Three Oaks Middle School

2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Three Oaks Middle School

18500 3 OAKS PKWY, Fort Myers, FL 33967

http://okm.leeschools.net//

Demographics

Principal: Forrest Walker

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2020

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	No
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	68%
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: A (63%) 2017-18: A (63%) 2016-17: A (63%)
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 Lee 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.](http://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

Three Oaks Middle School

18500 3 OAKS PKWY, Fort Myers, FL 33967

http://okm.leeschools.net//

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	**2020-21 Title I School**	**2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
Middle School 6-8	No	51%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	44%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Lee 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.

To provide a quality education in a safe and well managed environment

Provide the school's vision statement.

Three Oaks Middle School is committed to focus on student achievement strategies that enable all students to meet or exceed rigorous district standards.

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
Clark, Mason	Principal	
Barta, Richard	Assistant Principal	
Roache, Lindsey	Assistant Principal	
Doughty, Lynsey	Instructional Coach	
Harris, Connie	Teacher, K-12	
Laux, Jason	Teacher, K-12	
Moore, Christy	Teacher, ESE	
Mount, Carol	Administrative Support	
Pennington, Lindsay	Teacher, K-12	
Summers, Rich	Teacher, K-12	
Williams, Tara	Teacher, K-12	
Rossi, Lillian	School Counselor	

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Wednesday 7/1/2020, Forrest Walker

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.*
4

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.*
16

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

61

Total number of students enrolled at the school

1,067

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

8

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

7

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	370	346	351	0	0	0	0	1067
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	32	20	37	0	0	0	0	89
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	10	11	0	0	0	0	32
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5	7	0	0	0	0	23
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	4	13	0	0	0	0	33
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	31	57	63	0	0	0	0	151
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	34	61	67	0	0	0	0	162
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	37	47	65	0	0	0	0	149

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 9/21/2021

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
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	343	323	336	0	0	0	0	1002
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	13	16	0	0	0	0	36
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	23	0	0	0	0	31
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	0	3	0	0	0	0	11
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	3	0	0	0	0	7
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	47	29	46	0	0	0	0	122
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	33	27	42	0	0	0	0	102

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
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	25	16	43	0	0	0	0	84

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

2020-21 - Updated

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
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	343	323	336	0	0	0	0	1002
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	13	16	0	0	0	0	36
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	23	0	0	0	0	31
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	0	3	0	0	0	0	11
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	3	0	0	0	0	7
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	47	29	46	0	0	0	0	122
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	33	27	42	0	0	0	0	102

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
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	25	16	43	0	0	0	0	84

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	1	1	0	0	0	0	4
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1

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				64%	55%	54%	63%	55%	53%
ELA Learning Gains				58%	56%	54%	59%	54%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				43%	44%	47%	51%	44%	47%
Math Achievement				72%	64%	58%	69%	62%	58%
Math Learning Gains				69%	64%	57%	64%	63%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				52%	54%	51%	53%	54%	51%
Science Achievement				69%	50%	51%	62%	52%	52%
Social Studies Achievement				74%	70%	72%	73%	69%	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	65%	52%	13%	54%	11%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2021					
	2019	56%	51%	5%	52%	4%
Cohort Comparison		-65%				
08	2021					
	2019	71%	57%	14%	56%	15%
Cohort Comparison		-56%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2021					
	2019	43%	47%	-4%	55%	-12%
Cohort Comparison						

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
07	2021					
	2019	72%	57%	15%	54%	18%
Cohort Comparison		-43%				
08	2021					
	2019	72%	60%	12%	46%	26%
Cohort Comparison		-72%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2021					
	2019	68%	46%	22%	48%	20%
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	73%	67%	6%	71%	2%
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%	59%	39%	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.

Data was collected through a quarterly progress monitoring cycle, which included instruments such as STAR, iReady. and district-created progress monitoring assessments.

Grade 6				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	168/51.4	181/53.6	209/61.3
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	7/17.9	7/17.9	11/26.8
	English Language Learners	0/0	1/3.1	3/9.4
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	11/7.9	25/17.6	41/27.5
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	6/16.2	7/17.9	10/25
	English Language Learners	0/0	2/7.1	5/16.7

Grade 7				
	Number/% Proficiency	**Fall**	**Winter**	**Spring**
English Language Arts	All Students	152/51.1	180/56.8	213/65.3
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	4/16	3/10	6/18.8
	English Language Learners	0/0	1/7.7	2/13.3
	Number/% Proficiency	**Fall**	**Winter**	**Spring**
Mathematics	All Students	127/43.2	162/54.4	213/66.4
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	2/8	5/16.1	7/22.6
	English Language Learners	0/0	1/6.7	2/11.8
	Number/% Proficiency	**Fall**	**Winter**	**Spring**
Civics	All Students	180/58.6	233/71.9	245/75.2
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	4/15.4	6/19.4	10/32.3
	English Language Learners	3/23.1	3/20	2/12.5

