**Marion County Public Schools** 

# **Liberty Middle School**



2021-22 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       | 20 |
| - ·                            |    |
| Positive Culture & Environment | 24 |
|                                |    |
| Budget to Support Goals        | 25 |

# **Liberty Middle School**

4773 SW 95TH ST, Ocala, FL 34476

[ no web address on file ]

#### **Demographics**

Principal: Reuben Williams

Start Date for this Principal: 6/15/2017

| 2019-20 Status<br>(per MSID File)   | Active   |
|---|--|
| School Type and Grades Served<br>(per MSID File)  | Middle School<br>6-8   |
| Primary Service Type<br>(per MSID File)   | K-12 General Education   |
| 2020-21 Title I School  | Yes  |
| 2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)   | 88%  |
| 2020-21 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students |
| School Grades History   | 2018-19: B (54%)<br>2017-18: C (52%)<br>2016-17: C (50%)   |
| 2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Info  | rmation*   |
| SI Region   | Northeast  |
| Regional Executive Director   | <u>Cassandra Brusca</u>  |
| Turnaround Option/Cycle   | N/A  |
| Year  |  |
| Support Tier  |  |
| ESSA Status   |  |

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

#### **School Board Approval**

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

#### **SIP Authority**

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

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

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

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

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

#### **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       | 20 |
| Title I Requirements           | 0  |
| Budget to Support Goals        | 25 |

## **Liberty Middle School**

4773 SW 95TH ST, Ocala, FL 34476

[ no web address on file ]

#### **School Demographics**

| School Type and Gr<br>(per MSID F |          | 2020-21 Title I School | Disadvan  | 1 Economically<br>taged (FRL) Rate<br>rted on Survey 3) |  |  |  |  |  |
|-----------------------------------|----------|------------------------|---|---|--|--|--|--|--|
| Middle Sch<br>6-8                 | ool      | Yes                    |   | 57%   |  |  |  |  |  |
| Primary Servic<br>(per MSID F     | • •      | Charter School         | 2018-19 Minority Rate<br>(Reported as Non-white<br>on Survey 2) |   |  |  |  |  |  |
| K-12 General Ed                   | ducation | No                     |   | 63%   |  |  |  |  |  |
| School Grades Histo               | ry       |                        |   |   |  |  |  |  |  |
| Year                              | 2020-21  | 2019-20                | 2018-19   | 2017-18   |  |  |  |  |  |

В

В

C

#### **School Board Approval**

**Grade** 

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

#### **SIP Authority**

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

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

#### Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

#### **Part I: School Information**

#### **School Mission and Vision**

#### Provide the school's mission statement.

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

#### Provide the school's vision statement.

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

#### School Leadership Team

#### Membership

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

| Name                  | Position<br>Title      | Job Duties and Responsibilities  |
|-----------------------|------------------------|--|
| Forsyth,<br>Melissa   | Principal              | The Principal is the driving force and instructional leader of the school. She provides a common vision for the use of data-based decision—making, models the Problem Solving Process; supervises the development of a strong infrastructure; conducts an assessment of the skills of school staff; ensures implementation of high yield instructional strategies, collaborative learning, intervention support, and documentation; provides adequate professional learning opportunities; develops a culture of expectation with the school staff; ensures resources are assigned to those areas of most need and communicates with parents as necessary.               |
| Carter,<br>Michael    | Assistant<br>Principal | The Assistant Principal assists the Principal in providing a common vision for the use of data-based decision-making, assists in the development of a strong infrastructure of resources for the implementation of high yield instructional strategies, further assists the principal in the assessment of school staff, assists with the monitoring of the implementation of the intervention and necessary documentation, assists with the delivery of professional development for effective instructional delivery. The assistant principal carefully monitors the additional academic support schedule to ensure all personnel is serving in their specified areas. |
| Palacios,<br>Kayla    | Assistant<br>Principal | The Assistant Principal assists the Principal in providing a common vision for the use of data-based decision-making, assists in the development of a strong infrastructure of resources for the implementation of high yield instructional strategies, further assists the principal in the assessment of school staff, assists with the monitoring of the implementation of the intervention and necessary documentation, assists with the delivery of professional development for effective instructional delivery. The assistant principal carefully monitors the additional academic support schedule to ensure all personnel is serving in their specified areas. |
| Williams,<br>Crystal  | Instructional<br>Coach | The instructional coach will assist in training teachers on WICOR strategies in the classroom, implementing best practices in the classroom, and the Professional Development on campus. The instructional coach will also assist with the ITD and New to Liberty Teachers.  |
| Newbold,<br>Brian     | Dean                   | The Student Services Manager provides teachers with classroom support and feedback to ensure a safe, cooperative environment for learning to take place. Resources, such as behavior contracts, for at-risk students are carefully considered and shared by the SSM. He coordinates efforts to use positive reinforcements to encourage more positive behavior choices by students. He also monitors and shares disciplinary/attendance data, and serves on the PBIS/Safety committee. In addition, the SSM may act as a liaison with outside agencies that offer support to students and families   |
| Barrios,<br>Elizabeth | School<br>Counselor    | The Guidance Counselor participates in the collection, interpretation, and analysis of data; facilitates the development of intervention plans; provides   |

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

#### **Demographic Information**

#### Principal start date

Thursday 6/15/2017, Reuben Williams

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

5

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.

