

Lake County Schools

Mt. Dora Middle School



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	16
Positive Culture & Environment	20
Budget to Support Goals	20

Mt. Dora Middle School

1405 LINCOLN AVE, Mount Dora, FL 32757

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

Demographics

Principal: Jennifer Farnsworth

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2019

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Middle School 6-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
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* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students* White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (53%) 2017-18: B (55%) 2016-17: C (46%) 2015-16: C (50%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TS&I

* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, [click here](#).

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	16
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	20

Mt. Dora Middle School

1405 LINCOLN AVE, Mount Dora, FL 32757

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

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2019-20 Title I School	2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Middle School 6-8	No	74%
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	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17
Grade	C	C	B	C

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

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

Provide the school's vision statement.

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

School Leadership Team

Membership

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

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Frazier, Chad	Principal	
Williams, Charlotte	Assistant Principal	
Stuart, Edward	Instructional Coach	
Feld, Charles	Assistant Principal	
McCulloch, Heidi	Teacher, ESE	
Cornwell, Miranda	Instructional Technology	
Lashley, Collin	School Counselor	
Randolph, Shena	Other	
Porter, Erin	School Counselor	

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 7/1/2019, Jennifer Farnsworth

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.*

4

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.*

10

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

57

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)	100%
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* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students* White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (53%) 2017-18: B (55%) 2016-17: C (46%) 2015-16: C (50%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TS&I
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here .	

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	259	255	249	0	0	0	0	763
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	28	34	41	0	0	0	0	103
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	21	13	35	0	0	0	0	69
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	4	8	0	0	0	0	28
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	4	8	0	0	0	0	28
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	54	55	0	0	0	0	109
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	54	55	0	0	0	0	109

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	183	157	215	0	0	0	0	555

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	0
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	1	0	0	0	0	7

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 8/25/2020

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

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	77	143	107	0	0	0	0	327

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

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

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

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	77	143	107	0	0	0	0	327

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school, or combination schools).

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	53%	50%	54%	50%	47%	52%
ELA Learning Gains	52%	52%	54%	46%	50%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	39%	44%	47%	33%	39%	44%
Math Achievement	62%	56%	58%	55%	54%	56%
Math Learning Gains	48%	55%	57%	51%	56%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	41%	46%	51%	38%	45%	50%
Science Achievement	48%	49%	51%	41%	46%	50%
Social Studies Achievement	63%	70%	72%	56%	72%	70%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey				
Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)			Total
	6	7	8	
	(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	50%	52%	-2%	54%	-4%
	2018	50%	47%	3%	52%	-2%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	46%	49%	-3%	52%	-6%
	2018	47%	48%	-1%	51%	-4%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison		-4%				
08	2019	58%	54%	4%	56%	2%
	2018	56%	55%	1%	58%	-2%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison		11%				

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

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2019	47%	49%	-2%	48%	-1%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	46%	51%	-5%	50%	-4%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison						

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	0%	66%	-66%	67%	-67%
2018					

CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	61%	71%	-10%	71%	-10%
2018	62%	70%	-8%	71%	-9%
Compare		-1%			

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

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	92%	52%	40%	61%	31%
2018	95%	62%	33%	62%	33%
Compare		-3%			

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	100%	49%	51%	57%	43%
2018	0%	50%	-50%	56%	-56%
Compare		100%			

Subgroup Data

2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	17	36	33	27	41	38	24	33			
ELL	23	38	30	33	48	43	17	52			

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
ASN	60	40		90	80						
BLK	42	30	19	41	38	33	39	55	58		
HSP	46	50	34	49	45	36	35	56	69		
MUL	41	62	58	62	54		54	40	58		
WHT	62	57	49	74	52	46	56	72	75		
FRL	43	47	36	49	47	40	36	49	64		
2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	15	32	28	22	49	47	15	37			
ELL	30	58	52	41	66	61		9			
ASN	83	71		92	86						
BLK	29	35	31	31	49	58	26	61	42		
HSP	42	47	43	52	54	47	29	52	39		
MUL	42	40	29	57	54	53	38	60			
WHT	62	55	46	72	71	68	58	70	65		
FRL	41	46	41	51	60	58	36	57	48		
2017 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2015-16	C & C Accel 2015-16
SWD	12	30	25	16	33	26	6	15			
ELL	13	32	38	15	32	29	20	15			
ASN	71	79		79	57						
BLK	29	28	26	32	40	34	15	28	17		
HSP	39	42	33	46	47	38	33	45	42		
MUL	51	52		50	50	40	38	38			
WHT	59	49	38	63	54	40	49	67	49		
FRL	38	40	31	45	48	37	26	47	37		

ESSA Data

This data has been updated for the 2018-19 school year as of 7/16/2019.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	TS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	54
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	59
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	537
Total Components for the Federal Index	10

ESSA Federal Index	
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	33
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	38
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	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	68
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	39
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
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%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	54
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

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%	0
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	60
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	48
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	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.