Grade 8				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	196/63	206/61.9	240/71.9
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	4/13.8	2/6.1	7/21.9
	English Language Learners	2/10.5	4/18.2	4/18.2
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	146/64	173/72.4	183/75.6
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	3/13.6	6/23.1	5/19.2
	English Language Learners	2/66.7	1/33.3	0/0
Science	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	126/40.9	167/53.4	217/65.2
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	1/3.3	2/6.5	2/6.1
	English Language Learners	1/5.3	3/15.8	5/22.7

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	16	34	28	25	28	18	10	38			
ELL	29	37	32	34	33	25	26	38	60		
ASN	83	67		77	70		70	100			
BLK	60	60	50	48	45	43	47				
HSP	49	48	31	52	44	29	49	61	67		
MUL	71	64		86	57						
WHT	70	60	39	74	52	31	75	82	78		
FRL	49	46	34	50	40	25	38	61	58		
2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	22	34	30	34	57	54	28	36	40		
ELL	19	39	32	36	57	48	5	26			

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	81	70		85	78						
BLK	50	55	36	62	67	67		50			
HSP	52	52	36	61	62	50	49	61	62		
MUL	78	65		74	74						
WHT	72	62	52	79	73	52	79	82	70		
FRL	50	51	37	58	60	50	53	57	52		

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	22	43	37	24	44	46	22	30			
ELL	12	38	39	24	45	43	14	5			
ASN	86	76		90	81						
BLK	59	46		60	45			91			
HSP	49	53	43	54	58	53	50	58	60		
MUL	86	81		90	76						
WHT	69	62	61	77	67	55	68	80	75		
FRL	51	55	48	58	58	54	52	64	63		

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	55
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	35
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	545
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	97%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	23
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
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	78
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	50
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	46
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	70
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	62
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	44
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?

ELA proficiency decreased from 64 to 62
Math proficiency decreased from 72 to 65
L25 Math Gains decreased from 52 to 31
Acceleration increased from 69 to 75
Math 6th grade proficiency decreased the most--from 30th %ile to 21st %ile statewide

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

Math Grade 6
Math L25 Gains
ELA L25 Gains

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

In 20-21, many students began the school year participating in Lee Home Connect. As the students began to transition back into brick and mortar, many basic skills were lacking and remediation of the skills had to be implemented in Math and ELA. In Math, the students in 6th grade were any students that earned a 1 or 2 on the FSA. All students that demonstrated a 3 or above were placed on 7th grade curriculum. Teachers are using i-Ready to create customized learning paths to meet the students at their points of need. In first quarter, we began after-school tutoring. In second quarter, we will begin targeted small group support through our DEAR period. In third quarter, we anticipate an additional 30 minutes for all students and will engage in wider support as we move towards the FSA.

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

Acceleration

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

In 20-21, more students were placed in Algebra based on FSA and iReady scores. These students with levels of 3, 4, or 5 were presented with more challenging curriculum.

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

In 21-22, TOMS will continue to place students according to the FSA and iReady scores. All proficient 8th graders will be placed into Algebra.

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.

In the 21-22 school year, ELA is implementing a new Reading program. Teachers attend trainings from the District as needed. The Reading Coach meets with the ELA Department weekly to discuss best practices. District leading and learning provides strategies and best practices to multiple teachers quarterly. These teachers share out their learnings at PLCs the next week. The i-Ready team is pushing out content training multiple times monthly that our teachers are taking advantage of.

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

This school year, teachers meet monthly as a Department and monthly as a grade level. Discussions about curriculum and struggling learners take place. Teachers work collaboratively to come up with strategies to implement. These are revisited at the next meeting to determine the effectiveness and changes are made to meet the needs of the students.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	The percentage of Three Oaks Middle School students making learning gains in ELA decreased from 58% in 18-19 school year to 55% in the 20-21 school year. The percentage of Three Oaks Middle School students in the Lowest 25 Percentile making learning gains in ELA decreased from 43% in 2019-2020 to 35% in the 20-21 school year.
Measurable Outcome:	To increase the number of students making learning gains in ELA from 62% to 64% as measured by the FY21 ELA FSA. To increase the number of students in the L25 from 43% to 48%.
Monitoring:	Weekly PLC meetings Review of Lesson plans iReady lessons and passing percentages
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Lindsey Roache (lindseyro@leeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	ELA reading disaggregated. Implementation of new Reading programs for Reading. Each quarter, all content area will have a minimum of two content reading pieces for students to complete in core classes. These content reading texts will address a schoolwide reading strategy delivered at faculty PLCs twice quarterly.. Snap and Read will be available for all students this year.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Weekly progress monitoring of formative and summative assessments by teachers. Weekly PLC meetings by departments to analyze data and differentiate instruction. iReady reports will be reviewed quarterly.
Action Steps to Implement	