25

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

76

Total number of students enrolled at the school

1,262

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2020-21 school year.

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2021-22 school year.

**Demographic Data** 

#### **Early Warning Systems**

#### 2021-22

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

| Indicator  |   |   |   |   |   |   | Grad | le Le | vel |   |    |    |    | Total |
|--|---|---|---|---|---|---|------|-------|-----|---|----|----|----|-------|
| indicator  | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6    | 7     | 8   | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | TOLAI |
| Number of students enrolled                              | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 389  | 396   | 445 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 1230  |
| Attendance below 90 percent                              | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 75   | 118   | 146 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 339   |
| One or more suspensions                                  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 34   | 50    | 82  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 166   |
| Course failure in ELA                                    | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0    | 36    | 49  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 85    |
| Course failure in Math                                   | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0    | 10    | 74  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 84    |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment             | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 64   | 62    | 110 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 236   |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment            | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 58   | 69    | 111 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 238   |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0    | 0     | 0   | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |       |
|  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0    | 0     | 0   | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |       |

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

| Indicator                            | Grade Level |   |   |   |   |   |     |     |     |   |    |    |    |       |  |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|-----|-----|-----|---|----|----|----|-------|--|
| malcator                             | K           | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6   | 7   | 8   | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | TOLAI |  |
| Students with two or more indicators | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 161 | 196 | 278 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 635   |  |

#### The number of students identified as retainees:

| Indicator                           |   |   |   |   |   | G | rad | e L | evel |   |    |    |    | Total |
|-------------------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|-----|-----|------|---|----|----|----|-------|
| 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   | 33   | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 33    |
| 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 8/11/2021

#### 2020-21 - As Reported

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

| Indicator                                 |   |   |   |   |   |   | Grad | le Le | vel |   |    |    |    | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|------|-------|-----|---|----|----|----|-------|
| 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 | 405  | 451   | 445 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 1301  |
| Attendance below 90 percent               | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 139  | 72    | 91  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 302   |
| One or more suspensions                   | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 19   | 76    | 75  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 170   |
| Course failure in ELA                     | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0    | 1     | 6   | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 7     |
| Course failure in Math                    | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0    | 3     | 6   | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 9     |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 72   | 119   | 111 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 302   |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 83   | 118   | 121 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 322   |
|   | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0    | 0     | 0   | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |       |
|   | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0    | 0     | 0   | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |       |
|   | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0    | 0     | 0   | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |       |

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

| Indicator                            |   |   |   |   |   |   | Gra | de Le | vel |   |    |    |    | Total |
|--------------------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|-----|-------|-----|---|----|----|----|-------|
| 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 | 63  | 156   | 167 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 386   |

#### The number of students identified as retainees:

| La dia atao                         |   |   |   |   |   | G | rad | e L | evel |   | Grade Level |    |    |       |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|-------------------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|-----|-----|------|---|-------------|----|----|-------|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| 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   | 15   | 0 | 0           | 0  | 0  | 15    |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0   | 0   | 11   | 0 | 0           | 0  | 0  | 11    |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

#### 2020-21 - Updated

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

| Indicator                                 |   |   |   |   |   |   | Grad | le Le | vel |   |    |    |    | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|------|-------|-----|---|----|----|----|-------|
| 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 | 405  | 451   | 445 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 1301  |
| Attendance below 90 percent               | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 139  | 72    | 91  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 302   |
| One or more suspensions                   | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 19   | 76    | 75  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 170   |
| Course failure in ELA                     | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0    | 1     | 6   | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 7     |
| Course failure in Math                    | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0    | 3     | 6   | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 9     |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 72   | 119   | 111 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 302   |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 83   | 118   | 121 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 322   |
|   | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0    | 0     | 0   | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |       |
|   | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0    | 0     | 0   | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |       |
|   | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0    | 0     | 0   | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |       |

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

| Indicator                            |   | Grade Level |   |   |   |   |    |     |     |   |    |    | Total |       |
|--------------------------------------|---|-------------|---|---|---|---|----|-----|-----|---|----|----|-------|-------|
|                                      |   | 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 | 63 | 156 | 167 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0     | 386   |

#### The number of students identified as retainees:

| Indicator                           |   | Grade Level |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |   |    |    | Tatal |       |
|-------------------------------------|---|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|---|----|----|-------|-------|
|                                     |   | 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 | 15 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0     | 15    |
| Students retained two or more times |   | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0     | 11    |

## Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

#### **School Data Review**

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      |        | 2021     |       |        | 2019     |       |        | 2018     |       |  |  |
|-----------------------------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|--|--|
| School Grade Component      | School | District | State | School | District | State | School | District | State |  |  |
| ELA Achievement             |        |          |       | 48%    | 49%      | 54%   | 45%    | 47%      | 53%   |  |  |
| ELA Learning Gains          |        |          |       | 54%    | 54%      | 54%   | 45%    | 50%      | 54%   |  |  |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile  |        |          |       | 43%    | 46%      | 47%   | 38%    | 45%      | 47%   |  |  |
| Math Achievement            |        |          |       | 52%    | 54%      | 58%   | 55%    | 52%      | 58%   |  |  |
| Math Learning Gains         |        |          |       | 58%    | 58%      | 57%   | 61%    | 61%      | 57%   |  |  |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile |        |          |       | 48%    | 50%      | 51%   | 52%    | 52%      | 51%   |  |  |
| Science Achievement         |        |          |       | 44%    | 46%      | 51%   | 50%    | 46%      | 52%   |  |  |
| Social Studies Achievement  |        |          |       | 75%    | 70%      | 72%   | 63%    | 66%      | 72%   |  |  |

#### **Grade Level Data Review - State Assessments**

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-<br>District<br>Comparison | State    | School-<br>State<br>Comparison |
| 06         | 2021     |        |          |                                   |          |                                |
|            | 2019     | 40%    | 45%      | -5%                               | 54%      | -14%                           |
| Cohort Con | nparison |        |          |                                   |          |                                |
| 07         | 2021     |        |          |                                   |          |                                |
|            | 2019     | 48%    | 46%      | 2%                                | 52%      | -4%                            |
| Cohort Con | nparison | -40%   |          |                                   |          |                                |
| 08         | 2021     |        |          |                                   |          |                                |
|            | 2019     | 47%    | 50%      | -3%                               | 56%      | -9%                            |
| Cohort Con | nparison | -48%   |          |                                   | <u> </u> |                                |

|           |          |        | MATH     |                                   |       |                                |
|-----------|----------|--------|----------|-----------------------------------|-------|--------------------------------|
| Grade     | Year     | School | District | School-<br>District<br>Comparison | State | School-<br>State<br>Comparison |
| 06        | 2021     |        |          |                                   |       | <u>-</u>                       |
|           | 2019     | 40%    | 46%      | -6%                               | 55%   | -15%                           |
| Cohort Co | mparison |        |          |                                   |       |                                |
| 07        | 2021     |        |          |                                   |       |                                |
|           | 2019     | 48%    | 49%      | -1%                               | 54%   | -6%                            |
| Cohort Co | mparison | -40%   |          |                                   |       |                                |
| 08        | 2021     |        |          |                                   |       |                                |
|           | 2019     | 46%    | 41%      | 5%                                | 46%   | 0%                             |
| Cohort Co | mparison | -48%   |          |                                   |       |                                |

|            | SCIENCE  |        |          |                                   |       |                                |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|------------|----------|--------|----------|-----------------------------------|-------|--------------------------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| Grade      | Year     | School | District | School-<br>District<br>Comparison | State | School-<br>State<br>Comparison |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 08         | 2021     |        |          |                                   |       |                                |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|            | 2019     | 42%    | 44%      | -2%                               | 48%   | -6%                            |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Cohort Com | nparison |        |          |                                   | •     |                                |  |  |  |  |  |  |

|      | BIOLOGY EOC |          |                             |       |                          |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|------|-------------|----------|-----------------------------|-------|--------------------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| Year | School      | District | School<br>Minus<br>District | State | School<br>Minus<br>State |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2021 |             |          |                             |       |                          |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2019 |             |          |                             |       |                          |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

|      |        | CIVIC    | S EOC                       |       |                          |
|------|--------|----------|-----------------------------|-------|--------------------------|
| Year | School | District | School<br>Minus<br>District | State | School<br>Minus<br>State |
| 2021 |        |          |                             |       |                          |
| 2019 | 71%    | 65%      | 6%                          | 71%   | 0%                       |
|      |        | HISTO    | RY EOC                      |       |                          |
| Year | School | District | School<br>Minus<br>District | State | School<br>Minus<br>State |
| 2021 |        |          |                             |       |                          |
| 2019 |        |          |                             |       |                          |
|      |        | ALGEE    | BRA EOC                     |       |                          |
| Year | School | District | School<br>Minus<br>District | State | School<br>Minus<br>State |
| 2021 |        |          |                             |       |                          |
| 2019 | 94%    | 54%      | 40%                         | 61%   | 33%                      |
|      |        | GEOME    | TRY EOC                     |       |                          |
| Year | School | District | School<br>Minus<br>District | State | School<br>Minus<br>State |
| 2021 |        |          |                             |       |                          |
| 2019 | 100%   | 51%      | 49%                         | 57%   | 43%                      |

#### **Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments**

Provide the progress monitoring tool(s) by grade level used to compile the below data.

