 10% proficient and AA was 27% proficient. |
| State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve | To increase overall ELA proficiency to 46% by increasing the subcategories of: ELL to 5%, SWD to 12% and AA to 30% proficiency. |
| Person responsible for monitoring outcome | Alain Douge (alain.douge@polk-fl.net) |
| Evidence-based Strategy | Having a curriculum focus on LSI practices, SIM strategies, and AVID strategies. Provide a Literacy Family Engagement night. |
| Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy | Evidence-based curriculum focus on strategies that close the achievement gap; non-proficient student population at LGMS is 58% in ELA. |
| Action Step | |
| Description | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Provide staff professional instructional supplies (AVID weekly, Spring LSI training, SIMS training, and support staff) such as coaching cycles, and push in/pull out and tutoring sessions to close the achievement gap. 2. Incorporate reading into all classes using Accelerated Reader, cross curricular articles, and weekly library visits via ELA classes, as well as providing teachers with materials and trainings. 3. Reading teachers will utilize ACHIEVE 3000 curriculum to frontload the science and social studies concepts on a monthly basis. 4. Data chats will be held with all students at quarterly meetings with administration, with a special focus on bottom 25% students, ELL students, SWD, and AA students. Teachers will conduct weekly data chats with students, setting goals and progress monitoring by both the teachers and the students. 5. Provide extra support for AVID, ELL, SWD, and AA students to include materials and activities. There will be increased communication with ELL, SWD, and AA families regarding academic assistance, performance, and additional instructional support (via the ELL teacher, SWD support staff/teachers). The AVID teachers will be provided with access to AVID Weekly articles for instructional use, tutorials twice a week, and field trips. 6. LGMS will implement instructional strategies based on implementation of LSI strategies using growth tracker, teaming, success criteria, target task alignment, and rigorous standards based instruction. 7. Family Engagement night will be linked to learning, collaborative and interactive. 8. Title 1 Coach supporting instruction and staff through data management and professional development. 9. Daily staff feedback on instruction from administrative staff to teachers. |

Person Responsible Melinda Baine (melinda.baine@polk-fl.net)

#2

Title Math Proficiency

Rationale Overall Math proficiency increased from 40% to 43% for the 2018-2019 school year. The ELL subcategory was 11% proficient, SWD was 16% proficient and AA was 20% proficient.

State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve

To increase overall Math proficiency to 47% by increasing the subcategories of: ELL to 13%, SWD to 18% and AA to 25% proficiency.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome

Alain Douge (alain.douge@polk-fl.net)

Evidence-based Strategy

Having a curriculum focus on LSI practices, Imagine Math, Open Up Resources, and AVID strategies. Family Engagement Math night will be provided.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy

Evidence-based curriculum focus on strategies that close the achievement gap; non-proficient student population at LGMS is 57% in Math.

Action Step

Description

1. Use of common module assessments amongst grade levels and data analysis through streamlined PLC's.
2. Imagine Math will be used with fidelity within intensive math classes.
3. Provide instructional supplies and provisions in order to promote real-world experiences to develop and apply mathematical understanding.
4. Shark Camp will be offered for tutoring and will be focused on targeting the focus area subgroups (ELL, SWD, and AA) from the ESSA report.
5. Data chats will be held with all students at quarterly meetings with administration, with a special focus on bottom 25% students, ELL students, SWD, and AA students. Teachers will conduct weekly data chats with students, setting goals and progress monitoring by both the teachers and the students.
6. A family engagement math night will be liked to learning, collaborative and interactive.
8. Title 1 Coach supporting instruction and staff through data management and professional development.
9. Daily staff feedback on instruction from administrative staff to teachers.

Person Responsible

Carla Wiggs (carla.wiggs@polk-fl.net)

| #3 | |
|---|--|
| Title | Discipline |
| Rationale | 24% of students had referrals. 8% of students had six or more referrals. |
| State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve | Decrease discipline referrals to less than 20% of the total population. |
| Person responsible for monitoring outcome | Alain Douge (alain.douge@polk-fl.net) |
| Evidence-based Strategy | Implementing the school-wide use of PBIS, CHAMPS, and MTSS. Family engagement program linked to learning. |
| Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy | 76% of the students at LGMS are tier 1 students. |
| Action Step | |
| Description | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Using the Polk Early Warning Systems data, at risk students will be identified and families will be invited to attend quarterly meetings to discuss instructional resources and support opportunities in order to promote improvement within at risk areas. 2. Train faculty on how to track and monitor discipline using SIF. 3. Provide PD/Trainings on building relationships and best practices on classroom management skills. 4. Ensuring usage of CHAMPS, PBIS, and STOIC. 5. Identify students with high percentage of discipline referrals, while implementing behavior interventions. 6. Family engagement family nights data will be analyzed to see the link between families attendance with the family engagement and discipline of the students. 7. Test population of students and teachers using Ron Clark house discipline strategy to encourage positive behaviors. 8. Behavior interventionist assisting Tier 2 and Tier 3 teachers through coaching cycle and professional development. |
| Person Responsible | Leandrea Sessoms (leandrea.sessoms@polk-fl.net) |

