

Marion County Public Schools

Liberty 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 | 13 |
| Planning for Improvement | 18 |
| Positive Culture & Environment | 22 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 23 |

Liberty Middle School

4773 SW 95TH ST, Ocala, FL 34476

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Reuben Williams

Start Date for this Principal: 7/16/2020

| | |
|--|---|
| 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 | Yes |
| 2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3) | 88% |
| 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: B (54%) 2017-18: C (52%) 2016-17: C (50%) 2015-16: C (49%) |
| 2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information* | |
| SI Region | Northeast |
| Regional Executive Director | Cassandra Brusca |
| 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 Marion 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 | 13 |
| Planning for Improvement | 18 |
| Title I Requirements | 0 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 23 |

Liberty Middle School

4773 SW 95TH ST, Ocala, FL 34476

[no web address on file]

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 | Yes | 62% |
| Primary Service Type (per MSID File) | Charter School | 2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2) |
| K-12 General Education | No | 64% |

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Marion 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.

The administration, faculty, and staff of Liberty Middle School are committed to a higher standard of excellence. We invite our students, parents, and community members to become a part of our greater learning community and share our PRIDE. We are committed to educating the whole student and fostering a safe school environment where our students can learn.

Provide the school's vision statement.

- We are focused on inspiring our students to reach their highest academic potential.
- We are focused encouraging character development.
- We are focused on forging the leaders of tomorrow from the students of today.

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 |
|------------------|---------------------|--|
| Forsyth, Melissa | Principal | <p>The Principal is the driving force and instructional leader of the school. She provides a common vision for the use of data-based decision-making, models the Problem Solving Process; supervises the development of a strong infrastructure; conducts assessment of the skills of school staff; ensures implementation of high yield instructional strategies, collaborative learning, intervention support and documentation; provides adequate professional learning opportunities; develops a culture of expectation with the school staff; ensures resources are assigned to those areas of most need; and communicates with parents as necessary.</p> |
| Palacios, Kayla | Assistant Principal | <p>The Assistant Principal assists the Principal in providing a common vision for the use of data-based decision-making, assists in the development of a strong infrastructure of resources for the implementation of high yield instructional strategies, further assists the principal in the assessment of school staff, assists with the monitoring of implementation of intervention and necessary documentation, assists with the delivery of professional development for effective instructional delivery. The assistant principal carefully monitors the additional academic support schedule to ensure all personnel are serving in their specified areas.</p> |
| James, Kelley | Dean | <p>The Student Services Manager provides teachers with classroom support and feedback to ensure a safe, cooperative environment for learning to take place. Resources, such as behavior contracts, for at-risk students are carefully considered and shared by the SSM. He coordinates efforts to use positive reinforcements to encourage more positive behavior choices by students. He also monitors and shares disciplinary/attendance data, and serves on the PBIS/Safety committee. In addition, the SSM may act as a liaison with outside agencies that offer support to students and families</p> |
| Weston, Katie | Other | <p>The AVID Coordinator assists teachers with the interpretation and implementation of the Professional Development, delivered through WICOR instructional strategies. She also assists in the design and implementation for progress monitoring, data collection, and data analysis, participates in the design and delivery of professional development.</p> |
| Carter, Michael | Assistant Principal | <p>The Assistant Principal assists the Principal in providing a common vision for the use of data-based decision-making, assists in the development of a strong infrastructure of resources for the implementation of high yield instructional strategies, further assists the principal in the assessment of school staff, assists with the monitoring of implementation of intervention and necessary documentation, assists with the delivery of professional development for effective instructional delivery. The assistant principal carefully monitors the additional academic support schedule to ensure all personnel are serving in their specified areas.</p> |
| Wiseman, Lisa | School Counselor | <p>The Guidance Counselor participates in collection, interpretation, and analysis of data; facilitates development of intervention plans; provides</p> |