#### Middle

The progress monitoring tools used by grade level to compile the data below are:

- English Language Arts, Grades 6-8: ELA Quarters 1, 2, and 3 Quarterly Standards Mastery Assessment (QSMA)
- Mathematics Grades 6-8: Math Quarters 1, 2, and 3 Quarterly Standards Mastery Assessment (QSMA)
- Algebra: Algebra Quarters 1, 2, and 3 Quarterly Standards Mastery Assessment (QSMA)
- Geometry: Geometry Quarters 1, 2, and 3 Quarterly Standards Mastery Assessment (QSMA)
- Civics: Civics Quarters 1, 2, and 3 Quarterly Standards Mastery Assessment (QSMA)
- Science: Grade 8 Science Quarters 1, 2, and 3 Quarterly Standards Mastery Assessment (QSMA)

|                          |                               | Grade 6                              |                                     |                                      |
|--------------------------|-------------------------------|--------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|
|                          | Number/%<br>Proficiency       | Fall                                 | Winter                              | Spring                               |
|                          | All Students                  | 131 / 36%                            | 114 / 29%                           | 122 / 34%                            |
| English Language<br>Arts | Economically Disadvantaged    | 63 / 28%                             | 53 / 22%                            | 55 / 25%                             |
| ,                        | Students With Disabilities    | 5 / 11%                              | 4 / 8%                              | 5 / 12%                              |
|                          | English Language<br>Learners  | 2 / 10%                              | 2 / 10%                             | 2 / 10%                              |
|                          | Number/%<br>Proficiency       | Fall                                 | Winter                              | Spring                               |
|                          | All Students                  | "Math 206 / 57% "                    | "Math 159 / 41% "                   | "Math 137 / 39% "                    |
| Mathematics              | Economically Disadvantaged    | "Math 121 / 54% "                    | "Math 86 / 36% "                    | "Math 72 / 34% "                     |
|                          | Students With Disabilities    | "Math 6 / 14% "                      | "Math 4 / 8% "                      | "Math 3 / 7% "                       |
|                          | English Language<br>Learners  | "Math 12 / 55% "                     | "Math 5 / 23% "                     | "Math 4 / 19% "                      |
|                          |                               | Grade 7                              |                                     |                                      |
|                          | Number/%<br>Proficiency       | Fall                                 | Winter                              | Spring                               |
|                          | All Students                  | 198 / 49%                            | 158 / 37%                           | 134 / 33%                            |
| English Language<br>Arts | Economically Disadvantaged    | 103 / 40%                            | 76 / 28%                            | 63 / 25%                             |
|                          | Students With Disabilities    | 13 / 20%                             | 9 / 12%                             | 6 / 9%                               |
|                          | English Language<br>Learners  | 5 / 18%                              | 2/7%                                | 5 / 17%                              |
|                          | Number/%<br>Proficiency       | Fall                                 | Winter                              | Spring                               |
|                          | All Students                  | "Math 152 / 44%                      | "Math 141 / 38%                     | "Math 120 / 34%                      |
| Mathematics              | Economically                  | Algebra 27 / 49% "<br>"Math 96 / 42% | Algebra 20 / 36% " "Math 86 / 35%   | Algebra 25 / 48% " "Math 62 / 26%    |
| Mathematics              | Disadvantaged                 | Algebra 13 / 57% "                   | Algebra 6 / 26% "                   | Algebra 9 / 41% "                    |
|                          | Students With Disabilities    | "Math 21 / 33%<br>Algebra 1 / 50% "  | "Math 20 / 28%<br>Algebra 1 / 50% " | "Math 12 / 18%<br>Algebra 1 / 100% " |
|                          | English Language<br>Learners  | "Math 11 / 39% "                     | "Math 8 / 28% "                     | "Math 3 / 10% "                      |
|                          | Number/%<br>Proficiency       | Fall                                 | Winter                              | Spring                               |
|                          | All Students                  | 204 / 51%                            | 183 / 46%                           | 209 / 53%                            |
| Civics                   | Economically<br>Disadvantaged | 106 / 43%                            | 95 / 35%                            | 111 / 43%                            |
|                          | Students With Disabilities    | 21 / 33%                             | 13 / 18%                            | 13 / 19%                             |
|                          | English Language<br>Learners  | 8 / 33%                              | 6 / 22%                             | 7 / 26%                              |

