Lawton Chiles Middle Academy

2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Lawton Chiles Middle Academy

400 FLORIDA AVE N, Lakeland, FL 33801

http://www.lcmaknightsonline.com/

Demographics

Principal: Angela Price

Start Date for this Principal: 8/17/2019

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)	62%
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: A (67%) 2017-18: A (76%) 2016-17: A (75%) 2015-16: A (74%) 2014-15: A (82%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	

ESSA Status	N/A
* 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

Lawton Chiles Middle Academy

400 FLORIDA AVE N, Lakeland, FL 33801

http://www.lcmaknightsonline.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	No	43%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	52%

School Grades History

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

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.

We are an internationally-minded community committed to fostering curious minds in an educational environment that produces resilient, respectful and empathetic students, empowering them to exemplify academic integrity and exhibit responsiveness to our ever-changing global community.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The Lawton Chiles Middle Academy family, consisting of students, faculty, staff, parents, and the community are partners in guiding our students' education by:

- Developing a high interest in all academic areas with an emphasis on math, science, and technology;
- Enabling students to maximize the development of their talents in music and the arts;
- Providing a safe and orderly environment that is student-centered;
- Promoting high expectations academically, socially and technologically;
- Equipping students to work at their highest capability;
- Stressing verbal and written communication;
- Focusing on the development of critical thinking and problem-solving skills;
- Integrating real world situation into the classrooms;
- Encouraging an acceptance of cultural differences, ideas, feelings and talents through cooperative learning and social skills development;
- Linking technology to learning in the classroom and developing proficiency in computer usage; and
- Demonstrating strong parent support and commitment for the education of their child.

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
Kendrick, Telay	Principal	
Price, Angela	Assistant Principal	
DiGioia, Michelle	Teacher, K-12	
Tregler, Debbie	Teacher, K-12	
MacDonald, Susan	Other	
Lavelle, Erin	Teacher, K-12	
Gibson, Theresa	Teacher, K-12	
Simpson, Michael	Dean	
Castillo, Raquel	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	223	222	206	0	0	0	0	651
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	25	32	32	0	0	0	0	89

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	

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	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	2

FTE units allocated to school (total number of teacher units)
41

Date this data was collected or last updated
Wednesday 8/28/2019

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	18	16	21	0	0	0	0	55
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	17	11	0	0	0	0	42
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	3	0	0	0	0	7
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	26	24	8	0	0	0	0	58

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	18	16	21	0	0	0	0	55
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	17	11	0	0	0	0	42
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	3	0	0	0	0	7
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	26	24	8	0	0	0	0	58

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	

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	75%	48%	54%	84%	48%	52%
ELA Learning Gains	63%	52%	54%	71%	51%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	46%	48%	47%	64%	43%	44%
Math Achievement	79%	50%	58%	83%	47%	56%
Math Learning Gains	59%	50%	57%	67%	50%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	44%	48%	51%	59%	46%	50%
Science Achievement	73%	44%	51%	84%	44%	50%
Social Studies Achievement	90%	72%	72%	95%	64%	70%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey				
Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)			Total
	6	7	8	
Number of students enrolled	223 (0)	222 (0)	206 (0)	651 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	0 (18)	0 (16)	0 (21)	0 (55)
One or more suspensions	0 (14)	1 (17)	1 (11)	2 (42)
Course failure in ELA or Math	0 (0)	0 (4)	0 (3)	0 (7)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	25 (26)	32 (24)	32 (8)	89 (58)

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	71%	48%	23%	54%	17%
	2018	68%	41%	27%	52%	16%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	73%	42%	31%	52%	21%
	2018	78%	42%	36%	51%	27%
Same Grade Comparison		-5%				
Cohort Comparison		5%				
08	2019	82%	48%	34%	56%	26%
	2018	87%	49%	38%	58%	29%
Same Grade Comparison		-5%				
Cohort Comparison		4%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2019	77%	47%	30%	55%	22%
	2018	83%	40%	43%	52%	31%
Same Grade Comparison		-6%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	74%	39%	35%	54%	20%
	2018	78%	40%	38%	54%	24%
Same Grade Comparison		-4%				
Cohort Comparison		-9%				
08	2019	53%	35%	18%	46%	7%
	2018	86%	34%	52%	45%	41%
Same Grade Comparison		-33%				
Cohort Comparison		-25%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2019	72%	41%	31%	48%	24%
	2018	77%	42%	35%	50%	27%
Same Grade Comparison		-5%				
Cohort Comparison						

