Lake City Middle School

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Lake City Middle School

843 SW ARLINGTON BLVD, Lake City, FL 32025

http://lcms.columbiak12.com/

Demographics

Principal: Dennis Dotson

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2016

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Middle School 7-8
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: B (55%) 2017-18: C (52%) 2016-17: B (58%) 2015-16: B (54%)
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 Columbia 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 City Middle School

843 SW ARLINGTON BLVD, Lake City, FL 32025

http://lcms.columbiak12.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 7-8	Yes	85%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	41%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Columbia 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 City Middle School will educate all students in a safe and supportive learning environment that will develop life-long learners and productive citizens.

We are one school, one team, one goal; which is to prepare our students socially, emotionally, academically for high school.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Our vision is to be a premier middle school in which our students are curious and creative learners who succeed through personal initiative and sustained effort to reach high academic goals. They are critical thinkers who seek knowledge and possess the technological competence and collaborative skills. Our students embrace diversity, act responsibly, and contribute to our community.
Our educators believe that all students can meet or exceed rigorous academic standards. Teachers, staff, and administrators together form a rich professional learning community where all are supported to hone our professional craft and improve our effectiveness. Through the examination of our instructional practices and data, we adjust our teaching and operational systems in order to continuously improve.

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
Cooper, Robert	Principal	
Christie, Candace	Instructional Coach	
Murphy, William	Assistant Principal	
Dopler, Lori	Assistant Principal	
Guetherman, Regina	School Counselor	
Williams, Kim	School Counselor	
Agans, Jennifer	Other	Curriculum Resource Teacher

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Friday 7/1/2016, Dennis Dotson

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

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

14

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

56

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Middle School 7-8
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: B (55%) 2017-18: C (52%) 2016-17: B (58%) 2015-16: B (54%)
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	0	523	500	0	0	0	0	1023
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	82	90	0	0	0	0	172
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	20	0	0	0	0	31
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	32	0	0	0	0	50
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	30	47	0	0	0	0	77
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	58	67	0	0	0	0	125
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	62	45	0	0	0	0	107

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	55	81	0	0	0	0	136

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	1	7	0	0	0	0	8
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	12	0	0	0	0	32

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 9/28/2020

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	0	514	509	0	0	0	0	1023
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	99	98	0	0	0	0	197
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	84	81	0	0	0	0	165
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	80	149	0	0	0	0	229

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	65	83	0	0	0	0	148

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	5	7	0	0	0	0	12
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	0	514	509	0	0	0	0	1023
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	99	98	0	0	0	0	197
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	84	81	0	0	0	0	165
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	45	28	0	0	0	0	73
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	117	149	0	0	0	0	266

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	65	83	0	0	0	0	148

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	3	5	0	0	0	0	8
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	16	0	0	0	0	25

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	52%	56%	54%	55%	44%	52%
ELA Learning Gains	55%	58%	54%	54%	46%	54%

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	43%	51%	47%	39%	33%	44%
Math Achievement	58%	66%	58%	64%	50%	56%
Math Learning Gains	60%	65%	57%	62%	47%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	42%	51%	51%	52%	38%	50%
Science Achievement	51%	51%	51%	63%	47%	50%
Social Studies Achievement	71%	71%	72%	77%	62%	70%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey			
Indicator	**Grade Level (prior year reported)**		**Total**
	7	**8**	
	(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
07	2019	49%	53%	-4%	52%	-3%
	2018	50%	48%	2%	51%	-1%
Same Grade Comparison	-1%					
Cohort Comparison						
08	2019	52%	54%	-2%	56%	-4%
	2018	52%	51%	1%	58%	-6%
Same Grade Comparison	0%					
Cohort Comparison	2%					

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
07	2019	60%	63%	-3%	54%	6%
	2018	54%	54%	0%	54%	0%
Same Grade Comparison	6%					
Cohort Comparison						
08	2019	33%	36%	-3%	46%	-13%
	2018	33%	37%	-4%	45%	-12%
Same Grade Comparison	0%					
Cohort Comparison	-21%					

SCIENCE							
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2019	51%	52%	-1%	48%	3%
	2018	45%	46%	-1%	50%	-5%
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	70%	72%	-2%	71%	-1%
2018	66%	67%	-1%	71%	-5%
Compare		4%			
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	91%	64%	27%	61%	30%
2018	90%	51%	39%	62%	28%
Compare		1%			
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	0%	50%	-50%	57%	-57%
2018	79%	46%	33%	56%	23%
Compare		-79%			