1. All students receiving reading instruction, even those on grade level. Students scoring a 1 or 2 on the FSA receive an additional class every other day according to block scheduling.
2. Students attend all core subjects daily.
3. All core subjects will be required to have minimum of three reading content pieces per quarter that reinforces reading strategies.
4. Monitor using iReady

Person Responsible	Michelle Kaczmarek (michelleka@leeschools.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	The percentage of Three Oaks Middle School students making learning gains in Math declined from 69% in 2018-2019 to 49% in the 2021-2022 school year. The percentage of Three Oaks Middle School students in the Lowest 25 Percentile making learning gains in May declined from 52% in 2018-19 to 31% in the 2020-21 school year.
Measurable Outcome:	To increase the number of students making learning gains in the L25 Math subgroup from 31% to 57% as measured by the FY22 Math FSA. This will return our L25 gains to pre-pandemic levels.
Monitoring:	Weekly PLC meetings Review of Lesson plans iReady lessons and passing percentages
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Mason Clark (masonmc@leeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Math disaggregated. Implementation of iReady program Snap and Read will be available for all students this year.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Weekly progress monitoring of formative and summative assessments by teachers. Weekly PLC meetings by departments to analyze data and differentiate instruction. iReady reports will be reviewed quarterly.

Action Steps to Implement

1. All students have Math every day
2. Monitor using iReady weekly and adjust instructional levels as needed
3. Use of reading strategies to break down math problems

Person Responsible Richard Barta (richarddb@leeschools.net)

#3. Other specifically relating to Math Acceleration	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Three Oaks Middle School is currently at 75% Acceleration Points for the 2020-2021 school year. . This is an increase of 1% from 2018-2019 school year.
Measurable Outcome:	To increase the Acceleration points from 75 to 79.
Monitoring:	Weekly PLC meetings Review of Lesson plans STAR passing percentages
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	[no one identified]
Evidence-based Strategy:	Math disaggregated. USe of the FSA scores of three or higher to place students in Accelerated Program (Algebra)
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Weekly progress monitoring of formative and summative assessments by teachers. Weekly PLC meetings by departments to analyze data and differentiate instruction. STAR reports will be reviewed quarterly.

Action Steps to Implement

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

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.

Based upon 2019-2020 data, it appears that vandalism and tobacco usage are primary disciplinary concerns for our school. Based upon preliminary data for 2021-2022, these concerns remain, and are somewhat heightened to due to current social media trends regarding vandalism of school property.

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.

Utilization of positive behavior support strategies that will result in a reduction of internal (ISS) and out of school (OSS) suspensions.

TOMS uses a minor infraction system as a warning system to lower the number of discipline referrals. This is implemented through the FOCUS software program. Minor infractions accrue quarterly and step-wise with a specific consequences for each step. Three Oaks Middle has a Redirect and Return Room where students utilize Restorative Practices to discuss their actions and more appropriate strategies to use in the future. Three Oaks Middle employs a schoolwide discipline plan for consistency. All classrooms have student expectations posted.
Three Oaks Middle also uses FOCUS to record positive behavior. Students are recognized weekly and quarterly for positive behavior.

Daily Point Sheets are utilized by individual students needing strategies to improve their behavior in the school setting. The Redirect and Return Room is used as a Social Skills Classroom for students with behavioral disabilities. This is an alternative to students escalating in the educational environment.

Alternative consequences to suspensions include lunch detentions, after school detentions, and Thursday Night School.

Positive sanctions include "no-minor infractions" celebrations, dress-down days for students participating in National Junior Honor Society and Student Council, quarterly honor roll celebrations for academic achievement, and recognitions of significant growth after each i-Ready diagnostic.

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

Quarterly PBIS celebrations are planned by the staff. Mrs. Doughty reviews the data and and works to generate lists. Ms. MacLeod and Ms. Williams work together to plan celebrations for the students.

TOMS also has Peer Mediation orchestrated by Elizabeth Brown. Students are able to work through their differences without the fear of consequences.

TOMS offers after school Clubs as well:
STEM CLub
Best Buddies (student mentors for students with cognitive disabilities)
Book Battle Team
Math Team
Debate Team
Special Olympics
Youth Alive
GSA

These clubs are led by teachers or staff within the school

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: Other: Math Acceleration**	$0.00
		Total:	**$0.00**