| #4 | |
|---|--|
| Title | Attendance |
| Rationale | 12% of student population had excessive absences. |
| State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve | Decrease excessive student absences to 10%. |
| Person responsible for monitoring outcome | Alain Douge (alain.douge@polk-fl.net) |
| Evidence-based Strategy | Open communication is upheld between staff and MTSS team and school social worker to monitor students with excessive absences. Family relationships development. |
| Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy | Based on past collected data through MTSS, this strategy is effective for increasing student attendance. |
| Action Step | |
| Description | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Students with perfect attendance will participate in quarterly attendance celebrations. 2. Run weekly student attendance reports. Identify students with more than 3 whole day absences (Admin and counseling staff to help call home for student updates).. 3. Identify high risk attendance students prior to school starting. 4. Ensure student engagement in classrooms providing teachers with effective resources. 5. Family engagement program's data will be analyzed to see if families that attend the family engagement programs student's attendance increases. |
| Person Responsible | Alain Douge (alain.douge@polk-fl.net) |

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).

Part IV: Title I Requirements

Additional Title I Requirements

This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A schoolwide program and opts to use the Schoolwide Improvement Plan to satisfy the requirements of the schoolwide program plan, as outlined in the Every Student Succeeds Act, Public Law No. 114-95, Â§ 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families, and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission and support the needs of students.

See the school's Title I Parent & Family Engagement Plan.

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.

LGMS conducts District mandated prevention lessons. School counselors, psychologist, behavior interventionist and social worker are on campus available for students on a regular basis. Through our MTSS team, tier 3 students are placed with mentors to provide extra support.

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

We provide the following supports for incoming 6th graders through the following:

Open house for 5th graders

Guidance counselor made available for all students

All 6th graders are held in a common area in the mornings

Grade levels meetings to discuss expectations and policies

Open communication is held between the middle school and elementary school staff to ensure a smooth transition for the students

We provide the following supports for our 8th graders going to high school at the end of the year through the following:

Students participate in 8th grade transitional meetings to prepare for high school through ELA classes with Assistant Principal

Open house night at the high school

Open communication is held between the middle school and high school staff to ensure a smooth transition for the students

Describe the process through which school leadership identifies and aligns all available resources (e.g., personnel, instructional, curricular) in order to meet the needs of all students and maximize desired student outcomes. Include the methodology for coordinating and supplementing federal, state and local funds, services and programs. Provide the person(s) responsible, frequency of meetings, how an inventory of resources is maintained and any problem-solving activities used to determine how to apply resources for the highest impact.

The MTSS Leadership Team, including the behavior interventionist, will focus meetings on how to improve school/teacher effectiveness and student achievement using the Problem Solving Model.

The MTSS Leadership Team will meet at least once per week to engage in the following activities:

- o Along with the MTSS team, instructional coaches and interventionists will review school-wide, grade level, and teacher data to problem solve needed interventions on a systemic level and identify students meeting/exceeding benchmarks as well as those at moderate or high risk for not meeting benchmarks. Conducted monthly.

- o Help referring teachers design feasible strategies and interventions for struggling students by collaborating regularly, problem solving, sharing effective practices, evaluating implementation, assist in making decisions for school, teacher, and student improvement.

- o Focus on improving student achievement outcomes with evidence based interventions implemented with fidelity and frequent progress monitoring and support teachers in carrying out intervention plans.

A subgroup of the MTSS Leadership Team will meet at least monthly to specifically review and discuss discipline data, implementation of PBIS, utilize the problem solving model for students or classes needing Tier 2 or 3 interventions, and discuss staff professional development needs.

Title I, Part A, funds school-wide services to Lake Gibson Middle School. The Title I funds provide supplemental instructional resources and interventions for students with academic achievement needs. Paraprofessional will be strategically placed to support the achievement of the ESSA identified

subgroups within our areas of focus. This program supports after-school and summer instructional programs, supplemental instructional materials, resource teachers, technology for students, professional development for the staff (including trainings for adopted programs such as AVID, LSI, and SIMS), and resources for parents.

Students at Lake Gibson Middle School have the option to participate in a variety of pre-academies including Culinary, Business, Pre-Health, Agriculture Science, Media Design, and Fine Arts.

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

The guidance counselors will meet with students to discuss their individual grades and interests. Career pre-academies are offered. Counselors also reinforce/promote College and Career readiness by having a college day to wear your favorite college team attire. LGMS also participates in the District's WE3 Expo which advertises career academies. We will also continue the AVID program for the 2019-20 school year, which emphasizes college career options and lifelong learning. LGMS also hosts The Great American Teach In which introduces students to multiple college and career pathways. Students engage in career lessons via social studies courses.

LGMS on the road reaches out to the community and promotes partnerships between all stakeholders.

