Lake Placid Middle School

2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Lake Placid Middle School

201 S TANGERINE AVE, Lake Placid, FL 33852

http://www.highlands.k12.fl.us/~lpm/

Demographics

Principal: Hillary Hathaway

Start Date for this Principal: 11/13/2020

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 (42%) 2017-18: C (50%) 2016-17: C (48%)
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

Lake Placid Middle School

201 S TANGERINE AVE, Lake Placid, FL 33852

http://www.highlands.k12.fl.us/~lpm/

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	Yes	100%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	63%

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.

With support from community stakeholders, parents, teachers, peers, and individual determination, EVERY student will be ready for high school, in three years.

Provide the school's vision statement.

What starts here, changes the world!

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
Ward, Shane	Principal	

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Friday 11/13/2020, Hillary Hathaway

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.*

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.*

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
35

Total number of students enrolled at the school
659

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.
15

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

2021-22

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

Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
					Grade Level									
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	212	193	252	0	0	0	0	657
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	51	80	84	0	0	0	0	215
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	51	70	58	0	0	0	0	179
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	76	82	71	0	0	0	0	229
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	34	62	47	0	0	0	0	143
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	48	62	64	0	0	0	0	174
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	45	55	69	0	0	0	0	169
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	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	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
						Grade Level								
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	84	110	108	0	0	0	0	302

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
						Grade Level								
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	13	8	0	0	0	0	26

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 8/30/2021

2020-21 - As Reported

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

Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
						Grade Level								
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	267	235	200	0	0	0	0	702
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	37	35	23	0	0	0	0	95
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	72	57	54	0	0	0	0	183
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	42	53	36	0	0	0	0	131
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	21	37	27	0	0	0	0	85
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	76	70	68	0	0	0	0	214
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	68	73	57	0	0	0	0	198

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	67	70	59	0	0	0	0	196

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	4	7	0	0	0	0	14
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	16	5	0	0	0	0	37

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	267	235	200	0	0	0	0	702
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	37	35	23	0	0	0	0	95
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	72	57	54	0	0	0	0	183
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	42	53	36	0	0	0	0	131
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	21	37	27	0	0	0	0	85
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	76	70	68	0	0	0	0	214
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	68	73	57	0	0	0	0	198

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	67	70	59	0	0	0	0	196

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	4	7	0	0	0	0	14
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	16	5	0	0	0	0	37

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				38%	45%	54%	43%	47%	53%
ELA Learning Gains				43%	47%	54%	48%	50%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				28%	36%	47%	50%	44%	47%
Math Achievement				47%	52%	58%	48%	52%	58%
Math Learning Gains				52%	52%	57%	49%	53%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				40%	40%	51%	48%	43%	51%
Science Achievement				33%	42%	51%	48%	45%	52%
Social Studies Achievement				57%	63%	72%	59%	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	37%	44%	-7%	54%	-17%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2021					
	2019	32%	40%	-8%	52%	-20%
Cohort Comparison		-37%				
08	2021					
	2019	40%	46%	-6%	56%	-16%
Cohort Comparison		-32%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2021					
	2019	37%	44%	-7%	55%	-18%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2021					
	2019	39%	49%	-10%	54%	-15%
Cohort Comparison		-37%				
08	2021					
	2019	47%	44%	3%	46%	1%
Cohort Comparison		-39%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2021					
	2019	31%	41%	-10%	48%	-17%
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	55%	60%	-5%	71%	-16%
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	98%	52%	46%	61%	37%
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019					

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

Tool used for progress monitoring are iReady, Civics (7th Grade) Baseline, and Science Baseline.

Grade 6				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	27	33	28
	Economically Disadvantaged	26	29	25
	Students With Disabilities	28	45	36
	English Language Learners	11	20	9
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	26	27	24
	Economically Disadvantaged	21	21	17
	Students With Disabilities	32	43	42
	English Language Learners	22	0	9

Grade 7				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	32	33	36
	Economically Disadvantaged	27	25	27
	Students With Disabilities	39	40	38
	English Language Learners	10	15	25
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	32	34	31
	Economically Disadvantaged	26	30	26
	Students With Disabilities	33	36	35
	English Language Learners	20	28	14
Civics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			

Grade 8				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	33	27	28
	Economically Disadvantaged	26	21	24
	Students With Disabilities	58	42	46
	English Language Learners	0	9	9
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	30	30	30
	Economically Disadvantaged	23	23	23
	Students With Disabilities	51	44	53
	English Language Learners	22	18	20
Science	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	14	16	47
	Economically Disadvantaged	9	12	39
	Students With Disabilities	33	34	40
	English Language Learners	0	0	44