| Name | Title | Job Duties and Responsibilities |
|--------------------|---------------------|--|
| | | support for intervention fidelity and documentation; assists with professional development for behavior concerns; assists in facilitation data-based decision making activities. She also provides quality services and expertise on issues ranging from IEP development to intervention with individual students. She communicates with child-serving community agencies to support the students' academic, emotional, behavioral, and social success. |
| Newbold, Brian | Dean | The Student Services Manager provides teachers with classroom support and feedback to ensure a safe, cooperative environment for learning to take place. Resources, such as behavior contracts, for at-risk students are carefully considered and shared by the SSM. He coordinates efforts to use positive reinforcements to encourage more positive behavior choices by students. He also monitors and shares disciplinary/attendance data, and serves on the PBIS/Safety committee. In addition, the SSM may act as a liaison with outside agencies that offer support to students and families |
| Williams, Crystal | Instructional Coach | The instructional coach will assist training teachers on WICOR strategies in the classroom, implementing best practices in the classroom, and the Professional Development on campus. The instructional coach will also assist with the ITD and New to Liberty Teachers. |
| Barrios, Elizabeth | School Counselor | The Guidance Counselor participates in collection, interpretation, and analysis of data; facilitates development of intervention plans; provides support for intervention fidelity and documentation; assists with professional development for behavior concerns; assists in facilitation data-based decision making activities. She also provides quality services and expertise on issues ranging from IEP development to intervention with individual students. She communicates with child-serving community agencies to support the students' academic, emotional, behavioral, and social success. |
| Loria, Sherry | School Counselor | The Guidance Counselor participates in collection, interpretation, and analysis of data; facilitates development of intervention plans; provides support for intervention fidelity and documentation; assists with professional development for behavior concerns; assists in facilitation data-based decision making activities. She also provides quality services and expertise on issues ranging from IEP development to intervention with individual students. She communicates with child-serving community agencies to support the students' academic, emotional, behavioral, and social success. |

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Thursday 7/16/2020, Reuben Williams

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.*

22

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.*

38

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

76

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 | Yes |
| 2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3) | 88% |
| 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: B (54%) 2017-18: C (52%) 2016-17: C (50%) 2015-16: C (49%) |
| 2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information* | |
| SI Region | Northeast |
| Regional Executive Director | Cassandra Brusca |
| 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 | 405 | 451 | 445 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1301 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 139 | 72 | 91 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 302 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 19 | 76 | 75 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 170 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 72 | 119 | 111 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 302 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 83 | 118 | 121 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 322 |
| | 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 | 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 | 63 | 156 | 167 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 386 |

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 | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 15 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 |

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 8/10/2020

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 | 453 | 445 | 460 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1358 | |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 55 | 63 | 87 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 205 | |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 68 | 44 | 56 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 168 | |
| Course failure in ELA or Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 33 | 23 | 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 72 | |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 123 | 113 | 123 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 359 | |

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 | 27 | 30 | 25 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 82 | |

The number of students identified as retainees:

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| Retained Students: Current Year | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 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 | | |
| Number of students enrolled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 453 | 445 | 460 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1358 | |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 55 | 63 | 87 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 205 | |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 68 | 44 | 56 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 168 | |
| Course failure in ELA or Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 33 | 23 | 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 72 | |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 123 | 113 | 123 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 359 | |

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 | 27 | 30 | 25 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 82 | |

The number of students identified as retainees:

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| Retained Students: Current Year | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 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 | 48% | 49% | 54% | 48% | 45% | 52% |
| ELA Learning Gains | 54% | 54% | 54% | 49% | 48% | 54% |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | 43% | 46% | 47% | 40% | 36% | 44% |
| Math Achievement | 52% | 54% | 58% | 51% | 47% | 56% |
| Math Learning Gains | 58% | 58% | 57% | 54% | 54% | 57% |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 48% | 50% | 51% | 42% | 45% | 50% |
| Science Achievement | 44% | 46% | 51% | 45% | 44% | 50% |
| Social Studies Achievement | 75% | 70% | 72% | 68% | 64% | 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 | 40% | 45% | -5% | 54% | -14% |
| | 2018 | 42% | 44% | -2% | 52% | -10% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -2% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 07 | 2019 | 48% | 46% | 2% | 52% | -4% |
| | 2018 | 41% | 43% | -2% | 51% | -10% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 7% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 6% | | | | |
| 08 | 2019 | 47% | 50% | -3% | 56% | -9% |
| | 2018 | 48% | 49% | -1% | 58% | -10% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -1% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 6% | | | | |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|-----------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 06 | 2019 | 40% | 46% | -6% | 55% | -15% |
| | 2018 | 42% | 42% | 0% | 52% | -10% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -2% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 07 | 2019 | 48% | 49% | -1% | 54% | -6% |
| | 2018 | 41% | 49% | -8% | 54% | -13% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 7% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 6% | | | | |
| 08 | 2019 | 46% | 41% | 5% | 46% | 0% |
| | 2018 | 59% | 43% | 16% | 45% | 14% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -13% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 5% | | | | |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
|-----------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 08 | 2019 | 42% | 44% | -2% | 48% | -6% |
| | 2018 | 48% | 46% | 2% | 50% | -2% |
| 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 | 71% | 65% | 6% | 71% | 0% |
| 2018 | 60% | 64% | -4% | 71% | -11% |
| Compare | | 11% | | | |
| 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 | 94% | 54% | 40% | 61% | 33% |

