

The School District of Desoto

Desoto 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	12
Planning for Improvement	17
Positive Culture & Environment	24
Budget to Support Goals	25

Desoto Middle School

420 E GIBSON ST, Arcadia, FL 34266

<http://dms.desotoschools.com/>

Demographics

Principal: David Boland

Start Date for this Principal: 8/19/2020

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* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students* Multiracial Students White Students* Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: C (43%) 2017-18: C (47%) 2016-17: C (45%) 2015-16: D (38%)
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	CS&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 Desoto 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	12
Planning for Improvement	17
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	25

Desoto Middle School

420 E GIBSON ST, Arcadia, FL 34266

<http://dms.desotoschools.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	99%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	65%

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 Desoto 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 mission of DeSoto Middle School is to provide all students a positive learning environment focused on building relationships, high levels of student engagement and setting high expectations with academic rigor.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The vision of DeSoto Middle School is to provide a positive school culture that is student focused, promoting the development of the whole child and inspiring lifelong learners.

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
Derpich, Michelle	Principal	Scheduling Budget, Fundraising, Money Observation Schedule Faculty ELA, Intensive Reading and Math Departments School Wide Data Curriculum Instructional Material SAC Meetings ScIP (Lead) Hiring/ Recruiting Guidance New Staff Meetings Principal's Council Parent & Community Engagement (2nd) CHAMPS/ Discipline in the Secondary Classroom
Nelson, Leslie	Assistant Principal	MTSS School Safety Bulding Leaders Attendance / Truancy PBIS (2nd) Hiring/ Recruiting Present Monthly Discipline Data to Staff ScIP (2nd) New Staff Meetings (2nd) Departments - Science, Credit Retrieval, ESOL and ESE SAC Meetings SPDG (1st) Paraprofessionals Parent & Community Engagement (Lead) Virtual Learning (Lead)
Edsall, Timothy	Dean	PBIS (Lead) Supervises Social Studies and PE 6th Grade Dean of Students (Discipline, Threat Assessments & Supporting Teachers with Behavior Management)
Council, Renee	Dean	CHAMPS (2nd) 7th & 8th Grade Dean of Students (Discipline, Threat Assessments & Supporting Teachers with Behavior Management) Testing Coordinator

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Wednesday 8/19/2020, David Boland

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.*

16

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

61

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* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students* Multiracial Students White Students* Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: C (43%) 2017-18: C (47%) 2016-17: C (45%) 2015-16: D (38%)
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	CS&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	365	330	313	0	0	0	0	1008
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	105	11	21	0	0	0	0	137
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	54	37	53	0	0	0	0	144
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	92	69	78	0	0	0	0	239
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	75	72	80	0	0	0	0	227

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	270	251	237	0	0	0	0	758

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

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 8/19/2020

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	346	319	366	0	0	0	0	1031	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	33	40	57	0	0	0	0	130	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	7	15	0	0	0	0	37	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	84	95	138	0	0	0	0	317	

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	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

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	346	319	366	0	0	0	0	1031	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	33	40	57	0	0	0	0	130	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	7	15	0	0	0	0	37	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	84	95	138	0	0	0	0	317	

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	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

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	35%	35%	54%	31%	31%	52%
ELA Learning Gains	46%	46%	54%	46%	46%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	40%	40%	47%	38%	38%	44%
Math Achievement	36%	36%	58%	34%	34%	56%
Math Learning Gains	38%	38%	57%	59%	59%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	32%	32%	51%	55%	55%	50%
Science Achievement	30%	30%	51%	22%	22%	50%
Social Studies Achievement	46%	46%	72%	50%	50%	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	33%	32%	1%	54%	-21%
	2018	33%	33%	0%	52%	-19%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	29%	29%	0%	52%	-23%
	2018	34%	34%	0%	51%	-17%
Same Grade Comparison		-5%				
Cohort Comparison		-4%				
08	2019	40%	40%	0%	56%	-16%
	2018	37%	37%	0%	58%	-21%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison		6%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2019	37%	36%	1%	55%	-18%
	2018	36%	35%	1%	52%	-16%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	34%	33%	1%	54%	-20%
	2018	36%	36%	0%	54%	-18%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison		-2%				
08	2019	9%	8%	1%	46%	-37%
	2018	17%	17%	0%	45%	-28%
Same Grade Comparison		-8%				
Cohort Comparison		-27%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2019	30%	29%	1%	48%	-18%
	2018	28%	28%	0%	50%	-22%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
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	44%	43%	1%	71%	-27%
2018	46%	46%	0%	71%	-25%
Compare		-2%			
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	87%	40%	47%	61%	26%