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	18	30	25	26	45	35	3	39			
ELL	11	33	42	28	48	47	13	57			
BLK	15	23	24	14	29	33	10	33			
HSP	34	39	38	44	52	54	22	67	74		
MUL	44	33		36	31						
WHT	41	42	38	54	52	47	40	71	77		
FRL	28	32	29	36	43	41	24	57	68		
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	17	28	20	20	29	25	23	39			
ELL	8	33	31	21	31	38		40			
BLK	21	37	26	15	32	32	18	33			

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	43	32	43	51	40	27	53	31		
MUL	50	38		50	50						
WHT	48	45	24	59	58	46	41	69	52		
FRL	32	41	28	40	49	40	26	51	30		

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	19	44	50	23	44	33	17	22			
ELL	14	35	31	24	31	43	9	20			
BLK	25	54	50	28	42	50	32	41			
HSP	35	44	47	45	47	47	40	53	58		
MUL	46	46		46	54						
WHT	53	51	55	54	51	49	57	68	52		
FRL	35	45	48	42	46	47	37	51	53		

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	45
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	5
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	405
Total Components for the Federal Index	9
Percent Tested	96%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	28
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	35
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	23
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	47
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	36
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	51
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?

The historical trend for LPM is that ELA and Math Achievement scores have decreased consecutively for 2 testing cycles, as well as decreased 3 of the last 4 testing cycles. For both ELA and Math, the year without a decrease was a 0% increase/decrease for achievement as scores were stagnant.

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

Greatest need for improvement is ELA Proficiency. Currently holding at 34%.

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 continual trend of decreasing scores will need cease from 2015-2016 testing year. Training, recruitment and retention of teachers. Implementing a reading curriculum with reading certified teachers.

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

Acceleration Points show the most growth with a 30% increase from 44% to 74%. LPM has historically scored in the 70s every third year.

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

More students placed in courses with Acceleration Points.

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

PLCs, Common Formative Assessments, Certified Teachers teaching In-Field, Classroom management techniques, Recruitment and Retention of Highly Qualified staff.

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.

PLCs, Common Formative Assessments, Classroom Management instruction, and Reading Intervention techniques PD for teachers outside the of the ELA Content.

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

Common planning time within the master schedule. This will lead to more PLC, outside the 1 day per week requirement. Reading Intervention classes with Reading Certified/Endorsed Teachers.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Increase ELA Proficiency from 34% to 40%. ELA Proficiency has decreased every year since 2015-2016, except for the testing year of 2017-2018, which resulted in a 0% increase/decrease.
Measurable Outcome:	On the 2021-2022, LPM will raise it's proficiency scores 6% from 34% to 40%.
Monitoring:	Progress Monitoring each grading period, through PLC data, iReady D2 (December), iReady D3 (May), Common Formative Assessments.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Robyn Von Merveldt (vonmervr@highlands.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	PLC within ELA Content Area. Master schedule built to allow for common planning. Standards Based Curriculum AVID strategies introduced and utilized outside the AVID Elective. iReady Lessons for students in need or remediation or enrichment Explicit Vocabulary Instruction Remedial Course and Intense Intervention courses have been created in the Master Schedule
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	In order for our Overall school grade to increase, our Reading Proficiency must increase. 6% is asking for a tremendous increase, which would put us slightly above Pre-Covid numbers. 4% is more likely, which would put us at Pre-Covid proficiency. Science scores close resemble our ELA proficiency.

Action Steps to Implement

PLCs based around PLC question #3: How to respond when students experience difficulty in learning?

LPM's ESSA categories Black/African American, Hispanic, Students with Disabilities, Economically Disadvantage and English Language Learners all fall below the 41% threshold.

Increasing CORE (Tier1) instruction, building capacity through PD, targeted scheduling for struggling students and a solid curriculum will affect the entire student population and bring the ESSA Subcategories above the 41% threshold.

Person Responsible	Robyn Von Merveldt (vonmervr@highlands.k12.fl.us)

Staff Training and Retention: All ELA Teachers will be reading endorsed by the start of the school year.

Person Responsible	Shane Ward (wards1@highlands.k12.fl.us)

Identify students in the lowest quartile
Targeted student scheduling
Most experienced, highly qualified, Reading Endorsed teachers teaching lowest quartile.

Person Responsible	[no one identified]

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Increase Math Proficiency from 43% to 50%.
Measurable Outcome:	Raise our Math proficiency by 7% from 43% to 50%
Monitoring:	Progress Monitoring each grading period, through PLC data, iReady D2 (December), iReady D3 (May), Common Formative Assessments.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Shane Ward (wards1@highlands.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	PLC Standard Based Curriculum AVID strategies utilized outside the AVID elective. Spring Math Math Intensive classes
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Math Achievement positively affects Math Learning Gains and Math Lowest Quartile. We feel that if LPM's Math Proficiency is at or neat 50%, the LG and LQ will hover around 50%.

