

Seminole County Public Schools

Greenwood Lakes 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	19
Budget to Support Goals	0

Greenwood Lakes Middle School

601 LAKE PARK DR, Lake Mary, FL 32746

<http://www.scps.k12.fl.us/schools/schoolinfopage.cfm?schoolnumber=0671>

Demographics

Principal: Breezi Erickson

Start Date for this Principal: 2/7/2016

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)	66%
2020-21 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Asian Students Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students* White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (61%) 2017-18: B (59%) 2016-17: B (60%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	LaShawn Russ-Porterfield
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 Seminole 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	0

Greenwood Lakes Middle School

601 LAKE PARK DR, Lake Mary, FL 32746

<http://www.scps.k12.fl.us/schools/schoolinfopage.cfm?schoolnumber=0671>

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;">66%</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;">60%</p>

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 Seminole County School Board.

SIP Authority

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

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

<https://www.floridacims.org>.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

The mission of Greenwood Lakes Middle School is to ensure that all students require the knowledge, skills, and attitudes to be productive citizens.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The vision of Greenwood Lakes Middle School is to engage students through academic learning time, academic and behavioral interventions, introduce levels of cognitive complexity, provide literacy across all content areas, decrease the achievement gap through relationship, instructional relevance and rigor, and instructional technology for the 21st century learner.

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
Erickson, Breezi	Principal	Structures & Monitors School Learning Environment
Fletcher, Rendon	Assistant Principal	Collaboratively develops and implements instructional framework
Hall, Jacqueline	Assistant Principal	Collaboratively develops and implements instructional framework
Sokolowsky, Evan	Other	Title I Compliance, Facilities, & Testing Coordinator
Waller, Megan	Dean	Supports teachers in managing classroom behaviors & other related district initiatives
Todaro, Anthony	Dean	Supports teachers in managing classroom behaviors & other related district initiatives

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Sunday 2/7/2016, Breezi Erickson

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.*

20

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

58

Total number of students enrolled at the school

992

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

19

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

11

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	348	348	295	0	0	0	0	991
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	15	9	0	0	0	0	38
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	23	15	9	0	0	0	0	47
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	74	62	57	0	0	0	0	193
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	116	76	48	0	0	0	0	240
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	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	29	17	10	0	0	0	0	56

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	74	61	18	0	0	0	0	153
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 8/26/2021

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	348	321	333	0	0	0	0	1002
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	22	20	0	0	0	0	46
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	17	17	0	0	0	0	35
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	50	39	58	0	0	0	0	147
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	52	66	76	0	0	0	0	194
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	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	12	21	26	0	0	0	0	59

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	44	28	40	0	0	0	0	112
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

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	348	321	333	0	0	0	0	1002
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	22	20	0	0	0	0	46
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	17	17	0	0	0	0	35
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	50	39	58	0	0	0	0	147
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	52	66	76	0	0	0	0	194
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	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	12	21	26	0	0	0	0	59

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	44	28	40	0	0	0	0	112
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data 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				55%	61%	54%	51%	60%	53%
ELA Learning Gains				58%	57%	54%	55%	56%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				50%	45%	47%	47%	43%	47%
Math Achievement				60%	66%	58%	57%	66%	58%
Math Learning Gains				66%	64%	57%	61%	64%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				59%	52%	51%	58%	48%	51%
Science Achievement				55%	59%	51%	56%	62%	52%
Social Studies Achievement				61%	75%	72%	72%	74%	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	54%	60%	-6%	54%	0%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2021					
	2019	49%	58%	-9%	52%	-3%
Cohort Comparison		-54%				
08	2021					
	2019	56%	61%	-5%	56%	0%
Cohort Comparison		-49%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2021					
	2019	52%	65%	-13%	55%	-3%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2021					
	2019	48%	61%	-13%	54%	-6%
Cohort Comparison		-52%				
08	2021					
	2019	51%	32%	19%	46%	5%
Cohort Comparison		-48%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2021					
	2019	53%	57%	-4%	48%	5%
Cohort Comparison						

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	0%	71%	-71%	67%	-67%

CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	59%	74%	-15%	71%	-12%
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	85%	61%	24%	61%	24%
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	100%	64%	36%	57%	43%

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

Common District Created Benchmark Assessments were utilized to progress monitor:

- ELA – Grades 6-8
- Mathematics – Grades 6-8 including high school Algebra and Geometry
- Science – Grade 8
- Civics – Grade 7

Grade 6				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	177/69%	140/54%	188/67%
	Economically Disadvantaged	113/63%	89/49%	118/60%
	Students With Disabilities	14/63%	11/25%	17/36%
	English Language Learners	8/47%	7/39%	9/41%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	130/51%	123/46%	149/57%
	Economically Disadvantaged	83/47%	75/40%	89/49%
	Students With Disabilities	18/42%	17/38%	18/43%
	English Language Learners	6/35%	9/50%	10/53%
Grade 7				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	176/75%	181/80%	239/88%
	Economically Disadvantaged	99/69%	98/72%	145/85%
	Students With Disabilities	26/48%	32/60%	44/75%
	English Language Learners	10/48%	5/50%	14/67%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	144/64%	150/61%	157/60%
	Economically Disadvantaged	81/60%	81/55%	96/57%
	Students With Disabilities	29/58%	27/47%	31/57%
	English Language Learners	10/48%	8/36%	10/50%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Civics	All Students	204/88%	182/77%	221/82%
	Economically Disadvantaged	119/84%	104/71%	127/77%
	Students With Disabilities	40/77%	26/49%	35/59%
	English Language Learners	15/75%	10/50%	13/65%

