

Lake County Schools

Gray 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	11
Planning for Improvement	19
Positive Culture & Environment	22
Budget to Support Goals	23

Gray Middle School

205 E MAGNOLIA ST, Groveland, FL 34736

<https://gms.lake.k12.fl.us/>

Demographics

Principal: Melissa Frana

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2021

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
2020-21 Title I School	No
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	98%
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* Native American Students Asian Students Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: B (58%) 2017-18: B (58%) 2016-17: B (58%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
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 Lake 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	11
Planning for Improvement	19
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	23

Gray Middle School

205 E MAGNOLIA ST, Groveland, FL 34736

<https://gms.lake.k12.fl.us/>

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2020-21 Title I School	2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Middle School 6-8	No	80%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	62%

School Grades History

Year	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18
Grade		B	B	B

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Lake 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.

Gray Middle School's mission is to provide a safe, supportive learning environment with opportunities for all students to develop the skills and knowledge to become a responsible citizen in a global society.

La misión es proporcionar un ambiente de aprendizaje seguro y de apoyo con oportunidades para todos los estudiantes a desarrollar las habilidades y conocimientos para ser un ciudadano responsable en una sociedad global.

La mission est de fournir un environnement sûr et d'un grand soutien à l'apprentissage avec des opportunités pour tous les élèves à développer les compétences et les connaissances nécessaires pour devenir un citoyen responsable dans une société mondialisée.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Gators are...

Gifted

Always in Attendance

Task Oriented

Over Achievers

Respectful

Striving to move Gray from Good to Great!

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 Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Frana, Melissa	Principal	Oversee all aspects of hiring, budget, teacher retention, scheduling, instructional focus, PLC facilitator, interventionist.
Smallridge, Greg	Assistant Principal	Assist in hiring, new employee orientation, teacher retention, instructional focus and PLC facilitator.
Miller, Matthew	Instructional Coach	Literacy Coach
Hacker, Megan	Teacher, K-12	Instruction
Messer, Jessica	Teacher, K-12	Instruction
Vergara, Erika	Teacher, K-12	Instruction and behavior modification
Wentzell, Jennifer	School Counselor	Student scheduling, MTSS, Crisis management
Skelton, William	Assistant Principal	Assist in hiring, campus safety, teacher retention, instructional focus and PLC facilitator.
VanDemark, Daniel	Instructional Technology	Tech con and science team leader
Strickland, Joella	Instructional Media	Media specialist, tech con, testing coordinator
Deutsch, Shelley	Teacher, K-12	Math teacher; grade level chair
Brosious, Adrianna	Teacher, ESE	Support ESE students across the content area
Sorrells, Michelle	Assistant Principal	
Gilbert, Phyllis	Teacher, K-12	
Grady, Amy	Teacher, K-12	
Roca, Yamilisa	School Counselor	
Thompson, Thayis	Teacher, K-12	
Curry, Denise	Staffing Specialist	

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Thursday 7/1/2021, Melissa Frana

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.*

3

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

46

Total number of students enrolled at the school

1,206

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

9

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

10

Demographic Data**Early Warning Systems****2021-22**

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	387	385	422	0	0	0	0	1194	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	100	105	0	0	0	0	205	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	112	153	187	0	0	0	0	452	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	129	137	195	0	0	0	0	461	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	130	137	165	0	0	0	0	432	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	30	39	53	0	0	0	0	122	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	56	47	69	0	0	0	0	172	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	83	80	103	0	0	0	0	266	

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

Indicator	Grade Level														Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12		
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	130	137	195	0	0	0	0	462	

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	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	4	0	0	0	0	8	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 8/12/2021

2020-21 - 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	256	255	233	0	0	0	0	744	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	36	58	0	0	0	0	94	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	42	36	0	0	0	0	78	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	11	0	0	0	0	27	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	11	0	0	0	0	27	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	28	40	53	0	0	0	0	121	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	35	48	53	0	0	0	0	136	

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

Indicator	Grade Level														Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12		
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	217	222	0	0	0	0	439	

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	3	0	1	0	0	0	0	4	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	9	0	0	0	0	13	

2020-21 - 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	256	255	233	0	0	0	0	744	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	36	58	0	0	0	0	94	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	42	36	0	0	0	0	78	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	11	0	0	0	0	27	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	11	0	0	0	0	27	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	28	40	53	0	0	0	0	121	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	35	48	53	0	0	0	0	136	

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

Indicator	Grade Level														Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12		
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	217	222	0	0	0	0	439	

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	3	0	1	0	0	0	0	4	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	9	0	0	0	0	13	

