Lake Gibson Middle School

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Lake Gibson Middle School

6901 SOCRUM LOOP RD N, Lakeland, FL 33809

http://www.lakegibsonmiddle.com/

Demographics

Principal: Ismael Portillo

Start Date for this Principal: 6/8/2020

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

* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here.

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Table of Contents

Lake Gibson Middle School

6901 SOCRUM LOOP RD N, Lakeland, FL 33809

http://www.lakegibsonmiddle.com/

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2019-20 Title I School	2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Middle School 6-8	Yes	79%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	55%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

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

Provide the school's vision statement.

We believe that:
Success - All students can and will learn, no matter what!
Honesty - Honesty is the best policy.
Achievement - Students will achieve by participating in hands on, interactive learning experiences.
Respect - Everyone will treat each other with respect.
Knowledge - Students will gain knowledge through partnerships with school, families and community.
Safety - Our school environment will be safe.

School Leadership Team

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

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
	Principal	
Hutchinson, Robin	Instructional Coach	
Leslie, Gloria	Teacher, ESE	
Sullivan, Dena	Instructional Media	
Sessoms, Leandrea	Assistant Principal	
Wiggs, Carla	Assistant Principal	
Pedigo, Jackie	School Counselor	
Baine, Melinda	Assistant Principal	
Donhauser, Heather	Assistant Principal	
Jackson, Joanne	Other	
Whalen, Kelsey	Instructional Coach	
Hamilton, Dana	Instructional Coach	

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Monday 6/8/2020, Ismael Portillo

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.*
1

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.*
22

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
78

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

* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here.

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	440	403	439	0	0	0	0	1282
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	42	39	45	0	0	0	0	126
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	80	59	62	0	0	0	0	201
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	1	0	0	0	0	5
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	0	7	0	0	0	0	13
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	65	90	123	0	0	0	0	278
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	83	88	114	0	0	0	0	285
Dec. 2019 STAR Reading Level 1	0	0	0	0	0	0	91	98	102	0	0	0	0	291
Dec. 2019 STAR Math Level 1	0	0	0	0	0	0	91	68	94	0	0	0	0	253

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	118	111	145	0	0	0	0	374

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	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	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 6/8/2020

Prior Year - As Reported

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

Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	Grade Level 6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	432	395	443	0	0	0	0	1270
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	49	38	48	0	0	0	0	135
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	1	10	0	0	0	0	22
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	10	10	0	0	0	0	22
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	75	63	113	0	0	0	0	251

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

Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	Grade Level 6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	14	13	0	0	0	0	29

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	Grade Level 6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	77	47	56	0	0	0	0	180
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	4	0	0	0	0	9

Prior Year - Updated

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

Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	Grade Level 6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	432	395	443	0	0	0	0	1270
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	49	38	48	0	0	0	0	135
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	1	10	0	0	0	0	22
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	10	10	0	0	0	0	22
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	75	63	113	0	0	0	0	251

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

Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	Grade Level 6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	14	13	0	0	0	0	29

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	Grade Level 6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	77	47	56	0	0	0	0	180
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	4	0	0	0	0	9

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

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

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	**District**	**State**	**School**	**District**	**State**
ELA Achievement	43%	48%	54%	40%	48%	52%
ELA Learning Gains	47%	52%	54%	45%	51%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	39%	48%	47%	39%	43%	44%
Math Achievement	43%	50%	58%	40%	47%	56%
Math Learning Gains	42%	50%	57%	42%	50%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	46%	48%	51%	34%	46%	50%
Science Achievement	40%	44%	51%	37%	44%	50%
Social Studies Achievement	68%	72%	72%	61%	64%	70%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey				
Indicator	**Grade Level (prior year reported)**			**Total**
	6	**7**	**8**	
	(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	49%	48%	1%	54%	-5%
	2018	40%	41%	-1%	52%	-12%
Same Grade Comparison		9%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	38%	42%	-4%	52%	-14%
	2018	36%	42%	-6%	51%	-15%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison		-2%				
08	2019	39%	48%	-9%	56%	-17%
	2018	45%	49%	-4%	58%	-13%
Same Grade Comparison		-6%				
Cohort Comparison		3%				

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

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

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	**School**	**District**	**School Minus District**	**State**	**School Minus State**
2019	0%	54%	-54%	67%	-67%
2018	0%	59%	-59%	65%	-65%
Compare		0%			
CIVICS EOC					
Year	**School**	**District**	**School Minus District**	**State**	**School Minus State**
2019	66%	70%	-4%	71%	-5%
2018	93%	84%	9%	71%	22%
Compare		-27%			
HISTORY EOC					
Year	**School**	**District**	**School Minus District**	**State**	**School Minus State**
2019					
2018					