|                          |  | Grade 8   |  |  |
|--------------------------|--|---|--|--|
|                          | Number/%<br>Proficiency                              | Fall  | Winter   | Spring   |
|                          | All Students   | 54 / 15%  | 88 / 24%   | 101 / 28%  |
| English Language<br>Arts | Economically Disadvantaged                           | 33 / 14%  | 49 / 20%   | 56 / 24%   |
|                          | Students With Disabilities                           | 2 / 5%  | 4 / 10%  | 3 / 8%   |
|                          | English Language<br>Learners                         | 1 / 5%  | 1 / 5%   | 2 / 9%   |
|                          | Number/%<br>Proficiency                              | Fall  | Winter   | Spring   |
|                          | All Students   | "Math 92 / 45%<br>Algebra 25 / 32%<br>Geo 35 / 60%"                       | "Math 131 / 56%<br>Algebra 20 / 25%<br>Geo 38 / 64%"                     | "Math 112 / 49%<br>Algebra 29 / 38%<br>Geo 31 / 56%"                     |
| Mathematics              | Economically<br>Disadvantaged                        | "Math 62 / 42%<br>Algebra 12 / 31%<br>Geo 20 / 59%"                       | "Math 91 / 53%<br>Algebra 10 / 25%<br>Geo 21 / 62%"                      | "Math 78 / 46%<br>Algebra 15 / 38%<br>Geo 17 / 57%"                      |
|                          | Students With Disabilities English Language Learners | "Math 13 / 35%<br>Algebra 1 / 33% "<br>"Math 7 / 47%<br>Algebra 2 / 33% " | "Math 16 / 41%<br>Algebra 0 / 0% "<br>"Math 6 / 38%<br>Algebra 1 / 17% " | "Math 10 / 27%<br>Algebra 0 / 0% "<br>"Math 7 / 44%<br>Algebra 1 / 17% " |
|                          | Number/%<br>Proficiency                              | Fall  | Winter   | Spring   |
|                          | All Students   | 148 / 39%   | 182 / 46%  | 185 / 49%  |
| Science                  | Economically Disadvantaged                           | 81 / 32%  | 102 / 38%  | 102 / 40%  |
|                          | Students With Disabilities                           | 8 / 20%   | 8 / 18%  | 10 / 24%   |
|                          | English Language<br>Learners                         | 6 / 29%   | 3 / 13%  | 4 / 17%  |

## Subgroup Data Review

|           |             | 2021      | SCHOO             | OL GRAD      | E COMF     | ONENT              | S BY SI     | JBGRO      | UPS          |                         |                           |
|-----------|-------------|-----------|-------------------|--------------|------------|--------------------|-------------|------------|--------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|
| Subgroups | ELA<br>Ach. | ELA<br>LG | ELA<br>LG<br>L25% | Math<br>Ach. | Math<br>LG | Math<br>LG<br>L25% | Sci<br>Ach. | SS<br>Ach. | MS<br>Accel. | Grad<br>Rate<br>2019-20 | C & C<br>Accel<br>2019-20 |
| SWD       | 14          | 29        | 28                | 25           | 37         | 26                 | 24          | 35         |              |                         |                           |
| ELL       | 25          | 41        | 36                | 27           | 38         | 35                 | 18          | 40         | 76           |                         |                           |
| ASN       | 79          | 77        |                   | 85           | 53         |                    |             | 83         | 79           |                         |                           |
| BLK       | 29          | 30        | 15                | 22           | 24         | 22                 | 28          | 44         | 37           |                         |                           |
| HSP       | 40          | 44        | 39                | 37           | 34         | 32                 | 36          | 55         | 55           |                         |                           |
| MUL       | 41          | 45        |                   | 46           | 42         | 40                 | 39          | 68         | 91           |                         |                           |
| WHT       | 50          | 48        | 40                | 51           | 38         | 39                 | 50          | 68         | 66           |                         |                           |
| FRL       | 36          | 41        | 31                | 34           | 32         | 32                 | 34          | 54         | 52           |                         |                           |