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	21	44	36	15	30	29	20	31			

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
ELL	45	46		36	33	20					
ASN	100	73		91	82						
BLK	31	44	38	35	45	39	20	60	58		
HSP	51	48	36	67	66	41	57	61	74		
MUL	48	60	33	44	48	18	52	63	50		
WHT	61	60	49	68	67	50	64	76	68		
FRL	40	49	39	48	52	39	40	62	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	17	34	30	18	39	36	20	40			
ELL		40			75						
ASN	73	64		100	91						
BLK	32	42	36	29	40	39	27	51	52		
HSP	49	51	53	57	58	63	30	62	50		
MUL	50	44		51	60	54	32	62			
WHT	59	57	47	63	58	47	57	74	59		
FRL	43	47	42	47	50	44	42	61	55		

2017 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS

Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2015-16	C & C Accel 2015-16
SWD	9	25	23	14	34	38	16	41			
ELL	45	64		73	57						
ASN	93	87		93	87						
BLK	32	38	30	37	47	46	37	58	41		
HSP	66	65	61	69	64	44	67	85	60		
MUL	60	55	42	57	58	92	67	73	64		
WHT	61	57	42	73	67	54	70	82	53		
FRL	44	47	39	55	57	52	52	70	40		

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	56
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	60
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	559

ESSA Federal Index	
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	99%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	28
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	2
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	40
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	87
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	41
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	56
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	46
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO

Multiracial Students	
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	63
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	47
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.

The lowest performance component was math lowest 25th percentile at 42%. Teachers lacked knowledge of who their lower quartile students were and the strategies needed for engagement.

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

Math lowest 25th percentile showed the greatest decline falling 3% from the previous year. Teachers lacked knowledge of who their lower quartile students were and the strategies needed for engagement.

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.

Math lowest 25th percentile had the greatest gap when compared to the state average. Teachers lacked knowledge of who their lower quartile students were and the strategies needed for engagement.

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

Math learning gains showed the most improvement compared to the previous year. That component grew six percentage points. Last year, we focused more on iReady and each students' needs based on their iReady diagnostic scores. We also added paraprofessionals so that every team could implement smaller group instruction.

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

According to EWS indicators, LCMS has 229 students who are currently a level 1 in either math or ELA. Another area of concern is the suspension rate. Students enrolling this year are coming in with 165 suspensions.

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

1. Student Achievement
2. Parent Involvement
3. Discipline

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Student Engagement	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	According to our current data, ELA, Civics, and math FSA scores are just below the state average.
Measurable Outcome:	Increase student gains by 3% by targeting the bottom 30 students on each team. Increase student proficiency by 3% on all statewide assessments.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Candace Christie (christiec@columbiak12.com)
Evidence-based Strategy:	1. School-wide data chats (between teacher and student and also lead team member and teacher). 2. Professional development on strategies to engage students during instruction and continued best practices for iReady. 3. Peer observations 4. Provide an opportunity for all teachers to participate in a school-wide book study.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	1. Teachers will become familiar with their students' data and their areas of concern. 2. To introduce new engagement strategies for teachers to implement in the classroom. 3. Teachers will be able to observe best practices in live classrooms.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Teachers will become familiar with their students' data and their areas of concerns.
2. To introduce new engagement strategies for teachers to implement in the classroom.
3. Administration and the Instructional Coach will schedule peer observation opportunities.

Person Responsible	Candace Christie (christiec@columbiak12.com)

1. Teachers will identify their lowest quartile students. We will track the students' progress throughout the school year.
2. Instructional coach will facilitate professional learning communities to introduce new strategies and best practice to use in the classroom.
3. Administration and the Instructional coach will schedule peer observation opportunities.

Person Responsible	William Murphy (murphyw@columbiak12.com)

#2. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Parent Involvement

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	At Lake City Middle School, we want to provide more opportunities for parents to be involved in the learning process.
Measurable Outcome:	Through parent sign-in sheets, we want to see a 3% increase in parent involvement.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Jennifer Agans (agansj@columbiak12.com)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Professional development for teachers on parent communication and building student/parent relationships.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Building positive relationships between home and school at Lake City Middle School is a priority. Research shows that more parent involved, the higher the student achievement.

Action Steps to Implement

Use a variety of parent communication resources such as Remind 101, Facebook, newsletters, school marquee sign, and strategically placed signs.