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	77%	50%	27%	61%	16%
2018	73%	60%	13%	62%	11%
Compare		4%			

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	97%	53%	44%	57%	40%
2018	100%	41%	59%	56%	44%
Compare		-3%			

Subgroup Data

2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS

Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	16	37	38	22	45	46	14	41			
ELL	19	42	41	21	46	51	20	65			
ASN	59	59		59	76						
BLK	27	40	39	24	32	32	14	59	62		
HSP	41	48	43	41	41	52	37	67	72		
MUL	51	46		55	44						
WHT	49	50	36	50	46	53	51	72	69		
FRL	36	46	43	34	41	47	26	61	52		

2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS

Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	13	34	30	17	45	41	8				
ELL	15	34	33	27	37	40	33				
ASN	57	50		55	44						
BLK	30	40	37	22	28	29	27	84	46		
HSP	38	42	33	40	46	51	48	93	58		
MUL	50	35		52	46		36		73		
WHT	46	43	31	47	40	47	51	96	60		
FRL	34	39	34	34	37	39	40	86	51		

2017 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS

Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2015-16	C & C Accel 2015-16
SWD	12	22	17	11	26	25	19	16	30		
ELL	18	34	44	23	32	27	13	36			
ASN	56	59		47	56						
BLK	24	36	37	26	38	33	22	49	27		
HSP	36	45	40	36	37	34	31	52	38		
MUL	38	42	23	51	47			63			

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
WHT	48	49	41	46	45	35	47	68	36		
FRL	30	38	36	32	39	35	33	52	29		

ESSA Data

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

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	TS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	48
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	38
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	475
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	98%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	32
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	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	63
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO

Asian Students	
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	37
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	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	49
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	53
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	42
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.

Using the December 2019 STAR data, the lowest performance was amongst ELA ESSA subgroup ELL at 2% proficient; which is equivalent to one student out of a total of 44.

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

Comparing the 2019-20 school year intended outcomes and the December 2019 STAR data, the greatest decline is within the Math ESSA subgroup SWD which was 11% proficient with the intended outcome being 18% proficient; this is a 7% decline in proficiency.

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.

In comparing the 2018-19 state averages and the December 2019 STAR data, the greatest gap is within the 8th grade ELA. The state average was 56% proficiency and the December 2019 STAR data reflected a 45% proficiency which represents an 11% gap in proficiency.

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

Analyzing the data that was collected during the 2019-20 school year and comparing STAR data from September 2019 and December 2019, the most improvement was found within 8th grade Math. September 2019 proficiency was 16% and December was 22% which is a proficiency increase of 4%. The actions that contributed to this positive improvement was conducting quarterly common assessment for greater retention and placing students in an intensive math class to reinforce and build further understanding.

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

Based on the EWS data, the transition from 5th to 6th grade is an area of concern as it relates to behavior.

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

1. Progress Monitoring
2. Tier 3 academic supports and interventions (Academic Interventionist position) included but not limited to ESSA subgroups SWD, ELL, and AA.
3. Increase reading supports

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Progressing Monitoring in the Content Areas Every content area (including but not limited to ELA and Math) will develop mini assessments for progress monitoring through Performance Matters to be used for differentiated instruction. https://www.floridacims.org/plans/39361/edit/30178#activity-body-0 The data used for rationale for this area of focus is taken from the 2018-19 FSA; although STAR data was taken from the 2019-20 school year, it does not represent a significant change to support the reasoning behind the area of focus that is geared towards more advanced progress monitoring schoolwide. Overall ELA proficiency remained stagnate at 42% for the 2018-2019 school year. The ELL subcategory was 2% proficient, SWD was 10% proficient and AA was 27% proficient. Overall Math proficiency increased from 40% to 43% for the 2018-2019 school year. The ELL subcategory was 11% proficient, SWD was 16% proficient and AA was 20% proficient.
Measurable Outcome:	To increase overall ELA proficiency to 46% by increasing the subcategories of: ELL to 5%, SWD to 12% and AA to 30% proficiency. To increase overall Math proficiency to 47% by increasing the subcategories of: ELL to 13%, SWD to 18% and AA to 25% proficiency. Other content area data will be used in reference to the ELA and Math data within the outcomes of this area of focus.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Melinda Baine (melinda.baine@polk-fl.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Utilizing relevant real-time data to immediately differentiate instruction across content areas consistently.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Having a lack of data across the content areas has demonstrated a gap in instruction, and as a result, learning. Embedding formative assessment in Performance Matters in order to receive real-time data across the content areas.