| 2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS |             |           |                   |              |            |                    |             |            |              |                         |                           |
|---|-------------|-----------|-------------------|--------------|------------|--------------------|-------------|------------|--------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|
| Subgroups                                 | ELA<br>Ach. | ELA<br>LG | ELA<br>LG<br>L25% | Math<br>Ach. | Math<br>LG | Math<br>LG<br>L25% | Sci<br>Ach. | SS<br>Ach. | MS<br>Accel. | Grad<br>Rate<br>2017-18 | C & C<br>Accel<br>2017-18 |
| SWD                                       | 23          | 42        | 32                | 30           | 50         | 44                 | 23          | 51         |              |                         |                           |
| ELL                                       | 24          | 46        | 42                | 34           | 50         | 44                 | 14          | 55         | 38           |                         |                           |
| ASN                                       | 77          | 64        |                   | 86           | 85         |                    |             | 68         | 94           |                         |                           |
| BLK                                       | 35          | 47        | 46                | 34           | 48         | 43                 | 27          | 66         | 56           |                         |                           |
| HSP                                       | 42          | 52        | 41                | 47           | 53         | 42                 | 36          | 73         | 57           |                         |                           |
| MUL                                       | 58          | 58        | 25                | 55           | 66         | 54                 | 53          | 75         | 58           |                         |                           |
| WHT                                       | 56          | 59        | 46                | 62           | 63         | 56                 | 54          | 81         | 63           |                         |                           |
| FRL                                       | 40          | 50        | 40                | 44           | 54         | 44                 | 36          | 69         | 54           |                         |                           |
|   |             | 2018      | SCHO              | OL GRAD      | E COMF     | PONENT             | S BY SI     | JBGRO      | UPS          |                         |                           |
| Subgroups                                 | ELA<br>Ach. | ELA<br>LG | ELA<br>LG<br>L25% | Math<br>Ach. | Math<br>LG | Math<br>LG<br>L25% | Sci<br>Ach. | SS<br>Ach. | MS<br>Accel. | Grad<br>Rate<br>2016-17 | C & C<br>Accel<br>2016-17 |
| SWD                                       | 23          | 40        | 32                | 31           | 52         | 44                 | 19          | 42         |              |                         |                           |
| ELL                                       | 17          | 44        | 41                | 33           | 58         | 56                 | 29          | 26         | 42           |                         |                           |
| ASN                                       | 56          | 69        |                   | 81           | 57         |                    |             | 90         | 80           |                         |                           |
| BLK                                       | 30          | 36        | 32                | 38           | 53         | 46                 | 30          | 53         | 54           |                         |                           |
| HSP                                       | 45          | 47        | 40                | 56           | 64         | 57                 | 53          | 54         | 46           |                         |                           |
| MUL                                       | 45          | 36        | 46                | 55           | 57         | 54                 | 46          | 72         | 67           |                         |                           |
| WHT                                       | 51          | 47        | 36                | 60           | 62         | 53                 | 56          | 68         | 63           |                         |                           |
| FRL                                       | 40          | 43        | 37                | 51           | 59         | 51                 | 44          | 58         | 48           |                         |                           |

#### **ESSA Data Review**

This data has been updated for the 2021-22 school year as of 10/19/2021.

| ESSA Federal Index  |  |  |  |
|---|--|--|--|
| ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)  |  |  |  |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students  |  |  |  |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students                                    |  |  |  |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target                                    |  |  |  |
| Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency |  |  |  |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index                                       |  |  |  |
| Total Components for the Federal Index  |  |  |  |
| Percent Tested  |  |  |  |

# Students With Disabilities Federal Index - Students With Disabilities 27 Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%

| English Language Learners   |              |  |  |  |
|---|--------------|--|--|--|
| Federal Index - English Language Learners   | 39           |  |  |  |
| English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?   | YES          |  |  |  |
| Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%  |              |  |  |  |
| Native American Students  |              |  |  |  |
| Federal Index - Native American Students  |              |  |  |  |
| Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?  |              |  |  |  |
| Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%   |              |  |  |  |
| Asian Students  | L            |  |  |  |
| Federal Index - Asian Students  | 76           |  |  |  |
| Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?  | NO           |  |  |  |
| Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%   |              |  |  |  |
| Black/African American Students   |              |  |  |  |
| Federal Index - Black/African American Students   | 28           |  |  |  |
| Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?   | YES          |  |  |  |
| Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%  |              |  |  |  |
| Hispanic Students   |              |  |  |  |
| mapanic otudenta  |              |  |  |  |
| Federal Index - Hispanic Students   | 43           |  |  |  |
|   | 43<br>NO     |  |  |  |
| Federal Index - Hispanic Students   |              |  |  |  |
| Federal Index - Hispanic Students Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?   |              |  |  |  |
| Federal Index - Hispanic Students  Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?  Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%  |              |  |  |  |
| Federal Index - Hispanic Students  Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?  Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%  Multiracial Students  | NO           |  |  |  |
| Federal Index - Hispanic Students  Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?  Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%  Multiracial Students  Federal Index - Multiracial Students  | NO 52        |  |  |  |
| Federal Index - Hispanic Students Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%  Multiracial Students  Federal Index - Multiracial Students  Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?  | NO 52        |  |  |  |
| Federal Index - Hispanic Students Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%  Multiracial Students  Federal Index - Multiracial Students  Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?  Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%   | NO 52        |  |  |  |
| Federal Index - Hispanic Students Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%  Multiracial Students  Federal Index - Multiracial Students  Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?  Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%  Pacific Islander Students  | NO 52        |  |  |  |
| Federal Index - Hispanic Students  Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?  Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%  Multiracial Students  Federal Index - Multiracial Students  Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?  Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%  Pacific Islander Students  Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students   | 52<br>NO     |  |  |  |
| Federal Index - Hispanic Students  Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?  Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%  Multiracial Students  Federal Index - Multiracial Students  Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?  Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%  Pacific Islander Students  Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students  Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?  | 52<br>NO     |  |  |  |
| Federal Index - Hispanic Students Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?  Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%  Multiracial Students  Federal Index - Multiracial Students  Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?  Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%  Pacific Islander Students  Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students  Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?  Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%                 | 52<br>NO     |  |  |  |
| Federal Index - Hispanic Students Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?  Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%  Multiracial Students  Federal Index - Multiracial Students  Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?  Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%  Pacific Islander Students  Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students  Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?  Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%  White Students | NO 52 NO N/A |  |  |  |

| Economically Disadvantaged Students  |    |  |
|--|----|--|
| Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students                                | 40 |  |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?        |    |  |
| Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32% |    |  |

#### **Analysis**

#### **Data Analysis**

Answer the following analysis questions using the progress monitoring data and state assessment data, if applicable.