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

CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	90%	70%	20%	71%	19%
2018	93%	84%	9%	71%	22%
Compare		-3%			

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

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	98%	50%	48%	61%	37%
2018	100%	60%	40%	62%	38%
Compare		-2%			

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	100%	53%	47%	57%	43%
2018	100%	41%	59%	56%	44%
Compare		0%			

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	45	48	31	45	57	53					
ELL	23	55	42	45	58	57	23	38			
ASN	87	80		98	77		89	100	97		
BLK	58	49	41	59	43	27	62	82	66		
HSP	68	64	46	67	55	40	57	80	63		
MUL	87	60		87	67						
WHT	83	66	49	88	65	65	81	95	77		
FRL	60	55	46	60	48	36	53	79	44		

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	32	33	29	44	71	73					
ELL	31	44	38	47	66	67		63			
ASN	86	61		98	91		91	94	100		
BLK	57	50	49	76	78	84	59	86	56		
HSP	68	55	54	75	73	71	56	86	71		

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	78	65		88	69						
WHT	87	61	51	94	76	80	84	99	87		
FRL	62	48	47	76	75	77	58	86	63		
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	47	80	83	33	33	40					
ELL	33	63	61	37	34	27					
ASN	89	78		90	74		87	100	97		
BLK	72	66	65	69	63	69	61	89	25		
HSP	71	63	58	71	54	45	78	92	41		
MUL	95	68		95	74						
WHT	90	74	67	91	72	68	91	97	69		
FRL	70	66	63	65	57	55	57	90	38		

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)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	67
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	65
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	670
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	47
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	45
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO

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	90
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	54
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	61
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	75
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	74
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	55
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.

Based on statewide assessments Spring 2019, learning gains for the lowest 25% in math performed the lowest. Learning gains for this sub group had previously been at 51%, but this year dropped to 44%. Contributing factors to this performance included change with multiple teachers the during the second quarter and absence of intensive math in the master schedule.

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

Based on the statewide assessments Spring 2019, students scoring at the proficient level in 8th grade math showed the greatest decline. The 8th grade math proficiency level declined 33% from 86% to 53%. Most students scoring a 3 or above on previous state assessment were placed into Algebra, leaving mostly students who scored a level 1 or 2 taking the 8th grade math assessment is one factor that contributed to this decline. Other factors included change with multiple teachers during the second quarter and absence of intensive math in the master schedule.

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.

LCMA outperformed the state in every area, except with the lowest 25%. ELA learning gains for the lowest 25% showed 46% compared to the state at 47% resulting in a 1% gap; Math learning gains for the lowest 25% showed 44% compared to the state at 51% resulting in the greatest gap of 7%.

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

Based on the statewide assessment Spring 2019, performance in ELA learning gains increased 5% from 58% to 63% 6th grade ELA proficiency increased from 68% to 71% resulting in a 3% increase. New actions taken by the school in ELA included intentional and guided collaborative planning sessions focusing on breaking down standards and analyzing student work; data chats from admin to teachers and teachers to students; and targeted groups of students for small group intervention.

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

89 students scoring Level 1 on statewide assessment is a potential area of concern.

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

1. Subgroups: ELL, SWD, & Lowest 25% improvement in both ELA and Math in proficiency level and learning gains
2. Students maintaining level 4 and 5
3. Increased focus on the IB MYP School
4. Math Proficiency for 8th grade
5. Underachieving gifted students to proficiency