Action Steps to Implement

Science, Literacy and Math coaches will give Professional Developments on how to score vs. grade, utilize rubrics, how to use Performance Matters, and other relevant test banks or platforms and developing quality assessments to monitor progress of student learning. First PD will be during the pre planning week of school. PD's will follow on a monthly basis to assure the fidelity of the area of focus.

Person Responsible	Dana Hamilton (dana.hamilton@polk-fl.net)

Administrators will hold teachers accountable for the implementation of progress monitoring through walkthroughs, PLC's, data chats, lesson planning and gradebook checks.

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

Utilize various technological devices (iPad's, iPad carts) to create and administer progress monitoring across the content areas. Content areas are expected to administer monthly progress monitoring outside of county mandated progress monitoring such as STAR. Science administers weekly progress monitoring as per standards taught that week.

Person Responsible   Robin Hutchinson (robin.hutchinson@polk-fl.net)

Per standard, teachers will analyze their progress monitoring data to identify and execute a differentiation plan in their classroom. A differentiation plan could include but is not limited to the following supplemental curriculum/materials: Khan Academy, MOSA MACK, Coach Digital/Triumph Learning, Achieve, AVID weekly, Common Lit, Read Works, News ELA, Pearson workbooks, Maneuvering the Middle, and STAR. AVID teachers will expose AVID students to college campuses through field trips 3 times a year to have students get a feel for the experience of what a college education can offer.

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

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	ESSA Subgroups Tier 3 Interventions Tier 3 academic and behavioral interventions will be targeted towards, but not limited to, the SWD, ELL, and AA subgroups. The data used for rationale for this area of focus is taken from the 2018-19 school year and FSA; although discipline, attendance, and STAR data was taken from the 2019-20 school year, it does not represent the whole picture or a significant change to support the reasoning behind the area of focus that is targeting tier 3 interventions for subgroups. 24% of students had referrals. 8% of students had six or more referrals. 12% of student population had excessive absences. Overall ELA proficiency remained stagnate at 42% for the 2018-2019 school year. The ELL subcategory was 2% proficient, SWD was 10% proficient and AA was 27% proficient. Overall Math proficiency increased from 40% to 43% for the 2018-2019 school year. The ELL subcategory was 11% proficient, SWD was 16% proficient and AA was 20% proficient.
Measurable Outcome:	Decrease discipline referrals to less than 20% of the total population. Decrease excessive student absences to 10%. To increase overall ELA proficiency to 46% by increasing the subcategories of: ELL to 5%, SWD to 12% and AA to 30% proficiency. To increase overall Math proficiency to 47% by increasing the subcategories of: ELL to 13%, SWD to 18% and AA to 25% proficiency.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Kelsey Whalen (kelsey.whalen@polk-fl.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Utilization of a behavior interventionist to observe, meet, and develop behavioral strategies/interventions for teachers and students. The Title One team will pull students who have been identified as tier 3 for academic interventions and track data using the Easy CBM program.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	In order to support students who have not made adequate progress, addressing their academic and behavioral needs in tandem will help increase student academic achievement levels and behavioral success.

Action Steps to Implement

Identify tier 3 students within SWD, ELL, AA subgroups, as well as other at-risk students based on the Polk Early Warning Systems data. The initial identification will take place by July 1, 2020. There will be another follow up for any newly identified students by August 1, 2020. Each month there will be data collected to check for newly identified as well as when new students register for LGMS.

Person Responsible	Robin Hutchinson (robin.hutchinson@polk-fl.net)

Create a framework for increasing student success to be implemented by both an academic interventionist/para and the behavior interventionist.

Person Responsible	Dana Hamilton (dana.hamilton@polk-fl.net)

Utilize data collection tools and analyze data with the MTSS team on a weekly basis with an end goal for students to move out of tier 3 status.

Person Responsible   Kelsey Whalen (kelsey.whalen@polk-fl.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

In addition to the addressed areas of focus increased reading support on campus is a priority and will be treated as so on campus by the school leadership team through the following:
- Drop everything and read time across all content area/elective classes
- Book clubs
- Novel studies with tier 3 students

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.

Lake Gibson Middle plans to build a positive school atmosphere by including the following:
- Developed a Community Outreach Program that goes into the neighborhoods that our school services.
- Participating in community events
- Partner with feeder schools in our community
- Host various on-campus events for families and stakeholders
- Use online platforms effectively to communicate with families and stakeholders
- New teacher Cadre
- Portfolio nights
- Partnerships with local businesses and sponsors
- Title One team tours
- Student campus ambassadors
- Implementation of PBIS campus-wide
- Teacher attendance incentives
- Staff non-negotiable's
- Staff team building
- Parent University on-campus

It is important to note that this is not an exhaustive list.

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: ESSA Subgroup: Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups	$0.00
		Total:	**$0.00**