

The School Board of Highlands County

Avon Park 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 | 10 |
| Planning for Improvement | 18 |
| Positive Culture & Environment | 25 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 25 |

Avon Park Middle School

401 S LAKE AVE, Avon Park, FL 33825

<http://www.highlands.k12.fl.us/~apm/>

Demographics

Principal: Kimberly Riley

Start Date for this Principal: 7/21/2020

| | |
|--|--|
| 2019-20 Status (per MSID File) | Active |
| School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File) | Middle School 6-8 |
| Primary Service Type (per MSID File) | K-12 General Education |
| 2020-21 Title I School | Yes |
| 2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3) | 100% |
| 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* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students* |
| School Grades History | 2018-19: C (43%) 2017-18: C (44%) 2016-17: D (39%) |
| 2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information* | |
| SI Region | Southwest |
| Regional Executive Director | |
| 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 Highlands 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 | 10 |
| Planning for Improvement | 18 |
| Title I Requirements | 0 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 25 |

Avon Park Middle School

401 S LAKE AVE, Avon Park, FL 33825

<http://www.highlands.k12.fl.us/~apm/>

School Demographics

| | | |
|--|---|---|
| <p>School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Middle School 6-8</p> | <p>2020-21 Title I School</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Yes</p> | <p>2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">100%</p> |
| <p>Primary Service Type (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">K-12 General Education</p> | <p>Charter School</p> <p style="text-align: center;">No</p> | <p>2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">73%</p> |

School Grades History

| | | | | |
|--------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|
| Year | 2020-21 | 2019-20 | 2018-19 | 2017-18 |
| Grade | | C | C | C |

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Highlands 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.

Motto:

Reaching Excellence Daily- Go RED!

Mission:

Through a shared vision, humility, communication, transparency and core values, Avon Park Middle school will prepare students to be college and career ready by involving ALL students in a rigorous curriculum, attainable goals, and positive relationship building.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Vision:

The learning community of Avon Park Middle School will achieve academic excellence by elevating our own professional learning to support increased student achievement.

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 |
|------------|---------------------|--|
| Riley, Kim | Principal | Principal responsibilities include creating a culture for learning that is safe for all students, staff, and parents. Monitoring the implementation of the standards across the content areas. PLC's will be monitored and feedback provided. Principals will be monitoring instruction using walk-throughs and providing feedback to teachers. |
| | Assistant Principal | Assistant Principal responsibilities include creating a culture for learning that is safe for all students, staff, and parents. Monitoring the implementation of the standards across the content areas. PLC's will be monitored and feedback provided. Assistant Principal will be monitoring instruction using walk-throughs and providing feedback to teachers. |

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Tuesday 7/21/2020, Kimberly Riley

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.*

0

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.*

12

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

44

Total number of students enrolled at the school

653

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

7

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

3

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 | 207 | 227 | 216 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 650 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 92 | 97 | 98 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 287 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 23 | 27 | 23 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 73 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 141 | 109 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 258 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 74 | 90 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 172 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 37 | 36 | 55 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 128 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 41 | 35 | 51 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 127 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 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 |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|---|----|----|----|-------|
| | 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 | 79 | 82 | 92 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 253 |

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 | 5 | 17 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 31 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 10 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14 |

Date this data was collected or last updated

Saturday 8/21/2021

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 | 266 | 203 | 172 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 641 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 92 | 66 | 52 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 210 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 110 | 58 | 53 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 221 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 175 | 101 | 70 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 346 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 129 | 71 | 66 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 266 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 73 | 61 | 68 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 202 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 76 | 80 | 57 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 213 |

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 | 156 | 110 | 79 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 345 |

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 | 2 | 4 | 24 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 30 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14 | 5 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 28 |

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 | 266 | 203 | 172 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 641 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 92 | 66 | 52 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 210 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 110 | 58 | 53 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 221 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 175 | 101 | 70 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 346 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 129 | 71 | 66 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 266 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 73 | 61 | 68 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 202 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 76 | 80 | 57 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 213 |