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2018	79%	44%	35%	62%	17%
Compare		8%			
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	0%	39%	-39%	57%	-57%
2018					

Subgroup Data

2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	16	40	31	17	30	28	17	35			
ELL	15	40	38	26	37	39	18	23	69		
BLK	26	41	39	21	29	27	15	41			
HSP	32	46	44	36	39	34	30	41	82		
MUL	32	56		15	21						
WHT	40	46	34	41	41	30	33	53	81		
FRL	29	45	40	31	35	29	24	43	76		
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	38	37	17	45	45	13	31			
ELL	5	38	51	14	36	45	4	18			
BLK	13	41	40	13	35	38	9	28			
HSP	35	48	53	38	50	53	29	46	80		
MUL	38	65		21	52		25				
WHT	43	54	51	42	56	55	36	53	72		
FRL	31	48	49	33	48	50	25	43	73		
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	7	36	32	12	50	44	6	22			
ELL	13	37	45	16	51	56		29			
BLK	16	34	26	17	51	49	19	26			
HSP	29	45	37	36	58	52	19	49	70		
MUL	32	35		33	59			58			
WHT	36	51	44	36	63	61	26	58	67		
FRL	26	44	41	29	56	53	17	47	64		

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)	CS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	40
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	YES
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	6
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	12
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	396
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	27
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	32
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	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	30
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	2

Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	39
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	31
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	1
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	44
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	36
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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.

Math proficiency indicated the lowest performance. Specifically, 8th grade math was the lowest performing. I believe the contributing factor was the lack of certified math teachers and inconsistencies with substitutes.

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

Math Learning Gains and Math Lowest 25th Percentile showed the greatest decline from the prior year. I believe the contributing factor was the lack of certified math teachers and inconsistencies with substitutes. Also, there was not co-teaching/ inclusion model followed in math for SWD.

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.

Social Studies Achievement had the greatest gap when compared to the state average. I believe that our struggling readers find reading informational text difficult to comprehend and analyze.

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

The only area of improvement was Science achievement, which improved from 29% to 30%. I do not think this was a significant increase, however Science Benchmarks were given throughout the year in 7th and 8th grade to progress monitor and drive instruction.

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

The number of students with attendance below 90% and serving out of school suspension is alarming. Students need to be in class to learn and grow. There is no correlation between students' grades and proficiency on state assessments, which makes me question the alignment of lessons and school-wide assessments to standards.

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

1. Proficiency Levels of Students with Disabilities in ELA and Math
2. Proficiency Levels of Black/ African American Students in ELA and Math
3. Proficiency Levels of English Language Learners in ELA and Math
4. Overall ELA Achievement
5. Overall Math Achievement

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Six subgroups have been below the Federal Index of 41% and three of the six were below the minimum percentage points of 32%. These six subgroups include Students with Disabilities (27%), English Language Learners (32%), Black/ African American Students (30%), Hispanic Students (39%), Multiracial (31%), and Economically Disadvantaged Students (36%).

Measurable Outcome: DeSoto Middle School's Goal is to obtain a minimum of 32% percentage points for our three ESSA groups and work towards 41% for our other ESSA Subgroups.
 Goal 1: Students with Disabilities 32%
 Goal 2: Black/ African American Students 32%
 Goal 3: Multiracial Students 32%
 Goal 4: English Language Learners 37%
 Goal 5: Hispanic Students 41%
 Goal 6: Economically Disadvantaged Students 41%

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Michelle Derpich (michelle.derpich@desotoschools.com)

Evidence-based Strategy:

- The school will use an inclusive educational practice that will be monitored to support students in the least restrictive academic environment.
- Provide Professional Development on Marzano High Yield Strategies and utilize these tools to increase the rigor and engagement of classroom instruction.
- Professional development will be provided to staff on using data to drive instruction and data chats will happen after each STAR and Common Lit Assessment.
- The Assistant Principal and Principal will conduct walk throughs to promote discussion with staff members and provide staff with feedback/ support.
- Increase and support collaboration of staff to design instruction based on students' needs and aligned to standards
- Implement a School-Wide Intervention Period (Bulldog Power Hour) to address students' deficiencies and decrease learning gaps between ESSA Groups.
- Create a tutoring program after school and on Saturdays in March and April to focus on low performing ESSA groups.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