| ALGEBRA EOC | | | | | |
|--------------|--------|----------|-----------------------|-------|--------------------|
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2018 | 100% | 57% | 43% | 62% | 38% |
| Compare | | -6% | | | |
| GEOMETRY EOC | | | | | |
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2019 | 100% | 51% | 49% | 57% | 43% |
| 2018 | 94% | 54% | 40% | 56% | 38% |
| Compare | | 6% | | | |

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 | 23 | 42 | 32 | 30 | 50 | 44 | 23 | 51 | | | |
| ELL | 24 | 46 | 42 | 34 | 50 | 44 | 14 | 55 | 38 | | |
| ASN | 77 | 64 | | 86 | 85 | | | 68 | 94 | | |
| BLK | 35 | 47 | 46 | 34 | 48 | 43 | 27 | 66 | 56 | | |
| HSP | 42 | 52 | 41 | 47 | 53 | 42 | 36 | 73 | 57 | | |
| MUL | 58 | 58 | 25 | 55 | 66 | 54 | 53 | 75 | 58 | | |
| WHT | 56 | 59 | 46 | 62 | 63 | 56 | 54 | 81 | 63 | | |
| FRL | 40 | 50 | 40 | 44 | 54 | 44 | 36 | 69 | 54 | | |
| 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 | 23 | 40 | 32 | 31 | 52 | 44 | 19 | 42 | | | |
| ELL | 17 | 44 | 41 | 33 | 58 | 56 | 29 | 26 | 42 | | |
| ASN | 56 | 69 | | 81 | 57 | | | 90 | 80 | | |
| BLK | 30 | 36 | 32 | 38 | 53 | 46 | 30 | 53 | 54 | | |
| HSP | 45 | 47 | 40 | 56 | 64 | 57 | 53 | 54 | 46 | | |
| MUL | 45 | 36 | 46 | 55 | 57 | 54 | 46 | 72 | 67 | | |
| WHT | 51 | 47 | 36 | 60 | 62 | 53 | 56 | 68 | 63 | | |
| FRL | 40 | 43 | 37 | 51 | 59 | 51 | 44 | 58 | 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 | 22 | 44 | 42 | 24 | 44 | 35 | 25 | 38 | | | |
| ELL | 18 | 40 | 41 | 24 | 52 | 41 | 5 | 42 | | | |
| ASN | 62 | 62 | | 73 | 68 | | | | | | |
| BLK | 31 | 37 | 31 | 36 | 51 | 40 | 33 | 62 | 38 | | |
| HSP | 47 | 47 | 38 | 50 | 55 | 41 | 39 | 72 | 59 | | |
| MUL | 49 | 55 | 48 | 49 | 54 | 36 | 44 | 61 | 50 | | |
| WHT | 55 | 53 | 47 | 58 | 55 | 46 | 53 | 68 | 57 | | |

| 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 |
| FRL | 42 | 46 | 40 | 43 | 52 | 41 | 40 | 60 | 51 | | |

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 | 55 |
| 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 | 61 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 546 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 10 |
| Percent Tested | 98% |

| Subgroup Data | |
|---|-----|
| Students With Disabilities | |
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities | 37 |
| 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 | 41 |
| 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 | 79 |
| 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 | 45 |
| Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| Hispanic Students | |
| Federal Index - Hispanic Students | 50 |
| 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 | 56 |
| 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 | 50 |
| 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.