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 | 156 | 110 | 79 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 345 |

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 | 2 | 4 | 24 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 30 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14 | 5 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 28 |

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 | | | | 37% | 45% | 54% | 38% | 47% | 53% |
| ELA Learning Gains | | | | 41% | 47% | 54% | 46% | 50% | 54% |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | 33% | 36% | 47% | 43% | 44% | 47% |
| Math Achievement | | | | 42% | 52% | 58% | 37% | 52% | 58% |
| Math Learning Gains | | | | 47% | 52% | 57% | 43% | 53% | 57% |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | 36% | 40% | 51% | 35% | 43% | 51% |
| Science Achievement | | | | 36% | 42% | 51% | 36% | 45% | 52% |
| Social Studies Achievement | | | | 66% | 63% | 72% | 41% | 56% | 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 | 36% | 44% | -8% | 54% | -18% |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 07 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 35% | 40% | -5% | 52% | -17% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -36% | | | | |
| 08 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 36% | 46% | -10% | 56% | -20% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -35% | | | | |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 06 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 31% | 44% | -13% | 55% | -24% |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 07 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 42% | 49% | -7% | 54% | -12% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -31% | | | | |
| 08 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 38% | 44% | -6% | 46% | -8% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -42% | | | | |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 08 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 34% | 41% | -7% | 48% | -14% |
| 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 | 64% | 60% | 4% | 71% | -7% |

| 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 | 100% | 52% | 48% | 61% | 39% |
| GEOMETRY EOC | | | | | |
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2021 | | | | | |
| 2019 | 0% | 55% | -55% | 57% | -57% |

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

ELA & Math i-Ready used for all grade levels
 Science & Civics district baseline is used for all grade levels

| Grade 6 | | | | |
|-----------------------|----------------------------|--------|--------|--------|
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| English Language Arts | All Students | 68/33% | 68/33% | 60/29% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 37/25% | 34/23% | 31/21% |
| | Students With Disabilities | 6/13% | 6/13% | 5/11% |
| | English Language Learners | 0/0% | 0/0% | 0/0% |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Mathematics | All Students | 64/31% | 58/28% | 60/29% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 37/25% | 31/21% | 32/22% |
| | Students With Disabilities | 5/11% | 3/7% | 4/9% |
| | English Language Learners | 0/0% | 0/0% | 0/0% |

| Grade 7 | | | | |
|-----------------------|----------------------------|--------|--------|---------|
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| English Language Arts | All Students | 29/13% | 45/21% | 43/20% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 16/9% | 28/17% | 27/16% |
| | Students With Disabilities | 3/7% | 4/9% | 2/4% |
| | English Language Learners | 0/0% | 0/0% | 0/0% |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Mathematics | All Students | 51/24% | 42/19% | 45/21% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 32/19% | 27/16% | 32/19% |
| | Students With Disabilities | 4/9% | 4/9% | 5/11% |
| | English Language Learners | 0/0% | 0/0% | 0/0% |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Civics | All Students | | | 108/49% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | | | 65/41% |
| | Students With Disabilities | | | 23/53% |
| | English Language Learners | | | 16/42% |

| Grade 8 | | | | | |
|-----------------------|----------------------------|----------------------|----------------------|--------|---------|
| | | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| English Language Arts | All Students | | 45/22% | 47/23% | 51/25% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | | 24/15% | 24/15% | 30/19% |
| | Students With Disabilities | | 4/10% | 6/15% | 6/15% |
| | English Language Learners | | 0/0% | 0/0% | 0/0% |
| | | | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter |
| Mathematics | All Students | | 38/19% | 44/22% | 37/18% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | | 24/15% | 28/18% | 25/16% |
| | Students With Disabilities | | 5/13% | 4/10% | 5/13% |
| | English Language Learners | | 0/0% | 0/0% | 0/0% |
| | | | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter |
| Science | All Students | | 31/15% | 59/29% | 107/52% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | | 17/11% | 39/25% | 74/47% |
| | Students With Disabilities | | 5/13% | 7/18% | 8/20% |
| | English Language Learners | | 0/0% | 1/8% | 3/23% |
| | | | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter |

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 | 23 | 24 | 18 | 27 | 32 | 31 | 26 | 38 | | | |
| ELL | 17 | 21 | 28 | 23 | 33 | 44 | 10 | 38 | | | |
| BLK | 23 | 30 | 25 | 25 | 30 | 33 | 25 | 37 | 40 | | |
| HSP | 32 | 32 | 25 | 34 | 38 | 43 | 26 | 45 | 44 | | |
| MUL | 22 | 31 | | 33 | 38 | | | | | | |
| WHT | 49 | 47 | 37 | 54 | 45 | 48 | 59 | 69 | 69 | | |
| FRL | 27 | 30 | 26 | 31 | 36 | 39 | 27 | 43 | 40 | | |
| 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 | 24 | 35 | 26 | 27 | 48 | 45 | 18 | 60 | | | |
| ELL | 17 | 26 | 28 | 17 | 46 | 35 | | | | | |
| BLK | 22 | 29 | 25 | 24 | 43 | 40 | 20 | 64 | 15 | | |

| 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 |
| HSP | 33 | 38 | 36 | 38 | 45 | 30 | 33 | 58 | 54 | | |
| MUL | 54 | 67 | | 46 | 50 | | | | | | |
| WHT | 51 | 52 | 46 | 60 | 53 | 44 | 51 | 81 | 55 | | |
| FRL | 32 | 37 | 33 | 36 | 45 | 35 | 27 | 63 | 37 | | |
| 2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Subgroups | ELA Ach. | ELA LG | ELA LG L25% | Math Ach. | Math LG | Math LG L25% | Sci Ach. | SS Ach. | MS Accel. | Grad Rate 2016-17 | C & C Accel 2016-17 |
| SWD | 17 | 39 | 28 | 18 | 38 | 30 | 20 | 18 | | | |
| ELL | 11 | 49 | 56 | 14 | 35 | 30 | 9 | 18 | | | |
| BLK | 25 | 44 | 41 | 25 | 37 | 30 | 24 | 30 | 80 | | |
| HSP | 34 | 45 | 43 | 30 | 39 | 35 | 32 | 36 | 73 | | |
| MUL | 48 | 41 | | 36 | 48 | | | | | | |
| WHT | 55 | 51 | 42 | 58 | 56 | 46 | 55 | 54 | 81 | | |
| FRL | 35 | 46 | 42 | 34 | 42 | 36 | 34 | 37 | 75 | | |

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 | 38 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students | YES |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 6 |
| Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency | 22 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 378 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 10 |
| Percent Tested | 94% |
| Subgroup Data | |
| Students With Disabilities | |
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities | 27 |
| Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | YES |
| Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32% | |
| English Language Learners | |
| Federal Index - English Language Learners | 26 |
| English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | YES |

| English Language Learners | |
|--|-----|
| 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 | |
| Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32% | |
| Black/African American Students | |
| Federal Index - Black/African American Students | 30 |
| Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | YES |
| Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32% | |
| Hispanic Students | |
| Federal Index - Hispanic Students | 34 |
| Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | YES |
| Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32% | |
| Multiracial Students | |
| Federal Index - Multiracial Students | 31 |
| Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | YES |
| Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32% | |
| 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 | 53 |
| 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 | 32 |
| 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?

6th Grade is the most proficient grade level in all areas. Proficiency for math students decreased in all grade levels from the fall to spring assessment, indicating that students are not receiving adequate Tier 1 instruction. ELL subgroup is consistently the lowest level of proficiency, with little or no growth throughout the year.

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

Achievement for all students in ELA, Math, Science, and Civics. The most urgent area of need is ELL students, followed by Students with Disabilities, and Economically Disadvantaged students.

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 are teacher retention, expertise, and efficacy. Effective Tier 1 lessons must be implemented for all students, as well as a strong MTSS system to quickly identify students not progressing, and the resources to provide specific targeted interventions.