- The School Administration and Teachers completed a self-assessment from BPiE to select focus areas for the above strategies focusing on Students with Disabilities.
- Student data has been analyzed, a staff survey was given out and the Leadership Team met to develop strategies to meet our goals.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Review student data at the opening training of student mastery of grade level skills for all students and ESSA groups proficiency will be identified and goals will be set.
2. Data binders will be created for ELA, Math and Intensive Reading Students. Teachers will have data chats with students after each administration of STAR and Common Lit. Lessons and instruction will be focused on students' needs based on mastery charts, STAR and Teacher Input.
3. A focus will be placed on Formative Assessments to increase how data is used to drive instructional practices weekly and daily (included in weekly lesson plans).
4. Create a school-wide curriculum folder using Google Drive will be built with district pacing guides, resources, progression of standards and FSA Specs.
5. Analyze data quarterly to determine what standards to focus on in Intervention period. Common Performance Tasks and rubrics will be utilized across grade levels to assess mastery.

Person Responsible Michelle Derpich (michelle.derpich@desotoschools.com)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	DeSoto Middle School places a high priority on ensuring that all students can read on grade level. This is to help prepare students for success at high school and college or in the work place. All DeSoto Middle School students, whether they have reached a proficiency level or not per the state test, will be supported to strive for annual growth of 1.5 years. DeSoto Middle School will place a special emphasis on students who score in the BQ and our three lowest performing ESSA groups in regards to proficiency and learning gains.
Measurable Outcome:	Goal 1: DeSoto Middle School's goal is to improve ELA score to 38% proficiency. Goal 2: DeSoto Middle School will improve BQ learning gains from 46% to 50% proficiency. Goal 3: Improve average student growth on STAR Math by an average 1.5 years for all students from initial assessment to the final assessment.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Michelle Derpich (michelle.derpich@desotoschools.com)
Evidence-based Strategy:	-Focus on Data: Increase teachers' knowledge of students' specific needs through deep data analysis at data meetings between administration and staff; administration and departments; and administration and individual teachers. -Increase and support collaboration of staff to design instruction based on students' needs and alignment to standards through the Intervention Period (Bulldog Power Hour). -Utilize Marzano High Yield Strategies to increase the rigor and engagement of classroom instruction. -Conduct walk throughs frequently and consistently providing teachers with feedback to create a supportive learning environment focused on instruction.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	The Leadership Team collected and analyzed various data points (see below). We worked together to develop areas of focus and our school improvement plan. -SY2019 FSA Scores -SY2020 STAR Data -SY2020 Common Lit Data -BPIE Self-Assessment focusing on Students with Disabilities -SY2020 Staff Survey

Action Steps to Implement

1. Review student data throughout the year using STAR Assessment.
2. Maintain data binders for all students in ELA and Intensive Reading.
3. Develop a school-wide Writing Manual aligned to grade level standards.
4. Start a school-wide intervention period to address the achievement gaps for students.
5. Develop structured lessons reflective of students' needs based on mastery charts, STAR Data, Common Lit Data, and Teacher Input.
6. Create a Goggle Drive to store all curriculum documents, resources, progression of standards and FSA Specs.
7. Conduct targeted walk throughs on monthly instructional focuses and to help drive professional development.
8. Use common performance tasks and rubrics in the Intervention Period to asses student mastery of standards.
9. Use STAR data and Common Lit data to determine what standards need to be addressed and retaught in the Intervention period.
10. Create a tutoring program after school and on Saturdays in March and April to focus on BQ students.
11. Require all lessons to be Standards-Based.

Person Responsible Michelle Derpich (michelle.derpich@desotoschools.com)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: DeSoto Middle School places a priority on ensuring that all students can perform at grade level in mathematics, given appropriate supports. Teachers are committed to ensuring that all math students demonstrate 1.5 years of growth each year in order to be prepared for high school and career and college ready. DeSoto Middle School works together to target students' individual needs to maximize student achievement. We believe that all students have the ability to make learning gains and move towards proficiency.