8th Grade Science performed at only 44% proficiency. We've seen a bit of a downward trend in Science for the past couple of years and we've identified deficiencies in specific standards as the main focus moving forward.

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

8th Grade Science performed at only 44% proficiency. We've seen a bit of a downward trend in Science for the past couple of years and we've identified deficiencies in specific standards as the main focus moving forward.

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.

8th Grade Science had the biggest gap when compared to the state average. The state was at 51% proficiency and we were at 44% proficiency. We've identified several specific standards to use as our focus when looking at the 8th grade science curriculum.

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

Civics data showed the most improvement, increasing from 65% proficiency to 75% proficiency, above the state gains as well. LMS had collaborative, strategic planning in Civics this year and very focused standards-based instruction.

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

Attendance still needs to improve. In order for us to change our number of students who score a level 1 on the statewide assessment, we need students present. We have a new attendance plan in place for 2019-2020 that will address this concern.

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

1. 8th Grade Science
2. ELA Proficiency
3. Math Proficiency
4. Attendance
5. Decrease the amount of referrals from the classroom resulting in loss of instructional time.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Student Engagement**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Focus on the critical reading process by immersing students in authentic literacy in every classroom (traditional and online), every day. The vision of quality instruction at LMS includes knowing our standards, teaching them to the depth they will be assessed, and focusing on the critical reading process by immersing students in authentic literacy using WICOR instructional strategies, then we will see an increase in all content areas. Students in both a traditional and online setting will document their thinking and learning through the Focused Note Taking Process and utilizing the WICOR Tracker in their binder to understand the purpose of the strategy that they are using in order to utilize the strategy on their own.

Measurable Outcome:

If we focus on the critical reading process by immersing students in authentic literacy using WICOR instructional strategies, then we will see an increase in proficiency in all content areas.

ELA Baseline Target Indicator: from 47% to 50%
 MATH Baseline Target Indicator: from 45% to 48%
 SCIENCE Baseline Target Indicator: from 41% to 44%
 CIVICS Baseline Target Indicator: from 75% to 78%

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Melissa Forsyth (melissa.forsyth@marion.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy:

The AVID system of work provides professional development in WICOR (Writing, Inquiry, Collaboration, Organization, and Reading) instructional strategies for both traditional and online settings.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Proficiency in all content areas are below state averages, indicating a need for research based instructional strategies. WICOR instructional strategies include the Focused Note Taking Process, which will lead to students documenting their thinking and learning throughout the critical reading process.

Action Steps to Implement

Implement weekly common collaborative planning times to support teachers in developing standards-focus boards, standards-based lesson plans, and standards-based learning activities for all content areas across both instructional settings-traditional and online. Principal and assistant principals will oversee the scheduling and implementation of these meetings.

Person Responsible

Melissa Forsyth (melissa.forsyth@marion.k12.fl.us)

Teachers will be provided professional development through the AVID framework and WICOR instructional strategies. Staff will create lessons that are not only relevant to our learners, but standards-based and taught to the same rigor in which they will be assessed. The strategies and lessons will focus on both instructional setting types-traditional and online.

Person Responsible

Crystal Williams (crystal.williams@marion.k12.fl.us)

Teachers' lesson plans will be reviewed at quarterly walk throughs and data chats with teachers. Administrators and content area specialist will support teachers by modeling lessons and providing coaching feedback through use of the walk through tool and WICOR tracker.

Person Responsible Melissa Forsyth (melissa.forsyth@marion.k12.fl.us)

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Provide appropriate services and reading interventions based on student learning needs in both academic settings-traditional and online. Our Students with Disabilities populations (SWD) are below the federal index of 41%.

Measurable Outcome: If we provide our SWD population with appropriate services and appropriate reading interventions based on student learning needs, we will raise our proficiency from 37%-41%.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Kayla Palacios (kayla.palacios@marion.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy: Through re-examining IEPs and re-evaluating reading intervention steps, students will receive appropriate services in their chosen instructional setting.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Research shows that SWD are best served when their services are aligned to their specific needs. By working with our ESE Specialist to determine appropriate levels of service, and working with our Assistant Principal for Curriculum to appropriately schedule students, we will be able to raise proficiency for this sub-group.

