

Broward County Public Schools

Lyons Creek Middle School



2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	11
Planning for Improvement	19
Positive Culture & Environment	21
Budget to Support Goals	22

Lyons Creek Middle School

4333 SOL PRESS BLVD, Coconut Creek, FL 33073

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Vernicca Wynter

Start Date for this Principal: 10/1/2021

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Middle School 6-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2020-21 Title I School	Yes
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	57%
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 (65%) 2017-18: A (62%) 2016-17: A (65%)
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 Broward County School Board.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F. This plan is also a requirement for Targeted Support and Improvement (TS&I) and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CS&I) schools pursuant to 1008.33 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

To be designated as TS&I, a school must have one or more ESSA subgroup(s) with a Federal Index below 41%. This plan shall be approved by the district. There are three ways a school can be designated as CS&I:

1. have a school grade of D or F
2. have a graduation rate of 67% or lower
3. have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

For these schools, the SIP shall be approved by the district as well as the Bureau of School Improvement.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F, or a graduation rate 67% or less. Districts may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing for schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at www.floridacims.org.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Table of Contents	
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	11
Planning for Improvement	19
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	22

Lyons Creek Middle School

4333 SOL PRESS BLVD, Coconut Creek, FL 33073

[no web address on file]

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	52%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	72%

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 Broward 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 LCMS is to maintain a safe and secure learning environment where tolerance, respect, and accountability provide learning experiences that empower our diverse community.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The vision of LCMS is to cultivate a positive community of life-long learning & self-discovery.

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
Wynter , Vernicca	Principal	Mrs.Wynter effectively perform the performance responsibilities using the following knowledge, skills and abilities to: provide instructional leadership for all educational programs at the school; prepare and manage the school's budget and manage and inventory the school's assets; to read, interpret, follow and enforce the State Board Rules, Code of Ethics, School Board policies, and other state and federal laws; use effective interview techniques, coaching procedures, and evaluation procedures; enforce collective bargaining agreements; use effective public speaking skills, group dynamics, and interaction and problem solving skills; maintain a sensitivity to multicultural issues; perceive the impact of a decision on other components of the organization; communicate effectively, both orally and in writing, and through use of technology; and analyze and use data.
Gurreonero, Erick	Assistant Principal	Assistant Principals conduct classroom observations and assist grade levels with planning and executing standards-aligned instruction. All Assistant principals are over curriculum area ex. LA, SS, Math and non-instructional areas ex. technology, guidance, and security. They coordinate and facilitates all afterschool initiatives. Responsibilities include am/pm supervision, student discipline, iobservation/feedback, datamarks and lesson plan quarterly checks. All Assistant Principals are active participants in the MTSS school-wide plan and make school improvement plans based on recommendations. Administration participates in RTI, conferences, cycles of assistance, CFA/ data chats and PLCs. Each AP heads an area that includes TIER or Transportation or Master Schedule or Grade reports or Open House, subs, bell schedules, yearbook, PTSA, SAC/SAF, Agendas, ELO, SIP, Title 1, ESE, ESOL, Facilities, lunch, PD, Assemblies, and Testing.
Vega-Rodriguez, Dory	Assistant Principal	Assistant Principals conduct classroom observations and assist grade levels with planning and executing standards-aligned instruction. All Assistant principals are over curriculum area ex. LA, SS, Math and non-instructional areas ex. technology, guidance, and security. They coordinate and facilitates all afterschool initiatives. Responsibilities include am/pm supervision, student discipline, iobservation/feedback, datamarks and lesson plan quarterly checks. All Assistant Principals are active participants in the MTSS school-wide plan and make school improvement plans based on recommendations. Administration participates in RTI, conferences, cycles of assistance, CFA/ data chats and PLCs. Each AP heads an area that includes TIER or Transportation or Master Schedule or Grade reports or Open House, subs, bell schedules, yearbook, PTSA, SAC/SAF, Agendas, ELO, SIP, Title 1, ESE, ESOL, Facilities, lunch, PD, Assemblies, and Testing.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Friday 10/1/2021, Vernicca Wynter

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

3

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

1

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

93

Total number of students enrolled at the school

1,916

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

14

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	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	528	608	616	0	0	0	0	1752
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	72	91	113	0	0	0	0	276
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	3	4	0	0	0	0	23
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	18	19	0	0	0	0	45
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	25	12	0	0	0	0	50
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	231	273	300	0	0	0	0	804