FSA from 2019 indicated that ELA lowest quartile learning gains & Math lowest quartile learning gains were the lowest performance areas. Contributing factors appear to be a lack of structure during intervention time as well as a lack of strategic focus on these students during instructional time. Mid-year Lake Standards Assessments data showed ELA proficiency at 60% indicating a positive trend for growth.

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

FSA from 2019 indicated that Math lowest quartile learning gains. Contributing factors appear to be a lack of structure during intervention time as well as a lack of strategic focus on these students during instructional time. Mid-year Lake Standards Assessments data showed Math proficiency at 47% indicating this is still a focus area for this school year.

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.

FSA from 2019 indicated that Math lowest quartile learning gains. Contributing factors appear to be a lack of structure during intervention time as well as a lack of strategic focus on these students during instructional time. Mid-year Lake Standards Assessments data showed Math proficiency at 47% indicating this is still a focus area for this school year.

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

FSA from 2019 indicated that the acceleration rate showed the most improvement moving from 60 to 72. There was a strategic focus on students placed into acceleration opportunities and progress was monitored for each student. Mid-year Lake Standards Assessments data showed Algebra I proficiency at 88% indicating this is still a focus area for this school year to continue to move the acceleration rate in an upward trend.

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

The amount of students missing 10% of school at 103 students. The amounts of students scoring a level 1 on the ELA/Math FSA with 109 level 1 students. The amount of students with one or more suspensions with 69 students.

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

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

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Based upon previous FSA data along with Lake Standards Assessments Mid-year data from the Needs Assessment/Analysis section instructional practice specifically related to standards aligned instruction is one of our most critical areas of focus. This area of focus will be with high expectations, teachers will understand, plan, deliver, and differentiate standards-based instruction in all content areas for all students while intentionally incorporating setting the purpose, modeling thinking, guided instruction, collaborative learning, and independent learning. If we implement, monitor, and support common planning, then teachers will have the opportunity to plan for and evaluate student formative assessments/work products in order to increase student achievement. With professional development for teachers to increase cognitive demand and adequate support for all areas/ students to have increased opportunities to access CTE programs and high-school level courses, students will have the ability to grow academically and have more advanced opportunities.

Measurable Outcome:

Increase Reading, Thinking, Talking, and Writing as well as build capacity in setting the purpose for the lesson as well as teacher clarity. This will be evidenced by quarterly increases from the learning walk tool from baseline to mid-year. Increase student achievement in ELA proficiency from 53% to 56%, ELA learning gains from 53% to 55%, Math proficiency from 62% to 65%, Math learning gains from 48% to 51%, Civics proficiency from 68% to 71%, and Science proficiency from 43% to 46%.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Chad Frazier (frazierc@lake.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Common planning will be used to increase teacher capacity therefore leading to increases in student achievement. To monitor this strategy classroom walk-throughs will be analyzed monthly to ensure transfer into instructional delivery from common planning is occurring.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

If we implement, monitor, and support common planning, then teachers will have the opportunity to plan for and evaluate student formative assessments/work products in order to increase student achievement.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Create and establish a common planning schedule with identified facilitator/coach, clearly defined protocols, planning time frame, and expected products.

Who: Administration and literacy coach

When: 8:24/20, End 5/24/21

Frequency: Re-evaluate quarterly

Evidence: Schedule, Norms, List of protocols, and deliverables

2. Create a professional development series that focuses on the district instructional framework. The specific focus for the 2020-2021 school year will be setting purpose/teacher clarity.

Who: Administration and literacy coach

When: Monthly

Evidence: Professional development schedule, presentations, sign-in sheets, and CWT data.