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	Mathematics and ELA Proficiency Level and Learning Gains among Subgroups: ELL, SWD, and Lowest 25%
Rationale	Based on statewide assessments Spring 2019, learning gains for the lowest 25% in math performed the lowest. Learning gains for this sub group had previously been at 51%, but this year dropped to 44%. Identified students in the lowest 25% are SWD or ELL students. ELL students received 45% proficiency in Math and 23% in ELA; SWD received 45% proficiency in Math and 45% in ELA. African American students make up 50% (36 students) of the Lowest 25% population, compared to the following races: 19 White, 14 Hispanic, 1 Asian, and 1 Multiracial.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	The targets below indicate the measurable outcomes for these subgroups: Lowest 25% Learning Gains: ELA - 49% Math 47% ELL: ELA Proficiency: 25%; ELA Learning Gains: 57% & ELA Learning Gains for ELL in Lowest 25%: 44% ELL Math Proficiency: 47%; Math Learning Gains: 60% & Math Learning Gains for ELL in Lowest 25%: 59% SWD: ELA Proficiency: 47%; ELA Learning Gains: 50% & ELA Learning Gains for SWD in Lowest 25%: 33% SWD: Math Proficiency: 47%; Math Learning Gains: 59% & Math Learning Gains for SWD in Lowest 25%: 55%
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Angela Price (angela.price@polk-fl.net)
Evidence-based Strategy	1. Intentional efforts to support subgroups a.. Effective scheduling, tutoring opportunities, guided planning, and analyzing student work b.. Guided planning, data chats 2. Collective Teacher Efficacy and establishing a culture of instructional excellence
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	1a. Planning and prediction: strategies emphasizing learning intentions is rated at a 0.76 of Hattie's effect size list (Dec. 2017) 1b.. Feedback (data chats) is rated at 0.7 of Hattie's effect size list. (Dec. 2017) Marzano: Classroom Instruction that Works: Research-based Strategies for improving Student Achievement 2. Teachers understand that they way they do their work has a significant impact on student results - for better or worse. Involves stopping teachers from using other factors (i.e. home influence, poverty, lack of motivation) as an excuse. Making a difference despite hindrances. Collective Teacher Efficacy is rated at a 1.57 of Hattie's effect size. (Dec. 2017)
Action Step	
Description	1. Identify students (SWD, ELL, and Lowest 25%) by digging into data to determine proficiency level, learning gains, cell count towards school grade, number of points for next proficiency level or number of points for a learning gain. Create spreadsheet with identified students (with pictures) to use with teachers during data chats. 2.Effective scheduling of SWD and ELL students to streamline communication among teachers and stakeholders. 2. Guided planning with teachers to set clear learning targets, determine interventions and progress monitoring for specified students, analyzing student work to determine instructional shifts.Supply resources as needed.

3. Tutoring Opportunities within and outside the school day. Prioritize tutoring seats with identified students and make contact at home when tutoring opportunities arise outside of school. Determine opportunities within school day for small group remediation, skill-building or practice.
4. Data chats with teachers from administration, testing coordinator, and instructional coach. Bi-monthly teacher to student data chats.
5. Interdisciplinary strategies: reading strategies across content areas such as science and social studies; meaningful content within the reading classroom such as previewing science/social studies content and vocabulary.
6. Push in support from ELL paraprofessional and other support staff as determined through data chats and in ELA, Reading, and Math classrooms.
7. Diversity training during pre-planning days and then revisited throughout the school year to close the learning gap for our African American students in the Lowest 25%.

Person Responsible   Katelyn Gregory (katelyn.gregory@polk-fl.net)

#2	
Title	Maintain Levels 4 & 5 ELA & Math
Rationale	For the Spring of 2018 state assessment, 362 students earned a level 4 or 5 in Math; in Spring of 2019, there was a 17% decline with 299 students scoring a level 4 or 5 in Math. 162 of the 299 students (54.18%) maintained a level 4 or 5 from the previous year in Math. For the Spring 2018 state assessment, 307 students earned a level 4 or 5 in ELA; in Spring of 2019, there was an increase of 3.76% with 319 students scoring a level 4 or 5 in ELA. 170 of the 319 students (54.29%) maintained a level 4 or 5 from the previous year in ELA.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	57% of students who earned a Level 4 or 5 on Spring 2019 ELA state assessment will maintain a Level 4 or 5 on Spring 2020 ELA state assessment. 57% of students who earned a Level 4 or 5 on Spring 2019 Math state assessment will maintain a Level 4 or 5 on Spring 2020 Math state assessment.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Angela Price (angela.price@polk-fl.net)
Evidence-based Strategy	Intentional planning, implementing, analyzing, and monitoring of students, tasks, and differentiation will guide our work in assisting students in maintaining a level 4 or 5 on state assessments in ELA and Math.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Robert Marzano, Science International (LSI) practices - district initiative and evidence-based strategies Learning Cognitive Task Analysis is rated at 0.87 of Hattie's high effect size strategies (Dec. 2017) Carol Ann Tomlinson's research on differentiation (content, product, process) with an understanding of students' readiness, interests, and learning profile.(2010)