Action Steps to Implement

PLC conversions based around PLC question #3 (How to respond when students experience difficulty learning?). Staff retention through support with Math Coach. Identify students in the lowest quartile in August and progress monitor them through the year. Targeted student scheduling.

LPM's ESSA categories Black/African American, Hispanic, Students with Disabilities, Economically Disadvantage and English Language Learners all fall below the 41% threshold.

Increasing CORE (Tier1) instruction, building capacity through PD, targeted scheduling for struggling students and a solid curriculum will affect the entire student population and bring the ESSA Subcategories above the 41% threshold.

Person Responsible	Shane Ward (wards1@highlands.k12.fl.us)

Analysis of student data: What data will the Math Coach present to the administration to address student growth?
Common Formative Assessments through PLC's
iReady Baseline 1
iReady Diagnostic 2 in Jan. Expect 1-year growth
Spring Math
Remediation / Acceleration
Smaller class size
Staff Retention through support

Person Responsible	[no one identified]

#3. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Discipline	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	LPMs referral rate was 950 for the School Year 2020-2021. The goal this year is decrease that number by 50%. The discipline in classrooms and time out of the classroom for Out of School Suspension or Alternatives (ISS), lead to a staggering amount of time without Face to Face instruction.
Measurable Outcome:	Quantity of Disciplinary Referrrals and the time of Face to Face Instructional time lost due to discipline.
Monitoring:	Every other week, Admin will meet with the Deans to determine patterns, "hot spots" and a weekly focus on disciplinary matters.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Jesse Morgan (morganj@highlands.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Dean PLC Data Meeting (Number of referrals, types of referrals, demographics, etc.)
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Using this data, we can determine if our strategies are working and where to adjust. We can also determine how much face to face instructional time is lost due to discipline.

Action Steps to Implement

Schoolwide expectations
Grade level expectations, which follow schoolwide
Restructuring of ISS

Person Responsible	Jesse Morgan (morganj@highlands.k12.fl.us)

#4. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Black/African-American	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	ESSA Federal Index points for Black/African American students is 27%, which falls below the 41% threshold. LPM has been below 32% for 1 year.
Measurable Outcome:	iReady Proficiency at the end the year on Diagnostic 3.
Monitoring:	Through PLCs and iReady Diagnostic (Progress Monitoring) in Winter and Spring.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Robyn Von Merveldt (vonmervr@highlands.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	PLC Standard Based Curriculum AVID strategies for all students Intentional scheduling with Highly Qualified Teachers
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	LPM's Black/African American population remains stagnant from year to year at approximately 13%. This population of students we can target through specific course scheduling with certified/in-field teachers, interventions, and motivations to perform on the FSA Assessment.

Action Steps to Implement

LPM's ESSA categories Black/African American, Hispanic, Students with Disabilities, Economically Disadvantage and English Language Learners all fall below the 41% threshold.

Increasing CORE (Tier1) instruction, building capacity through PD, targeted scheduling for struggling students and a solid curriculum will affect the entire student population and bring the ESSA Subcategories above the 41% threshold.

Person Responsible	Shane Ward (wards1@highlands.k12.fl.us)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the 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.

On SafeSchoolsforAlex.org, we are #362 out of 553 Schools for the Middle/Junior Level. Our 2019-2020 data shows that we are High in Violent Incidents and High in Property Incidents. We are in the Middle with Drug/Public Order Incidents.

Primary Area of Concern: LPM Discipline Data for the 2020-2021 School Year was 950 Referrals, resulting in 545 classroom referrals and 110 coded for Out of School Suspension.

We have implemented new School-wide expectations across the campus. Provided classroom management training for New Teachers (New Teacher Academy), we have offered classroom management technique training during Pre-Week with teachers with our Deans.

We have increase our allocation of Deans from 1 to 2, One Male and One Female.

We have structured the classroom arrangements on campus to limit grade level interaction and keep students in "cohort area".

Secondary Area of Concern: Loss of instructional time due to disciplinary issues. 110 OSS Coded Referrals and 433 ISS Coded Referrals. We have structured our referral program to limit time out of Core Instruction.

We monitor school culture through a perception survey given to the staff and students.
We will also have bi-weekly Dean/Discipline Meeting with our Deans.
We will also have Disciplinary Dean present at StockTake Meeting.

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.

Recruiting Certified Teachers
Retaining Certified Teachers
All Teachers on Campus are teaching In-Field
Single School Culture of Every Day Expectations (Present, Prepared, Purposeful, Productive and Pride)

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

Parents - Supporting their child's education process, Communication with School Faculty,
Community Members - Financial Support, Mentoring, Extra-Curricular Support
Staff
SBHC Facilities

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: Culture & Environment: Discipline	$0.00
4	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Black/African-American	$0.00
		Total:	$0.00