L. A. Ainger Middle School

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

L. A. Ainger Middle School

245 COUGAR WAY, Rotonda West, FL 33947

http://yourcharletteschools.net/lam

Demographics

Principal: Bruce Fourman

Start Date for this Principal: 7/19/2016

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
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	81%
2019-20 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 (65%) 2017-18: A (62%) 2016-17: B (57%) 2015-16: B (58%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	
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 was approved by the Charlotte County School Board on 10/13/2020.

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

L. A. Ainger Middle School

245 COUGAR WAY, Rotonda West, FL 33947

http://yourcharlotteschools.net/lam

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	**2019-20 Title I School**	**2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
Middle School 6-8	No	66%

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

School Grades History

Year	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17
Grade	A	A	A	B

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Charlotte County School Board on 10/13/2020.

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.

To promote TRUST, RESPECT, ACHIEVEMENT, CHARACTER, and KINDNESS in a positive culture that inspires SUCCESS for ALL.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Student Success!

School Leadership Team

Membership
Identify the name, email address, position title, and job duties/responsibilities for each member of the school leadership team.**:**

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Harvey, Jeff	Principal	Program and support funding. Monitoring program implementation integrity.
Konrardy, Daryl	Assistant Principal	Curriculum data analytics. Needs Assessment. Prescriptive program support measures.
Murnighan, Mary	Teacher, K-12	Teacher input and observation. Needs assessment. Teacher support.
Fourman, Bruce	Assistant Principal	Technology and facilities support. Student discipline and attendance.

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Tuesday 7/19/2016, Bruce Fourman

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*
3

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*
7

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

35

Demographic Data

2020-21 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
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	81%
2019-20 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 (65%) 2017-18: A (62%) 2016-17: B (57%) 2015-16: B (58%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	
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]().	

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

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

Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	162	197	161	0	0	0	0	520
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	21	51	36	0	0	0	0	108
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	3	2	0	0	0	0	11
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	19	11	0	0	0	0	43
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	4	4	0	0	0	0	20
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	31	18	29	0	0	0	0	78
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	31	34	21	0	0	0	0	86
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	19	20	0	0	0	0	56

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

Date this data was collected or last updated
Wednesday 9/23/2020

Prior Year - As Reported

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

Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	241	201	244	0	0	0	0	686
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	22	27	34	0	0	0	0	83
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	30	38	38	0	0	0	0	106
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	50	54	59	0	0	0	0	163
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	42	45	68	0	0	0	0	155

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	44	59	0	0	0	0	103

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	2	2	1	0	0	0	0	5
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

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	
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	214	200	244	0	0	0	0	658
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	33	32	48	0	0	0	0	113
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	38	46	59	0	0	0	0	143
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	57	35	36	0	0	0	0	128
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	52	47	67	0	0	0	0	166

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	50	38	63	0	0	0	0	151

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	2	2	1	0	0	0	0	5
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

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	59%	54%	54%	52%	50%	52%
ELA Learning Gains	54%	53%	54%	50%	52%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	42%	46%	47%	39%	42%	44%

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
Math Achievement	71%	63%	58%	65%	59%	56%
Math Learning Gains	78%	61%	57%	64%	58%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	62%	50%	51%	53%	46%	50%
Science Achievement	61%	59%	51%	58%	54%	50%
Social Studies Achievement	75%	78%	72%	80%	78%	70%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey				
Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)			Total
	6	7	8	
	(0)	(0)	(0)	0 (0)

Grade Level Data
NOTE: This data is raw data and includes ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2019	56%	49%	7%	54%	2%
	2018	58%	48%	10%	52%	6%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	53%	46%	7%	52%	1%
	2018	49%	51%	-2%	51%	-2%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison		-5%				
08	2019	64%	56%	8%	56%	8%
	2018	63%	57%	6%	58%	5%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison		15%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2019	54%	51%	3%	55%	-1%
	2018	44%	46%	-2%	52%	-8%
Same Grade Comparison		10%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	62%	62%	0%	54%	8%
	2018	72%	64%	8%	54%	18%
Same Grade Comparison		-10%				
Cohort Comparison		18%				
08	2019	76%	47%	29%	46%	30%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	61%	45%	16%	45%	16%
Same Grade Comparison		15%				
Cohort Comparison		4%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2019	60%	55%	5%	48%	12%
	2018	66%	53%	13%	50%	16%
Same Grade Comparison		-6%				
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	74%	78%	-4%	71%	3%
2018	81%	78%	3%	71%	10%
Compare		-7%			
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	100%	64%	36%	61%	39%
2018	99%	72%	27%	62%	37%
Compare		1%			
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	100%	62%	38%	57%	43%
2018					

Subgroup Data

2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	28	41	35	40	53	43	30	50	36		
ELL	40	43		47	71						
HSP	63	54	61	66	75	57	52	79	80		
MUL	47	47		71	87						
WHT	58	54	39	71	78	63	62	74	80		
FRL	47	46	40	64	73	60	54	66	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
SWD	26	44	45	39	47	39	35	62			
ELL	35	55		60	63	40	46				
ASN					80						
HSP	38	40	41	58	56	40	38	69	80		
MUL	33	45		75	64						
WHT	60	60	47	66	57	51	72	84	72		
FRL	47	53	47	57	53	50	53	80	56		
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	9	25	23	23	48	44	15	41			
ELL	22	50		44	50			69			
HSP	44	39	32	52	53	44	67	53	47		
MUL	36	38		46	62						
WHT	54	51	41	68	66	54	59	84	56		
FRL	40	42	37	56	60	55	51	69	32		

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	65
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	581
Total Components for the Federal Index	9
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	40
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	50
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
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%	0
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	65
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	63
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	

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%	0
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	64
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	58
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

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.