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

6th grade math showed the most improvement on state assessment data. 7th grade ELA showed the most improvement based on progress monitoring.

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

Contributing factors for 6th grade math and 7th grade ELA is fully certified and experienced teachers in each classroom.

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

PLC to plan for remediation and enrichment, effective Tier 1 Instruction, targeted and specific Tier 2 and 3 interventions. Instructional planning uses Models of Effective Instruction, Instructional Practice Guide Coaching Cycles.

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.

Professional development in PLC, Models of Effective Instruction, Critical Reading Process/Content Area Reading (CARPD), AVID and WICOR. Coaching Cycles, Learning Walks.

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

Training teachers to be content area leaders, PLC leads, and obtain additional certifications or endorsements as needed.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: On the end of year i-Ready Diagnostic, 55% of students are two or more grade levels below. 44% of students met one year of growth.

Measurable Outcome: 55% of students will make one year of growth on the i-Ready Diagnostic.

Monitoring: Student progress towards annual growth will be monitored 3 times a year using the i-Ready Diagnostic. Common Formative Assessments will be used monthly to monitor for an increase in the percentage of proficient students.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: [no one identified]

Evidence-based Strategy: The ELA Model of Effective instruction will be used by coaches and teachers.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: The Model of Effective Instruction is a research-based (Schmoker) approach to lesson design. A common framework will allow for professional development, collaboration, and coaching.

Action Steps to Implement

Train staff in Models of Effective Instruction and the evaluation tools for this model (Danielson & IPG) within the first 30 days of school.

Person Responsible [no one identified]

Administration & Coaches will complete a minimum of 5 combined IPG walkthroughs weekly. Administration will complete 5 Danielson observations weekly.

Person Responsible [no one identified]

The LCRT will complete prescriptive Coaching Cycles.

Person Responsible [no one identified]

All ELA teachers will participate in PLC a minimum of 50 minutes weekly.

Person Responsible [no one identified]

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: On the end of year i-Ready Diagnostic, 43% of students are two or more grade levels below. 42% of students met one year of growth.

Measurable Outcome: 53% of students will make one year of growth on the i-Ready Diagnostic.

Monitoring: Student progress towards annual growth will be monitored 3 times a year using the i-Ready Diagnostic. Common Formative Assessments will be used monthly to monitor for an increase in the percentage of proficient students.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Katlyn Vazquez (vazquezk@highlands.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy: The Math Model of Effective instruction will be used by coaches and teachers.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: The Model of Effective Instruction is a research-based (Schmoker) approach to lesson design. A common framework will allow for professional development, collaboration, and coaching.

Action Steps to Implement

Train staff in Models of Effective Instruction and the evaluation tools for this model (Danielson & IPG) within the first 30 days of school.

Person Responsible [no one identified]

Administration & Coaches will complete a minimum of 5 combined IPG walkthroughs weekly. Administration will complete 5 Danielson observations weekly.

Person Responsible Katlyn Vazquez (vazquezk@highlands.k12.fl.us)

The Math Coach will complete prescriptive Coaching Cycles.

Person Responsible Katlyn Vazquez (vazquezk@highlands.k12.fl.us)

All Math teachers will participate in PLC a minimum of 50 minutes weekly.

Person Responsible Katlyn Vazquez (vazquezk@highlands.k12.fl.us)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: 22% of 8th grade students scored 39% or below on the End of Year District Science Assessment (High Risk). 60% of students scored 54% or higher (On-Watch or Low Risk).

Measurable Outcome: 65% of students will score 54% or higher on the End of Year District Science Assessment.

Monitoring: Student progress towards annual growth will be monitored 3 times a year using the District Science Baseline. Common Formative Assessments will be used monthly to monitor for an increase in the percentage of On-Watch or Low Risk level.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: [no one identified]

Evidence-based Strategy: The Science Model of Effective Instruction (5E) will be used by teachers.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: The Model of Effective Instruction is a research-based (Schmoker) approach to lesson design. A common framework will allow for professional development, collaboration, and coaching.