#### What trends emerge across grade levels, subgroups and core content areas?

The trend that emerges across the data is that there was a decreased school-wide from 2019 to the 2021 state assessments. We had a 5% decrease in ELA Proficiency, 11% decrease in Math Proficiency, 26% decrease in Civics Proficiency, and 3% decrease in Science Proficiency. Analyzing the district quarterly assessments, it is evident that our SWD students and ELL students are performing well below their peers in ELA and Science. However, only our SWD students are performing below their peers in Math across all grade levels.

# What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

Based upon the data, our greatest need for improvement is in ELA and Math with our Bottom Quartile students who dropped 10% in ELA Learning Gains and 16% in Math Learning Gains.

# What were the contributing factors to this need for improvement? What new actions would need to be taken to address this need for improvement?

The contributing factors to the need for improvement are attendance issues. For the 2020-2021 School Year, 31% of our students missed more than 10% of school days. We will need to utilize attendance initiatives and provide supports to students who cannot come to school. Teachers will need to be further trained to provide rigorous at-home learning opportunities through the Learning Management System to keep students from falling behind when they must be out of school. Students were also not engaged in lessons that were at the depth of the standard to which it will be assessed. The teachers will utilize Common Assessments and student work to determine if the planned lesson teaches mastery to the depth of the standard.

# What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

Even though it was not an increase, our Science proficiency for the 2021 State Assessment dropped the least with a 3% decrease (44% to 41%).

# What were the contributing factors to this improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

The 8th-grade science teachers have been meeting and planning regularly over the course of the past two years with a focus on implementing WICOR strategies into the classroom and developing lessons that incorporate standards from 6th, 7th, and 8th grade to improve the student's knowledge of Science standards. This past year, our science teachers became more focused on developing common assessments that aligned with state assessments.

#### What strategies will need to be implemented in order to accelerate learning?

AVID WICOR Strategies such as Focused Note Taking, Text Marking, the Critical Reading Process, and implementing a Collaborative Planning process that focus' on evaluating lessons through student work, common assessments, and the depth of the standard. Instructional Rounds will also become a common practice at the school to allow the administration and teachers to identify needs and develop action plans.

Based on the contributing factors and strategies identified to accelerate learning, describe the professional development opportunities that will be provided at the school to support teachers and leaders.

We will continue to build our faculty's capacity of incorporating WICOR strategies into their classroom. Teachers will take part in PD throughout the year focused on the Critical Reading Process with a classroom implementation timeline. Teachers in all subject areas will take part in Instructional Rounds to review the teaching practices in other classrooms and receive feedback on their own classroom which will then be part of developing our PD offered to teachers based upon our campus' need.

Provide a description of the additional services that will be implemented to ensure sustainability of improvement in the next year and beyond.

We will continue to evaluate our observational and quantitative data throughout the school year to determine if our PD plan is moving our school in the correct direction. During the times of evaluation, we determine if there needs to be a change in the professional development plan.

WICOR Strategies will continue to develop in the classroom with the students being able to determine the note-taking style to use and the correct way to collaborate when completing a lesson which will in turn increase student learning.

We will be offering 21st Century in a different format this school year. Students in 21st Century will be placed based upon their needs and teachers will focus upon the Math and ELA needs of the students within the group.

### Part III: Planning for Improvement

**Areas of Focus:** 

#### #1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Student Engagement

#### Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Focus on the critical reading process by immersing students in authentic literacy in every classroom, every day. The vision of quality instruction at LMS includes knowing our standards, teaching them to the depth they will be assessed, and focusing on the critical reading process by immersing students in authentic literacy using WICOR instructional strategies, then we will see an increase in all content areas. Students will document their thinking and learning through the Focused Note Taking Process and utilizing the WICOR strategies in the classroom to improve upon their mastery of the standard.

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

#### Measurable

Outcome: ELA Baseline Target Indicator: from 43% to 48%

Math Baseline Target Indicator: from 41% to 46% Science Baseline Target Indicator: from 41% to 46% Civics Baseline Target Indicator: from 59% to 64%

#### **Monitoring:**

This will be monitored through reviewing lesson plans, student work, classroom

walkthroughs, common assessments, and quarterly district assessments.

Person responsible

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

monitoring outcome:

Evidencebased

The AVID system of work provides professional development in WICOR (Writing, Inquiry,

Collaboration, Organization, and Reading) instructional strategies.