Grade 8				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	183/81%	140/60%	202/75%
	Economically Disadvantaged	102/73%	72/52%	113/66%
	Students With Disabilities	27/59%	12/27%	19/36%
	English Language Learners	12/50%	7/30%	13/50%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	122/55%	167/71%	155/59%
	Economically Disadvantaged	58/44%	94/65%	87/52%
	Students With Disabilities	10/24%	24/51%	21/44%
	English Language Learners	8/36%	16/64%	17/68%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students	159/68%	158/67%	166/61%
	Economically Disadvantaged	80/55%	81/57%	85/49%
	Students With Disabilities	17/36%	13/28%	13/25%
	English Language Learners	8/32%	8/32%	8/30%

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	20	35	31	20	34	33	17	43	38		
ELL	38	53	43	33	41	26	22	46			
ASN	68	67		58	28						
BLK	31	35	27	28	29	28	22	46	64		
HSP	50	52	37	45	40	39	41	72	72		
MUL	52	46		46	39			55			
WHT	69	57	45	63	45	47	54	81	72		
FRL	46	46	34	40	38	36	33	64	66		
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	49	45	27	54	51	28	25			
ELL	24	56	57	39	63	58	24	23			

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	70	78		78	78			69			
BLK	35	51	48	41	61	59	34	54	84		
HSP	48	56	51	53	62	58	39	48	80		
MUL	63	61		63	89		73				
WHT	67	62	47	71	68	59	72	71	88		
FRL	43	54	50	51	63	57	44	54	84		

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	43	42	25	50	51	20	38			
ELL	22	42	33	28	54	50	29	32			
ASN	62	80		85	79						
BLK	33	51	56	31	51	55	32	58	63		
HSP	41	49	36	51	61	59	53	59	71		
MUL	44	61		61	61						
WHT	63	57	51	69	64	61	65	84	69		
FRL	41	51	46	47	56	58	48	63	61		

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	51
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	53
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	507
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	91%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	29
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	39
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	55
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	34
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	50
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	48
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	59
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	46
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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 performance of students with disabilities across all grade levels and content areas is a concerning trend.

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

The achievement and learning gains of students with disabilities demonstrates the greatest need for improvement.

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

Factors contributing to the low performance of students with disabilities in ELA and Math proficiency and learning gains include disruption in instructional continuity due to the pandemic that further widened gaps in students' foundational skills. Actions to support improvement in these areas will include frequent formative progress monitoring with target support and acceleration in identified areas of need.

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

Grade 6 mathematics and Grade 7- ELA reflect the most improvement.

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

Deliberate monitoring of specific student groups contributed to this improvement. Actions included focus on the monitoring of the lowest 30% of students, acceleration of high level 1 and high level 2 and level 3 students along with standards-based tutoring.

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

Acceleration strategies will include strategic monitoring of lowest 30% of students, acceleration of high level 1 and high level 2 and level 3 students, more frequent common formative assessment to gather progress monitoring data and highly structured professional learning community discussions using this data to collaborate on strategies to accelerate student learning.

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 will be focused on the development of highly effective professional learning communities and how school-based leaders can foster the growth and development of teacher collaboration for student success.

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

Additional services dedicated to student acceleration include social emotional learning support for students and families, data driven tutoring and acceleration support, expanded use of SCPS early warning tracking and MTSS based support, and additional progress monitoring opportunities in ELA and mathematics for all students in grades 6-8.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Increasing academic achievement of students with disabilities. ESSA Federal Percent of Points Index indicates this is a high priority need and focusing on the success of these students will reduce achievement gaps and prepare these students for future academic success.

Measurable Outcome: Increase achievement and learning gains for students with disabilities.

Monitoring: This area of focus will be monitored through classroom walk throughs, review of progress monitoring data and through data chats with professional learning communities.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Breezi Erickson (breezi_erickson@scps.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy: Lessons aligned to Florida Standards at the appropriate level of complexity with ongoing feedback loops between leadership and teachers, students and teachers and student with students and PLCs focused on data, instructional planning and student evidence of learning.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Standards based lessons differentiated to meet the needs of these specific student groups and data driven deliberate action planning will improve achievement and learning gains for our students. This strategy is aligned to having high expectations for all learners and teachers.

Action Steps to Implement

- Student owned progress monitoring
- Low 30% Monitoring
- High Level 1 and High Level 2 Monitoring
- Low Level 3 Acceleration
- Collaborative Data Driven PLCs
- Tutoring
- See SCPS School Improvement Plan for additional details

Person Responsible: Breezi Erickson (breezi_erickson@scps.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.

The school culture and environment are monitored through the lens of behavior or discipline data through PBS. Discipline data is reviewed every week in administration meetings, as well as quarterly by all staff. Based on trends in discipline data, new PBIS programs are initiated to address these trends; such as the mentor program, Eagles of Excellence, student/teacher of the month, SOAR bucks, etc. The discipline data also provides an insight if MTSS interventions are effective or need adjusting.

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.

GLMS staff members expect students to behave in a way that brings positive credit to the school, their family, and themselves. Administration takes PRIDE in building a positive school culture and students who misbehave receive appropriate consequences as set forth in the SCPS Student Conduct and Discipline Code. Through SOAR Time students review behavior expectations, do team building activities, character development, and are encouraged to display PROUD AND POSITIVE behavior at all times. GLMS promotes S.O.A.R. - Showing respect, Owning our behavior, Acting responsible, and Reaching for your personal best.

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

Stakeholders play an important role in GLMS' everyday affairs. Active participation in school programs, projects, and activities help our students succeed and achieve on a daily basis. Financial support and donations from community members and parents help fund programs like our clothing closet and food pantry for our Families in Need. Effective communication, shared vision, and collegiality are extremely important and our stakeholders are tasked with helping us address the diverse needs of our students.