Part V: Budget

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

| 1 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: ELA Proficiency | | | | \$18,800.00 |
|---|----------|---------------------------------|--|----------------|-----|-------------|
| | Function | Object | Budget Focus | Funding Source | FTE | 2019-20 |
| | 7200 | 790-Miscellaneous Expenses | 1761 - Lake Gibson Middle School | | | \$4,000.00 |
| | | | <i>Notes: Substitutes - LSI Peer Observations</i> | | | |
| | 7200 | 790-Miscellaneous Expenses | 1761 - Lake Gibson Middle School | | | \$7,500.00 |
| | | | <i>Notes: LSI Professional Development</i> | | | |
| | 7200 | 790-Miscellaneous Expenses | 1761 - Lake Gibson Middle School | | | \$1,150.00 |
| | | | <i>Notes: Instructional Supplies</i> | | | |
| | 7200 | 790-Miscellaneous Expenses | 1761 - Lake Gibson Middle School | | | \$1,000.00 |
| | | | <i>Notes: Family Engagement</i> | | | |
| | 7200 | 790-Miscellaneous Expenses | 1761 - Lake Gibson Middle School | | | \$1,600.00 |
| | | | <i>Notes: Technology IPAD Cart</i> | | | |
| | 7200 | 790-Miscellaneous Expenses | 1761 - Lake Gibson Middle School | | | \$600.00 |
| | | | <i>Notes: LCD Projectors for new portables (2)</i> | | | |
| | 7200 | 790-Miscellaneous Expenses | 1761 - Lake Gibson Middle School | | | \$750.00 |

| | | | | | | |
|----------|---------------|---|--|----------------|-----|--------------------|
| | | | <i>Notes: Printers for new portables (3_</i> | | | |
| | 7200 | 790-Miscellaneous Expenses | 1761 - Lake Gibson Middle School | | | \$2,200.00 |
| | | | <i>Notes: SmartBoards for new portables</i> | | | |
| 2 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Math Proficiency | | | | \$20,694.00 |
| | Function | Object | Budget Focus | Funding Source | FTE | 2019-20 |
| | 7200 | 790-Miscellaneous Expenses | 1761 - Lake Gibson Middle School | | | \$4,000.00 |
| | | | <i>Notes: Substitutes - LSI Peer Observations</i> | | | |
| | 7200 | 790-Miscellaneous Expenses | 1761 - Lake Gibson Middle School | | | \$3,000.00 |
| | | | <i>Notes: PFE Agendas</i> | | | |
| | 7200 | 790-Miscellaneous Expenses | 1761 - Lake Gibson Middle School | | | \$2,000.00 |
| | | | <i>Notes: Technology</i> | | | |
| | 7200 | 790-Miscellaneous Expenses | 1761 - Lake Gibson Middle School | | | \$1,000.00 |
| | | | <i>Notes: Family Engagement</i> | | | |
| | 7200 | 790-Miscellaneous Expenses | 1761 - Lake Gibson Middle School | | | \$1,150.00 |
| | | | <i>Notes: Instructional Supplies</i> | | | |
| | 7200 | 790-Miscellaneous Expenses | 1761 - Lake Gibson Middle School | | | \$7,500.00 |
| | | | <i>Notes: LSI - Professional Development</i> | | | |
| | 7200 | 790-Miscellaneous Expenses | 1761 - Lake Gibson Middle School | | | \$544.00 |
| | | | <i>Notes: Publix math field study</i> | | | |
| | 7200 | 790-Miscellaneous Expenses | 1761 - Lake Gibson Middle School | | | \$1,500.00 |
| | | | <i>Notes: AVID field study - Colleges</i> | | | |
| 3 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Discipline | | | | \$6,450.00 |
| | Function | Object | Budget Focus | Funding Source | FTE | 2019-20 |
| | 7200 | 790-Miscellaneous Expenses | 1761 - Lake Gibson Middle School | | | \$1,800.00 |
| | | | <i>Notes: Ron Clark Academy House Points Application</i> | | | |
| | 7200 | 790-Miscellaneous Expenses | 1761 - Lake Gibson Middle School | | | \$2,500.00 |
| | | | <i>Notes: Instructional Supplies</i> | | | |
| | 7200 | 790-Miscellaneous Expenses | 1761 - Lake Gibson Middle School | | | \$1,000.00 |
| | | | <i>Notes: Family Engagement</i> | | | |

| | | | | | | |
|---------------|---------------|-----------------------------------|--------------------------------------|----------------|-----|--------------------|
| | 7200 | 790-Miscellaneous Expenses | 1761 - Lake Gibson Middle School | | | \$1,150.00 |
| | | | <i>Notes: Instructional Supplies</i> | | | |
| 4 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Attendance | | | | \$2,150.00 |
| | Function | Object | Budget Focus | Funding Source | FTE | 2019-20 |
| | 7200 | 790-Miscellaneous Expenses | 1761 - Lake Gibson Middle School | | | \$1,150.00 |
| | | | <i>Notes: Instructional Supplies</i> | | | |
| | 7200 | 790-Miscellaneous Expenses | 1761 - Lake Gibson Middle School | | | \$1,000.00 |
| Total: | | | | | | \$48,094.00 |