Strategy: Rationale

for Evidence-based

Proficiency in all content areas is below state averages, indicating a need for research-based instructional strategies. WICOR instructional strategies include the Focused Note

Taking Process, which will lead to students

Strategy: documenting their thinking and learning throughout the critical reading process.

#### **Action Steps to Implement**

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

#### Person Responsible

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

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

#### Person Responsible

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

Teachers will be provided professional development on properly implementing the critical reading process and evaluating student success throughout the process. Staff will create lesson plans that incorporate authentic literacy through the critical reading process and then evaluate student learning through common assessments and student work.

Person Responsible

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

Last Modified: 3/13/2024 https://www.floridacims.org Page 21 of 25

#### #2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

Area of Focus
Description and
Rationale:

Provide appropriate services and reading interventions based on student learning needs. Our Students with Disabilities populations (SWD) are below the federal index of 41%.

Measurable Outcome: If we provide our SWD population with appropriate services and appropriate reading interventions based on student learning needs, we will raise our proficiency to above the 41% ESSA thresh hold.

Monitoring:

The area of focus will be closely monitored through classroom walk-throughs, lesson plans, student work, and intervention-based progress monitoring/assessments.

Person responsible for

responsible for monitoring outcome:

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

Evidence-based Strategy:

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

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Research shows that SWD are best served when their services are aligned to their specific needs. By working with our ESE Specialist to determine appropriate levels of service, and working with our Assistant Principal for

Curriculum to appropriately schedule students, we will be able to raise proficiency for

this sub-group.

#### **Action Steps to Implement**

Re-examining Individualized Education Plans (IEPs) and make sure that they are being implemented to students.

Person Responsible

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

Re-evaluating reading intervention services to SWD and that they are receiving the appropriate remediation.

Person Responsible

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

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

Area of Focus

Increase parent engagement to improve academics, discipline, and social skills for

students.

**Description** 

Attendance issues increased from the previous school year from 13% to 30% of our

students were at <90%

and

attendance last year. Discipline decreased in the number of students receiving 2 or more Rationale:

Office Discipline Referrals from 81% to 86%.

Measurable Outcome:

If we increase parent engagement to improve academics, discipline, and social skills for students then students with <90% will decrease from 30% to 20% and students receiving 2

or more ODRs will decrease from 14% to 10%.

The data will be monitored through weekly attendance and discipline reports through the Monitoring: Skyward Report System.

Person responsible

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

monitoring outcome:

Attendance awareness campaign, recognition competitions, "Nudge" postcard reminders,

Evidencebased Strategy:

school site absence notification letters, small group attendance booster sessions, and Parent and Family Engagement Plan (PFEP) events. Getting families engaged in student learning both at school and virtually is a step toward understanding the importance of

student attendance.

PBIS program will be implemented school-wide to assist in correcting student behavior.

Rationale

for Evidence-

The above strategies have been shown to improve attendance rates and decrease

based Strategy:

discipline occurrences.

#### **Action Steps to Implement**

Facilitate school-wide attendance initiatives with class competitions to increase student attendance school-wide.

Person Responsible

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

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

Person Responsible

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

Monitor attendance weekly to determine students who are missing school regularly and work with the Guidance Department and the family to remediate the cause of the truancy. Monitor discipline occurrences weekly to identify areas and students of need and implement positive supports to correct the behavior.

Person Responsible

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

#### Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the <u>SafeSchoolsforAlex.org</u>, compare the discipline data of the school to discipline data across the state and provide primary or secondary areas of concern that the school will monitor during the upcoming school year. Include how the school culture and environment will be monitored through the lens of behavior or discipline data.

We are in continuous communication with our staff, teachers, students, families, community members, and members of the School Advisory Council (SAC) throughout the school year. We know that our stakeholders play a key role not only in our school's performance but also in effectively addressing any behavior concerns that arise on campus. With the support of all stakeholders, we are able to continue our PBIS program and SEL program by supporting all of our student's individual needs. We have community members who mentor our students and multiple organizations who provide therapy for our students' mental health. The school leadership team recognizes those students who continue to make positive choices with monthly rewards to celebrate their success in creating a safe environment for all students to learn. The entire faculty at the school communicate with the parents the BIG 3-Do What's Right, Do Your Best, and Treat Others the Way You Want to be Treated, in order to continue the emotional and behavioral learning from school at home.

#### 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.

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

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

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

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

# Identify the stakeholders and their role in promoting a positive culture and environment at the school.

Teachers, staff, and administration at the school level communicate to the students, the families, and the community about what is happening at the school.

District staff support the school and communicate to the community.

Students and family members communicate with the school about any needs or concerns to the school.

Community Members donate time to make sure that the needs of the students and staff are met.

## Part V: Budget

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

| 1 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Student Engagement                         | \$0.00 |
|---|--------|--|--------|
| 2 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities                          | \$0.00 |
| 3 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports | \$0.00 |
|   | •      | Total:   | \$0.00 |