Measurable Outcome: Goal 1: DeSoto Middle School will improve math scores on FSA to 38% proficiency.
Goal 2: DeSoto Middle School will improve BQ learning gains from 38% to 44%.
Goal 3: Students will demonstrated 1.5 years of growth on the STAR Math Assessment from the initial assessment to the post assessment.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Michelle Derpich (michelle.derpich@desotoschools.com)

Evidence-based Strategy: -Focus on Data: Increase teachers' knowledge of students' specific needs through deep data analysis at data meetings between administration and staff; administration and departments; and administration and individual teachers.
-Increase and support collaboration of staff to design instruction based on students' needs and alignment to standards through the Intervention Period (Bulldog Power Hour).
-Utilize Marzano High Yield Strategies to increase the rigor and engagement of classroom instruction.
-Conduct walk throughs frequently and consistently providing teachers with feedback to create a supportive learning environment focused on instruction.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: The Leadership Team collected and analyzed various data points (see below). We worked together to develop areas of focus in our school improvement plan.
-SY2019 FSA Scores
-SY2020 STAR Data
-BPIE Self-Assessment focusing on Students with Disabilities
-SY2020 Staff Survey

Action Steps to Implement

1. Review student data throughout the year using STAR Assessment.
2. Maintain Math data binders for all students .
3. Start a school-wide intervention period to address the achievement gaps for students.
4. Develop structured lessons reflective of students' needs based on mastery charts, STAR Data and Teacher Input.
5. Create a Goggle Drive to store all curriculum documents, resources, progression of standards and FSA Specs.
6. Conduct targeted walk throughs on monthly instructional focuses and to help drive professional development.
7. Use common performance tasks and rubrics in the Intervention Period to asses student mastery of standards.
8. Use STAR data data to determine what standards need to be addressed and retaught in the Intervention period.
9. Create a tutoring program after school and on Saturdays in March and April to focus on BQ students.
10. Require all lessons to be Standards-Based.

Person Responsible Michelle Derpich (michelle.derpich@desotoschools.com)

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

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	DeSoto Middle School will embed positive behavior interventions and supports that are school-wide to help teach students positive expectations, increase instructional time and decrease discipline referrals. Staff, students, parents and community members will work together to develop a plan that positively affects the school climate and culture.
Measurable Outcome:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Compare the SY2020 and SY2021 Staff Survey and look for comments directly related to improvement of student discipline. -Increase the retention rate of teachers by 7.5% from SY20 to SY21. -Decrease the number of discipline referrals by 10%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Leslie Nelson (leslie.nelson@desotoschools.com)
Evidence-based Strategy:	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. School-wide implementation year for C.H.A.M.P.S / Discipline in the Secondary School. 2. Planning year for PBIS. 3. Check and Connect / ESE Mentoring Program
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Discipline Referrals -Discipline Data of Subgroups -SY20 Staff Survey -Retention Data

Action Steps to Implement

1. Utilize staff and student committees; Use surveys for staff and parents; and gain input from the SAC committee to increase the voice of all stakeholders and increase buy in from all.
2. Form a CHAMPS committee.
3. Create classroom and school wide expectations through CHAMPS.
4. Provide professional development for PBIS and form a committee.
5. Provide professional development to become a check and connect mentor.
6. Develop activities for Intervention on Fridays to allow for mentoring, data chats and teaching expectations.

Person Responsible [no one identified]

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 will work with the Civic Teachers to ensure there are common assessments aligned to standards to better prepare students for the EOC and to use data to drive instruction.

The School Leadership Team and the Instructional Coach will work with 6th and 7th grade teachers to create assessment questions to use as bellwork. Also, a full staff of Science teachers have been hired that are content experts.

To address our attendance and discipline concerns DeSoto Middle School has implemented CHAMPS for the 2020-2021 SY and it is a planning year for PBIS.

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.

DeSoto Middle School strives to include all stakeholders in decision making and building a positive school culture. This year we will be planning PBIS and working with staff, students and families to obtain input to successfully implement it in SY21-22.

SAC meetings are held monthly to involve parents and community members. This year meetings will start via zoom.

Surveys will be used to collect information from parents, teachers and students on how to continually improve the school culture and to obtain feedback.

Principals throughout the district and Directors meet twice a month for continuity among schools.

The community college and education association works closely offering teachers planning time and professional development hours.

Our school social workers and student services have monthly meetings with support services in the community to ensure our students and their families are receiving the best care.

The local food pantry works with the school to host a bi-weekly food pantry for those in need.

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: ESSA Subgroup: Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math	\$0.00
4	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00