Action Steps to Implement

Train staff in Models of Effective Instruction and the evaluation tools for this model (Danielson & IPG) within the first 30 days of school.

Person Responsible [no one identified]

Administration & Coaches will complete a minimum of 5 combined IPG walkthroughs weekly. Administration will complete 5 Danielson observations weekly.

Person Responsible [no one identified]

A member of the instructional leadership team will complete prescriptive Coaching Cycles.

Person Responsible [no one identified]

All science teachers will participate in PLC a minimum of 50 minutes weekly.

Person Responsible [no one identified]

#4. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Student Attendance

| | |
|---|--|
| Area of Focus Description and Rationale: | 54% of students are present 90% or more. |
| Measurable Outcome: | 60% of students will be present 90% or more. |
| Monitoring: | Monthly SARC Meetings |
| Person responsible for monitoring outcome: | Sharon Elder (elders@highlands.k12.fl.us) |
| Evidence-based Strategy: | PBIS Incentives for attendance |
| Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: | Reward students for positive behavior. Set goals with incentives for students needing improvement. |

Action Steps to Implement

Establish PBIS Committee to oversee the attendance incentives.

Person Responsible Sharon Elder (elders@highlands.k12.fl.us)

Twice a month SARC Meetings to review students at risk, follow up on interventions, and complete SARC steps.

Person Responsible Sharon Elder (elders@highlands.k12.fl.us)

#5. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Professional Learning

| | |
|---|--|
| Area of Focus Description and Rationale: | 48% of the staff are new to the school or have less than 3 years of teaching experience. |
| Measurable Outcome: | 85% of staff will meet their Professional Learning Goals in TNL. |
| Monitoring: | Danielson evaluations will include specific feedback and focus on the teachers' PLG. |
| Person responsible for monitoring outcome: | [no one identified] |
| Evidence-based Strategy: | Charlotte Danielson teacher evaluation system. |
| Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: | Specific feedback in the areas of teacher effectiveness. |

Action Steps to Implement

Train staff in Danielson evaluation tools within the first 30 days of school.

Person Responsible [no one identified]

Administration will complete 5 Danielson observations weekly.

Person Responsible [no one identified]

Administration will provide feedback to teachers through informals and post observation conferences, and formal evaluations.

Person Responsible [no one identified]

#6. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Black/African-American

| | |
|---|--|
| Area of Focus Description and Rationale: | Black/African American students are achieving at 31% |
| Measurable Outcome: | Black/African American students will increase achievement by 2% or more. |
| Monitoring: | |
| Person responsible for monitoring outcome: | [no one identified] |
| Evidence-based Strategy: | |
| Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: | |

Action Steps to Implement

Administration & Coaches will complete a minimum of 5 combined IPG walkthroughs weekly. Administration will complete 5 Danielson observations weekly.

Person Responsible [no one identified]

Administration & Coaches will complete a minimum of 5 combined IPG walkthroughs weekly. Administration will complete 5 Danielson observations weekly.

Person Responsible [no one identified]

The coaches will complete prescriptive Coaching Cycles.

Person Responsible [no one identified]

All Core teachers will participate in PLC a minimum of 50 minutes weekly.

Person Responsible [no one identified]

#7. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to English Language Learners

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Measurable Outcome:

Monitoring:

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: [no one identified]

Evidence-based Strategy:

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Action Steps to Implement

Train staff in Models of Effective Instruction and the evaluation tools for this model (Danielson & IPG) within the first 30 days of school.

Person Responsible [no one identified]

Administration & Coaches will complete a minimum of 5 combined IPG walkthroughs weekly. Administration will complete 5 Danielson observations weekly.

Person Responsible [no one identified]

The coaches will complete prescriptive Coaching Cycles.

Person Responsible Jenn Sanchez (sanchezj@highlands.k12.fl.us)

All Core teachers will participate in PLC a minimum of 50 minutes weekly.