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	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement				51%	50%	54%	54%	49%	53%
ELA Learning Gains				54%	52%	54%	56%	50%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				48%	44%	47%	53%	45%	47%
Math Achievement				62%	56%	58%	59%	55%	58%
Math Learning Gains				58%	55%	57%	56%	56%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				50%	46%	51%	49%	47%	51%
Science Achievement				61%	49%	51%	59%	51%	52%
Social Studies Achievement				72%	70%	72%	81%	72%	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-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2021					
	2019	46%	52%	-6%	54%	-8%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2021					
	2019	44%	49%	-5%	52%	-8%
Cohort Comparison		-46%				
08	2021					
	2019	61%	54%	7%	56%	5%
Cohort Comparison		-44%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2021					
	2019	49%	53%	-4%	55%	-6%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2021					
	2019	61%	58%	3%	54%	7%
Cohort Comparison		-49%				
08	2021					
	2019	59%	39%	20%	46%	13%
Cohort Comparison		-61%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2021					
	2019	61%	49%	12%	48%	13%
Cohort Comparison						

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019					
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	71%	71%	0%	71%	0%

HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019					
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	94%	52%	42%	61%	33%
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	0%	49%	-49%	57%	-57%

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

Lake Standards Assessments

Grade 6				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	218		22
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	34		1
	English Language Learners	17		7
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	219		23
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	35		5
	English Language Learners	16		4

Grade 7				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	214		88
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	23		14
	English Language Learners	15		4
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	219	140	37
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	22	13	2
	English Language Learners	17	11	1
Civics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	204	14	273
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	21	5	29
	English Language Learners	12	1	19

Grade 8				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	0	0	0
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	0	0	3
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			0
Science	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	0	0	0
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			

Subgroup Data Review

2021 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 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
SWD	22	36	24	29	39	27	29	36	35		
ELL	30	40	36	26	30	36	8	44			
ASN	61	52		68	30						
BLK	47	50	36	37	36	24	27	71	36		
HSP	41	41	33	41	36	31	40	54	61		
MUL	45	45		39	27		40	82			
WHT	49	46	37	53	38	31	54	62	55		
FRL	39	42	32	38	37	28	38	55	52		
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	22	43	41	30	46	42	23	39	30		
ELL	18	41	44	31	53	50	35	34	50		

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
ASN	57	57		61	62						
BLK	46	49	48	45	44	48	53	59	50		
HSP	47	52	49	54	56	53	48	61	54		
MUL	65	64		62	58		75	85	92		
WHT	55	54	48	73	62	46	73	83	65		
FRL	42	49	47	51	55	52	48	62	54		
2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	15	39	39	27	47	45	17	48			
ELL	13	43	44	20	47	54	8	56			
ASN	55	76		68	67						
BLK	49	57	54	47	56	50	57	74	40		
HSP	42	50	48	49	50	41	44	77	49		
MUL	77	72		61	59			100			
WHT	63	59	57	71	60	65	72	84	60		
FRL	47	52	51	52	52	43	53	77	40		

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	46
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	4
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	59
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	456
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	97%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	31
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	

English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	34
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?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	53
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	40
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	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	44
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	46
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	47
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	40
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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?

ESE students perform well below their peers on standardized testing. Our SWD's performed at 35% proficiency which is below the ESSA standard of 41%. Due to school closures in 2019 and the continuation of the COVID pandemic our student scores showed significant declines in performance across all content areas.

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

Based off progress monitoring and state assessments, our areas identifying the largest decrease in performance is 8th grade ELA and 8th grade Math including Algebra I.

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

Contributing factors include lack of adequate yearly progress due to the effects of the covid pandemic as well as attendance issues and the impact of non-traditional teaching. Our new actions include beginning in preplanning, we focused our professional development and faculty meetings for the year to focus on the lesson study cycle as it pertains to response to student data on common assessments and structured, prescriptive use of intervention time.

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

6th and 7th grade ELA performance is the only area that did not decrease in overall percentages.

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

6th and 7th grade ELA did not drop in performance which during a global pandemic is a win. This is likely attributed to a collaborative common planning and the cohesiveness of the group which affected the sustainability of performance.

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

The following strategies will be implemented in order to accelerate learning: Tutoring opportunities throughout the school year. Expectation of collaborative teams. Use of flextime for highly prescriptive remediation focus based on the student needs not the content experts recommendations. Grade recovery offered quarterly for failures. Increase in technology use across the content areas.

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.

These are strategies that we will use to accelerate learning: Professional development sessions to include utilization of flextime for remediation, reassessment opportunities, collective commitments for student achievement. Other areas may include the use of Google classroom, kinesthetic learning techniques, collaborative planning tools and lesson study cycles.