Person Responsible Robert Cooper (cooperr@columbiak12.com)

#3. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Discipline

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Even though we have decreased the number of referrals over the past three years, we still had over 900 referrals last year. This is an average of one referral per student. This results in students missing more school/instruction time and therefore lowers their overall student achievement.
Measurable Outcome:	Decrease the number of referrals by 5%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Lori Dopler (doplerl@columbiak12.com)
Evidence-based Strategy:	LCMS will introduce a new Falcon Gameroom that we will use as an incentive for good behavior and academic achievement. Teachers will also receive professional development during PLCs on classroom management and building relationships between teachers and students.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Research shows that positive relationships between teachers and students promotes student achievement,

Action Steps to Implement

1. Professional development on effective classroom management.
2. Continue the use of our school-wide positive behavior program.
3. Introduction of our Falcon gameroom
4. Book study

Person Responsible Robert Cooper (cooperr@columbiak12.com)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

Lake City Middle School has in place various ways to identify our school's needs and to align our funding. We develop a Comprehensive Needs Assessment (CNA) and it is used throughout the school year to adjust programs and meet the needs of our students as they change. Instructional personnel, support personnel, curricular needs, technology needs as well as other needs, as identified, are evaluated and aligned during the evaluation and development of the needs assessment. Based on our CNA, we prioritize our needs, resources, and spending and meet regularly with the school leadership team to discuss implementation and modifications. Inventory reconciliation is conducted annually by the district and is reconciled in accordance with board policy.

The Multi-Tier System of Supports (MTSS) team meets with teachers to discuss prospective students for the MTSS process. MTSS is a data-driven prevention framework that uses data to identify and predict students who may be at risk for poor learning outcomes or who experience social/emotional needs, and/or behavioral concerns that impact learning. Tiers of intervention can address academic, social, and behavioral needs that are monitored for progress monthly and weekly. Data is collected and analyzed to determine whether or not to begin the process. Data is collected in the form of trend FSA Data (3 years), Performance Matters scores, classroom grades, and observations.

MTSS will support all students in Tier 1 including different subgroups. ELL students and students who are part of the Migrant Education Program could receive additional support that addresses their unique educational needs. The MTSS program will ensure these students overcome the educational disruption that can occur, any cultural and language barriers, social isolation and other factors that inhibit the ability of success in our school.

Drop-Out Prevention: LCMS will implement the use of Edgenuity to assist students that are behind in course credits to make necessary academic gains to prevent retentions and eventual drop-outs. LCMS will also begin the Check and Connect program (grant funded) that will connect students to trained mentors.

Once identified, accommodations/classroom supports are determined and implemented to assist the child in making academic and/or behavioral improvements. These accommodations/classroom supports are tracked by the teachers and MTSS team for effectiveness. If accommodations/classroom supports are effective, then they continue on as long as they are sustainable and/or if the child becomes proficient in academics/behavior. If the data of the newly implemented accommodations/classroom supports are deemed ineffective, the MTSS team along with teachers will meet to discuss changes in the accommodations/classroom supports.

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.

Building positive relationships between home and school at Lake City Middle School is a priority. We use various modes of communication between home and school including: Remind 101, school messenger, our school website, social media platforms, and reaching out to members of the community to encourage their school-based initiatives. We continuously offer opportunities for our stakeholders to be included in the Title I School Improvement Plan and Family Engagement Plan by seeking input on activities and funding priorities. One such opportunity for input is the Lake City Middle School - School Advisory Council, which is a forum open to the public.

Lake City Middle School provides state certified teachers who use highly effective, research based teaching methods. Teachers who are certifiable, participate in the EPI program and are on track to be certified teachers within three years.

The mission of Lake City Middle School is to educate all students in a safe and supportive learning environment that will develop life-long learners and productive citizens.

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				$196,338.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	5100	369-Technology-Related Rentals	0241 - Lake City Middle School	Title, I Part A		$38,830.00
			Notes: iReady, Flocabulary, Study Island (Social Studies), BrainPop, and MAFS/LAFS toolkits for Math and ELA.			
	5100	510-Supplies	0241 - Lake City Middle School	Title, I Part A		$6,105.28
			Notes: Scholastic Magazines, Science manipulatives, and teacher classroom supplies.			
	5100	150-Aides	0241 - Lake City Middle School	Title, I Part A		$51,500.18
			Notes: Paraprofessionals (Quantity - 2)			

	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	6300	100-Salaries	0241 - Lake City Middle School	Title, I Part A		$68,103.00
			Notes: Curriculum Resource Teacher (100%)			
	6400	100-Salaries	0241 - Lake City Middle School	Title, I Part A		$31,799.54
			Notes: Instructional Coach (50%)			
2	**III.A.**	**Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Parent Involvement**				**$4,306.36**
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	6150	510-Supplies	0241 - Lake City Middle School	Title, I Part A		$4,256.36
			Notes: Materials and Supplies			
	6150	369-Technology-Related Rentals	0241 - Lake City Middle School	Title, I Part A		$50.00
3	**III.A.**	**Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Discipline**				**$1,127.00**
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	6400	510-Supplies	0241 - Lake City Middle School	Title, I Part A		$1,127.00
			Notes: Book Study			
					Total:	**$201,771.36**