Person Responsible [no one identified]

#8. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

Area of Focus

Description and Rationale: Students with Disabilities are achieving at 35%

Measurable Outcome: Students with Disabilities will increase achievement by 2% or more.

Monitoring: Student progress towards annual growth will be monitored 3 times a year using the i-Ready Diagnostic. Common Formative Assessments will be used monthly to monitor for an increase in the percentage of proficient students.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: [no one identified]

Evidence-based Strategy: The Model of Effective instruction will be used by coaches and teachers.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: The Model of Effective Instruction is a research-based (Schmoker) approach to lesson design. A common framework will allow for professional development, collaboration, and coaching.

Action Steps to Implement

Train staff in Models of Effective Instruction and the evaluation tools for this model (Danielson & IPG) within the first 30 days of school.

Person Responsible [no one identified]

Administration & Coaches will complete a minimum of 5 combined IPG walkthroughs weekly. Administration will complete 5 Danielson observations weekly.

Person Responsible [no one identified]

The coaches will complete prescriptive Coaching Cycles.

Person Responsible [no one identified]

All Core teachers will participate in PLC a minimum of 50 minutes weekly.

Person Responsible [no one identified]

#9. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Hispanic

Area of Focus

Description and Rationale: Hispanic students are achieving at 39%

Measurable Outcome: Hispanic students will increase achievement by 2% or more.

Monitoring: Student progress towards annual growth will be monitored 3 times a year using the i-Ready Diagnostic. Common Formative Assessments will be used monthly to monitor for an increase in the percentage of proficient students.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: [no one identified]

Evidence-based Strategy: The Model of Effective instruction will be used by coaches and teachers.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: The Model of Effective Instruction is a research-based (Schmoker) approach to lesson design. A common framework will allow for professional development, collaboration, and coaching.

Action Steps to Implement

Train staff in Models of Effective Instruction and the evaluation tools for this model (Danielson & IPG) within the first 30 days of school.

Person Responsible [no one identified]

Administration & Coaches will complete a minimum of 5 combined IPG walkthroughs weekly. Administration will complete 5 Danielson observations weekly.

Person Responsible [no one identified]

The coaches will complete prescriptive Coaching Cycles.

Person Responsible [no one identified]

All Core teachers will participate in PLC a minimum of 50 minutes weekly.

Person Responsible [no one identified]

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the [SafeSchoolsforAlex.org](https://www.safe-schools-for-alex.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.

Currently, Avon Park Middle is below the state average for incidents at 3.8% compared to 4.2% state average in 2019-20. There is a high number of Public Order/Drug incidents compared to the state's data on the School Safety Dashboard for the 2019-20 school year.

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.

Avon Park Middle will increase parent involvement with back to school orientation, SAC, parent conference nights, as well as individual parent conferences as needed, AVID family nights, and any other parent involvement event from various departments or clubs. Community stakeholders are invited to join us for SAC meetings, College and Career Week, and AVID walk-throughs. Mentors will be invited to dinners and various events with all mentors and mentees.

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

Stakeholders include parents and guardians, whose role is to support the student in learning, advocate for student needs, actively participate in school activities. Community members role is to partner with the school to plan for improvement, provide opportunities for students, volunteer, and mentor. Student stakeholders are to follow all school rules and expectations, be active participants in their education, and fully engage in school events. The role of teachers and staff is to provide valuable, consistently effective instruction and classroom management, plan and implement school wide behavior and academic celebrations, create a safe classroom and school environment.

Part V: Budget

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

| | | | |
|---|--------|---|--------|
| 1 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA | \$0.00 |
| 2 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math | \$0.00 |
| 3 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Science | \$0.00 |
| 4 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Student Attendance | \$0.00 |
| 5 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Professional Learning | \$0.00 |
| 6 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Black/African-American | \$0.00 |
| 7 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: English Language Learners | \$0.00 |

| | | | |
|---------------|--------|---|---------------|
| 8 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities | \$0.00 |
| 9 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Hispanic | \$0.00 |
| Total: | | | \$0.00 |