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

Some additional services that will be implement include the continued use and improvement of the collaborative planning process. Administration will be tasked with monitoring fidelity in the transfer of common planning to instructional practice in the classroom resulting in improved student achievement. Specific focus on the lesson study cycle, reactive teaching from analysis of common assessments, giving students the opportunity reassess and relearn. This will also be coupled with the use of the district instructional framework to drive instruction.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Based on a double digit decrease in 8th grade ELA and Math/Algebra as well as a decrease in all other content areas, our area of focus is on instructional practice specifically related to common planning and how the lesson study cycle aligns to standards aligned instruction. This impacts student learning due to the positive effect size (1.57) that is directly related to teacher efficacy. The rationale behind our area of focus is that students are not aware of the purpose for learning and how it relates to the four PLC questions. What do we want the student to learn? How will we know they have learned it? What we will do when we know a student has not learned the material?
Measurable Outcome:	54% of students will be proficient in ELA. (+8%) 56% of students will be proficient in Math (+10%)/Algebra 92% (+19%) Increase in learning gains of lowest quartile students in ELA and Math by 10%
Monitoring:	Administrators will be active participants in the Collaborative Planning Time on Tuesdays. Teachers will focus on the three questions of the PLC Collaborative Planning model. Teachers will submit a planning document outlining the product of their work together. This tool will build collective teacher efficacy by breaking down data to determine specific student needs in the classroom. Utilization of Flextime Manager to specifically identify students in need of remediation additional assistance in core classes.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Melissa Frana (franam@lake.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Collective teacher efficacy is built by responding to data from quarterly LSA's focused specifically on Lowest Quartile. Identified students will receive remediation 2x/week minimum through flextime
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	The rationale behind building teacher efficacy is due to its high effect strategy in improving student performance. Student needs will be addressed during remediation and acceleration time (R&A). The purpose of this time will be to individually meet student needs. Students will be given choice on where they will attend flextime. Teachers will have the ability to override student selections based on student data gleaned during Collaborative Planning time. Additionally, the use of frequent formative assessments and reaction to those assessments will drive remediation and enrichment time.

Action Steps to Implement

Administrative participation in collaborative planning specifically inspecting the teacher products that are generated during collaborative planning. Teacher led discussions based on individual student performance. This actionable data will be utilized during common planning time to assign students to flextime to re-teach standards or give the students the opportunities to re-assess their knowledge proving mastery of content. Students who have not demonstrated mastery by the end of the quarter will be invited to grade recovery sessions at the end of each quarter as well as the end of the school year. Other needs that may arise include the use of technology and tutoring programs or other supplies to assist all students but especially the lowest quartile.

Person Responsible Melissa Frana (franam@lake.k12.fl.us)

#2. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Early Warning Systems

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	After a school closure in March 2020 and a disrupted school year in 2020-2021 due to the COVID pandemic, high expectations manifested itself in barriers to student achievement. Those barriers became a rationale that resulted in a decrease in student achievement across the content areas.
Measurable Outcome:	Collective efficacy is the key to returning to high expectations. Structured collaborative planning time will be required this school year. Student performance on common assessments and Lake Standards Assessments will be how we measure the outcome.
Monitoring:	Administration will be integral partners in the collaborative planning process. Teachers will be required to submit documentation of their lesson study cycle and how they plan to meet the needs of lowest quartile students and students with multiple EWS.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Melissa Frana (franam@lake.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Utilizing flextime as it is directly relates to statistically significant intervention. Reacting to student data and providing a prescriptive plan for remediation will improve student achievement outcomes.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	In building collective teacher efficacy, our students will have learning gaps closed at a faster rate to improve academic achievement.

Action Steps to Implement

Professional development activities that focus on building relationships in the building and improving overall teacher efficacy

Person Responsible Melissa Frana (franam@lake.k12.fl.us)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Differentiation

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Based on ESSA data our SWD performed below the threshold of 41% coming in at 35%
Measurable Outcome:	Reducing the number of D's and F's for all students but with specific focus on SWD.
Monitoring:	Teachers will be required to meet with administration at the 4.5 week mark to identify and discuss interventions needed to prove mastery of content
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Melissa Frana (franam@lake.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Use of formative assessments and re-teaching/re-assessments for students to show mastery of content
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	SWD performed significantly lower than their non-disabled peers. Structured interventions are needed for SWD's to have opportunities to re-learn or re-assess.

Action Steps to Implement

Administration will meet with teachers at the 4.5 mark to identify students underperforming so adjustments can be made before the end of the term. Tutoring opportunities and grade recovery will support students to decrease course failures and retentions

Person Responsible Melissa Frana (franam@lake.k12.fl.us)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the [SafeSchoolsforAlex.org](https://www.safeschoolsforalex.org), 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.

2.3/100 falls into low category. #188/553 Primary area-reduce ISS and OSS Secondary-Reducing incidents of defiance. Use Restorative practices, PBIS, student mentoring programs, sga, gator bucks

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.

Beginning this year, we will be implementing a student of the month program. Partnering with Chick-Fil-A, we will honor 4 students per grade level who will enjoy lunch with the principal, a certificate, and their name on the marquee. We will also continue to utilize the "Gator Bucks" PBIS program. Students who earn "Gator Bucks" will be allowed to shop in the school spirit store, purchase concessions, and utilize a "Gator Buck Technology" pass which allows them to use their electronic devices at lunch.

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

Whole school-Identifying and recognizing students of the month, Gator Bucks.

Grade level team-competitions and Gator Buck incentives

Leadership team-PBIS

PTO-Gator spirit store

PBIS team-Santuchi, Sorrells, Lee, Milchman, Guterias, Messer, Lawrence-Robinson meeting on the third Tuesday of every month.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Standards-aligned Instruction	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Early Warning Systems	\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Differentiation	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00