3. Increase access to and enrollment in CTE Certification Classes, Algebra, & Geometry

Who: Scheduling Administrator

When: Each Semester

Evidence: Number of courses available and students enrolled in the courses

Person Responsible Edward Stuart (stuarte@lake.k12.fl.us)

#2. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Early Warning Systems

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: By utilizing early warning systems data, Mount Dora Middle will increase attendance, positive student behaviors, and maintain a safe and supportive environment for all students. If we monitor early warning systems data quarterly and work with families to ensure expectations are clear, then we will increase attendance, positive student behaviors, and maintain a safe and supportive environment for all students.

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

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Charlotte Williams (williamsc1@lake.k12.fl.us)

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

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

Action Steps to Implement

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

Who: Administration and guidance

When: 8/24/20, End 5/24/21

Person Responsible Charlotte Williams (williamsc1@lake.k12.fl.us)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Differentiation

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Based upon the lowest quartile data in ELA and Math from the Needs Assessment/Analysis section list interventions for the lowest quartile is one of our most critical areas of focus. This area of focus was identified as a critical area of need because students in the lowest quartile dropped a combined total of 19 points in ELA & Math which impacts their ability to be success on statewide assessments. The lowest quartile still showed signs of struggling on mid-year Lake Standards Assessments. There are also three sub-groups performing under the required 41% in Students with disabilities, African American, and English Language Learners.

Measurable Outcome: By focusing on this area, we expect to see increase in state level data from 41% to 44% in Math lowest quartile learning gains and 39% to 42% in ELA lowest quartile learning gains. We expect to see all sub-groups performing at or above the required 41% by ESSA.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Charles Feld (feldc@lake.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy: A structured intervention time will be used to increase the lowest quartile learning gains in ELA from 39% to 42% and the lowest quartile learning gains in Math from 41% to 44%. The intervention time will also address our identified sub-groups performing below the required 41% by ESSA. To monitor this strategy school/state/district level data, EWS data, and classroom walk-through data will be analyzed quarterly by the teacher support team.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: If we implement, monitor, and support a structured intervention time then there will be an increase in our lowest quartile data as evidenced in school/state/district level data.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Create a structured intervention plan to support by non-load bearing staff to implement ELA/Math interventions for student identified in the lowest quartile in ELA & Math.
2. Implement the usage of ALEKS to support quality instruction during Math & Intervention/Acceleration block.
3. Offer before/after-school tutoring for level 1 & level 2 students to provide prescriptive assistance for students in need.

Who: Administration and literacy coach
 When: 8/24/20, End 5/24/21
 Frequency: Reevaluate quarterly
 Evidence: School/state/district level data

Person Responsible Edward Stuart (stuarte@lake.k12.fl.us)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

N/A

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.

MDMS will continue developing a healthy culture and school environment by increasing attendance and positive student behaviors using the PBIS reward system and utilizing restorative practices.

The amount of students missing 10% of school at 103 students will be decrease by 10%. The amount of students with one or more suspensions with 69 students will be decreased by 10%.

Restorative Practices PD will be provided to every teacher on the campus.

If teachers are trained and utilize restorative practices then student discipline will decrease.

1. We have an updated behavior tracking system that provides flexibility for teachers to positively affect behavior.
2. P.A.S.S. class will be utilized to provide students with opportunities for restorative practices.
3. We will educate students on new rules and expectations using clearly defined protocols.

All Stakeholders play a key role in school performance and addressing equity. Mount Dora Middle School will consult with various stakeholder groups to assist in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Standards-aligned Instruction				\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Early Warning Systems				\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Differentiation				\$15,210.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	5100	690-Computer Software	0411 - Mt. Dora Middle School	Other		\$14,600.00

Lake - 0411 - Mt. Dora Middle School - 2020-21 SIP

			<i>Notes: Purchase ALEKS to support quality instruction to work with level 1 & level 2 students for acceleration and intervention.</i>			
	5100	130-Other Certified Instructional Personnel	0411 - Mt. Dora Middle School	Other		\$500.00
			<i>Notes: Extra duty pay for tutoring the level 1 & level 2 students for acceleration and intervention.</i>			
	5100	500-Materials and Supplies	0411 - Mt. Dora Middle School	Other		\$110.00
			<i>Notes: Miscellaneous supplies to support instruction for level 1 & level 2 students.</i>			
					Total:	\$15,210.00