SWD ELA Achievement was the lowest sub-category. 5 of 6 ELA teachers were new to their grade level and or curriculum associated with their grade level. 2 of 6 ELA teachers new to the middle school curriculum from elementary school. Historically, SWD ELA Achievement is the lowest performing group at L.A. Ainger.

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

The greatest decline was SWD Achievement in Social Studies. The decline was 12% from the previous year. Overall, the Social Studies Achievement declined by 8%. Paired with a decline in ELA Achievement, a test such as the Civics test, which requires reading and comprehension skills with accelerated vocabulary, would be difficult for SWD to comprehend and process questions.

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

ELA Lowest 25% was the only category lower than the state average for L.A. Ainger Middle School. ELA Lowest 25% was 5% lower than the state average of 47%. The contributing factors could be a lack of teacher experience at the middle school level and the new ELA curriculum for 5 of the 6 ELA teachers.

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

Math Learning Gains improved by an astounding 21%! Math Help/Tutoring was available everyday for every student. Teacher experience with the curriculum and corroboration with middle schools within

the district helped to focus instruction on vital standards and critical concepts. Monthly parent-teacher engagement nights help to improve academic support for student success at home.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern?

Decrease the number of students failing Math and/or ELA.
Decrease the number of students with less than 90% attendance.

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

1. Increase overall reading proficiency among all sub-groups.
2. Continue to maintain high achievement in Math.
3. Monitor achievement in Civics and Science.
4. Decrease Attendance and Disciplinary concerns.
5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	SWD ELA Achievement was lower than the threshold of the ESSA index for L.A. Ainger. Students with insufficient literacy skills are likely to struggle in other subjects due to lack of comprehension, reduced ability to use context clues, and decreased ability to understand what questions are asking. 40% of SWD's demonstrated ELA proficiency.
Measurable Outcome:	The plan is to improve SWD's ELA Achievement by 4% in the next year.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Daryl Konrardy (daryl.konrardy@yourcharlotteschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	The lowest achieving SWD's will be enrolled in a Reading Block at each grade level. ELA tutoring will be made available to students before and after school. Continued use of the i-Ready program as well as the addition of Read 180 and MyOn for level 1 and 2 achievement level students. Use of computer-based progress monitoring throughout the school year. Students scheduled into computer classes that will utilize programs to support ELA Achievement such as Khan Academy.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	These strategies will provide additional support and instruction for struggling readers. Scheduled BOY, MOY, and EOY progress monitoring using ClearSight and incremental student ability-based progress monitoring using i-Ready. Teacher small-group instruction will also be used to make determinations about individual barriers to ELA success.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Identify Lowest Performing ELA SWD's
2. Schedule Lowest Performing ELA SWD's in Reading Intervention Classes
3. Identify Lowest Performing ELA Non-SWD's
4. Schedule Lowest Performing ELA Non-SWD's in Reading Intervention Classes
5. Implement Evidence Based Strategies

Person Responsible   Daryl Konrardy (daryl.konrardy@yourcharlotteschools.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities.

The school will continue to implement and improve the PBIS program in an effort to diminish behavior concerns and improve attendance. SIM strategies have continued to be reinforced this year through professional development with the intention of decreasing student failure in all subjects with and emphasis on Math, Science, and ELA. Math, ELA, and Science tutoring will continue to be offered to help students overcome barriers and provide additional academic support and reinforcement to struggling learners.

Part IV: Positive Culture & Environment

A positive school culture and environment reflects: a supportive and fulfilling environment, learning conditions that meet the needs of all students, people who are sure of their roles and relationships in student learning, and a culture that values trust, respect and high expectations. Consulting with various stakeholder groups to employ school improvement strategies that impact the positive school culture and environment are critical. Stakeholder groups more proximal to the school include teachers, students, and families of students, volunteers, and school board members. Broad stakeholder groups include early childhood providers, community colleges and universities, social services, and business partners.

Stakeholders play a key role in school performance and addressing equity. Consulting various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment ensuring all stakeholders are involved.

The school uses PBIS to build relationships and reinforce positive behaviors with staff and students. The Check and Connect mentoring program will continue and include more students and teachers as well as community members as the Check and Connect program continues to expand. The school will continue to participate in and host events integrating all stakeholders including students, parents, staff, and the community. The school's Student Council hosts events on a regular basis to promote positive social student interaction outside of the academic environment. The PTO and SAC provide funding and volunteer to help students have opportunities outside of school to promote well-rounded learning and reward students who exhibit positive behavior in the school. The PTO and SAC express their appreciation for the staff by hosting a variety of opportunities for the staff. Finally, the staff has established a Sunshine Committee to recognize and provide support to fellow staff members.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link
The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.