Action Steps to Implement

Re-examining Individualized Education Plans (IEPs) and make sure that they are being implemented to students who are attending both instructional settings-traditional and online.

Person Responsible Kayla Palacios (kayla.palacios@marion.k12.fl.us)

Re-evaluating reading intervention services to SWD and that they are receiving the appropriate remediation in the students chosen academic setting.

Person Responsible Kayla Palacios (kayla.palacios@marion.k12.fl.us)

#3. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports

| | |
|---|--|
| Area of Focus Description and Rationale: | Increased parent engagement to improve academic, discipline, and social skills for students. Attendance issues and discipline referrals increased slightly from the previous school year. That, coupled with statutory requirements for Mental Health Training, led us to this goal. 87% of our students were at <90% attendance last year and 81% of our students had <2 referrals. |
| Measurable Outcome: | If we increase parent engagement by 10% at family activities, 90% of students will be at <90% attendance 85% of students will be at <2 referral. |
| Person responsible for monitoring outcome: | Michael Carter (michael.carter@marion.k12.fl.us) |
| Evidence-based Strategy: | Attendance awareness campaign, recognition competitions, "Nudge" postcard reminders, school site absence notification letters, small group attendance booster sessions, Law Enforcement Information night, and Parent and Family Engagement Plan (PFEP) events. Getting families engaged in student learning both at school and virtually is a step toward understanding the importance of student attendance. |
| Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: | The above strategies have been shown to improve attendance rates, which tend to go hand-in-hand with discipline occurrences. |

Action Steps to Implement

Facilitate school wide attendance initiatives with class competitions to increase student attendance school wide. Competition will be focused on both instructional settings-traditional and online.

Person Responsible Sherry Loria (sherry.loria@marion.k12.fl.us)

Facilitate "nudge" postcard reminders and "wake-up" calls regarding missing students on campus and attendance laws.

Person Responsible Sherry Loria (sherry.loria@marion.k12.fl.us)

Monitor attendance daily to add/drop students from postcard/morning call lists and facilitate small group mentoring for chronically absent students. This will be done in person for the traditional setting students and virtually through Microsoft Teams for the online students. The School Social worker will be conducting the meetings with the different students.

Person Responsible Michael Carter (michael.carter@marion.k12.fl.us)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

The school leadership team is first going to work with the teachers on developing their ability to navigate between the two different instructional settings-traditional and online. The school leadership team is also going to be merging PBIS Strategies with the already in place AVID Culture to assist on the decreasing of student referrals. This will be done with teacher buy in and support for ALL students at Liberty Middle School to assist them with their success at Liberty Middle School. By doing this, the school leadership team is insuring that ALL students at Liberty Middle School (traditional and online) receive a high quality education by being in the classroom setting and not missing key instruction due to attendance and behavioral concerns.

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.

We continuously consult with our teachers, students, families, volunteers and School Advisory Council (SAC) throughout the year. We understand that our stakeholders play a key role in school performance and addressing equity. As such, we start each school year with a meeting (notifications and invitations in English and Spanish) to address the following:

- A description and explanation of the school's curriculum,
- Information on the forms of academic assessment used to measure student progress, and
- Information on the proficiency levels students are expected to meet;
- Explain the school parental Parent and Family Engagement Plan, and school-parent compact;
- Explain the right of parents to become involved in the school's programs and ways to do so;
- Explain that parents have the right to request opportunities for regular meetings for parents to formulate suggestions and to participate in decisions about the education of their children.
- Allow for feedback and open discussion.

In order to increase stakeholder engagement and promote a welcoming environment we will offer different modalities (online and paper based) of communication with to our families such as phone, email, Dojo and/or Remind App, Twitter, school website, teacher webpage, Skyward Parent Portal and school marquee.

Family and community feedback is requested/collected during quarterly SAC meetings, the Annual Parent Survey, Parent and Family Engagement Plan event surveys and Schoolwide Improvement Plan surveys.

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: Student Engagement | \$0.00 |
| 2 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities | \$0.00 |
| 3 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports | \$0.00 |
| Total: | | | \$0.00 |