Action Step	
Description	1. Identify students who scored a Level 4 and/or 5 in ELA and/or Math. Create spreadsheet with identified students (with pictures) to use with teachers during administrative data chats. 2.Cognitively complexity for task and target/task alignment to standard will be planned, implemented, analyzed, and monitored for rigor and student success. 3. Intentional differentiation (content, process, and product) for students will be planned, implemented, analyzed, and monitored for student success and enrichment. 4.Gifted resource teachers will work on a regular basis with small groups of underachieving gifted students to develop plans and assist students with academic content; small groups of gifted students for enrichment opportunities within the academic content. 5. Data chats will occur between students and teachers that include goal setting, data tracking, feedback and reflection. 6. Enrichment opportunities for students within and outside the school day to enhance skills and strategies with ELA and Math content.
Person Responsible	Katelyn Gregory (katelyn.gregory@polk-fl.net)

#3	
Title	Increased Focus and Implementation on IB Middle Years Programme
Rationale	International Baccalaureate (IB) Middle Years Programme (MYP) is based on reseached-based practices with the focus on the development of the global citizenship. Lawton Chiles Middle Academy has a new principal and, as a result, a renewed focus on IB MYP.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	All LCMA stakeholders will be prepared for the 2022 IB MYP evaluation. Staff participation in vertical planning, MYP Collaborative Planning, and professional development opportunities will be evidenced through sign-in sheets, unit plans, and reflections. Parent and community members will participate in IB related meetings and dialogue.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Telay Kendrick (telay.kendrick@polk-fl.net)
Evidence-based Strategy	LCMA stakeholders will engage in a well-planned and deliberate series of professional development and activities that will result in an understanding of the IB Middle Years Programme and what it means for LCMA to be an IB World School.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	All IB World Schools undergo an extensive programme evaluation process every five years. Stakeholders, including parents and community members, will participate in comprehensive interviews with visiting evaluators. School staff will provide documentation and evidence of the efficacy of LCMA's IB Middle Years Programme.
Action Step	
Description	1. IB MYP Coordinator will model instructional practices for new teachers within the IB philosophy. 2. Differentiated MYP Collaborative Planning opportunities will be provided for teachers based on teacher feedback and need. 3. IB MYP Coordinator will collaborate with LCMA's ITV program to emphasize Learner Profile, Approaches to Learning, and global citizenship. 4. Teachers, counselors, coordinator, and administration will participate in IB professional development. Teachers will also participate in vertical planning and school-based IB MYP professional development. 5. Redesign of student agendas with focus on IB components: Learner Profiles, Approaches to Learning, MYP data/summatives, Academic Honesty Policy, and MYP reflection pages. 6. Redesign of community project for 8th grade through Global Technology classes. 7. IB informational video will be created and will be accessible to parents and other stakeholders on LCMA website and also will be shared in SAC and PTSO meetings. 8. Staff members will use IB MYP terminology within parent and stakeholder conversations/conferences. 9. Focus parent groups for feedback regarding IB MYP components at Lawton Chiles Middle Academy.
Person Responsible	Susie Kallan (susie.kallan@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.

NA

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.

NA

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

NA

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.

NA

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

NA

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Mathematics and ELA Proficiency Level and Learning Gains among Subgroups: ELL, SWD, and Lowest 25%	$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Maintain Levels 4 & 5 ELA & Math	$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Increased Focus and Implementation on IB Middle Years Programme	$0.00
		Total:	$0.00