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	7	13	6	0	0	0	0	26

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	22	31	26	0	0	0	0	79
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	3

Date this data was collected or last updated

Friday 10/1/2021

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Students retained two or more times	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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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				60%	57%	54%	61%	57%	53%
ELA Learning Gains				57%	57%	54%	57%	57%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				46%	48%	47%	52%	50%	47%
Math Achievement				72%	60%	58%	67%	60%	58%
Math Learning Gains				70%	58%	57%	62%	59%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				60%	49%	51%	49%	50%	51%
Science Achievement				60%	49%	51%	58%	52%	52%
Social Studies Achievement				84%	71%	72%	81%	72%	72%

Grade Level Data Review - State Assessments

NOTE: This data is raw data and includes ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2021					
	2019	57%	57%	0%	54%	3%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2021					
	2019	57%	55%	2%	52%	5%
Cohort Comparison		-57%				
08	2021					
	2019	61%	59%	2%	56%	5%
Cohort Comparison		-57%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2021					
	2019	63%	58%	5%	55%	8%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2021					
	2019	64%	53%	11%	54%	10%
Cohort Comparison		-63%				
08	2021					
	2019	69%	45%	24%	46%	23%
Cohort Comparison		-64%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2021					
	2019	52%	43%	9%	48%	4%
Cohort Comparison						

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	100%	67%	33%	67%	33%
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	82%	71%	11%	71%	11%

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	92%	61%	31%	61%	31%
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	97%	56%	41%	57%	40%

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

I-ready, Mastery Connect.

Grade 6				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	35%	43%	0
	Economically Disadvantaged	0	0	0
	Students With Disabilities	8%	15%	0
	English Language Learners	9%	20%	0
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	31%	42%	0
	Economically Disadvantaged	0	0	0
	Students With Disabilities	13%	14%	0
	English Language Learners	13%	27%	0

Grade 7				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	39%	48%	0
	Economically Disadvantaged	0	0	0
	Students With Disabilities	19%	18%	0
	English Language Learners	8%	17%	0
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	21%	29%	0
	Economically Disadvantaged	0	0	0
	Students With Disabilities	7%	13%	0
	English Language Learners	7%	19%	0
Civics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	0	49%	67%
	Economically Disadvantaged	0	0	0
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	0
	English Language Learners	0	0	0

Grade 8				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	41%	52%	0
	Economically Disadvantaged	0	0	0
	Students With Disabilities	13%	24%	0
	English Language Learners	12%	18%	0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	9%	20%	0
	Economically Disadvantaged	0	0	0
	Students With Disabilities	2%	8%	0
	English Language Learners	5%	13%	0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students	.19%	8.72%	17.25%
	Economically Disadvantaged	0	0	0
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	0
	English Language Learners	0	0	0

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	19	32	26	17	28	27	15	41	42		
ELL	37	45	44	38	29	23	27	58	47		
ASN	78	66		76	51		77		81		
BLK	42	36	30	35	27	22	42	55	53		
HSP	52	46	39	45	29	26	49	70	69		
MUL	65	44		55	31		53		65		
WHT	58	43	28	59	35	33	55	67	69		
FRL	47	41	30	43	27	24	45	61	64		
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	18	39	36	31	51	51	25	47	37		
ELL	41	52	46	57	64	60	40	68	52		

2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
ASN	79	63		91	80		80	100	96		
BLK	51	53	45	59	64	57	38	81	75		
HSP	56	56	44	68	67	59	53	82	68		
MUL	67	61	60	80	70		65	89	79		
WHT	67	60	49	80	75	66	73	87	78		
FRL	52	55	46	65	67	61	48	82	68		
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	20	41	38	28	46	41	27	45	43		
ELL	41	55	57	49	55	51	40	60	69		
ASN	84	80		87	80		72	93	82		
BLK	51	48	44	52	56	49	46	73	72		
HSP	57	58	55	64	60	50	56	77	72		
MUL	67	53		69	62	44	65	82	70		
WHT	69	60	54	76	65	45	64	86	76		
FRL	54	54	50	60	58	49	51	77	71		

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	47
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	47
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	471
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	79%
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	40
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	72
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	38
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	52
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	50
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	42
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 lowest 25th percentile made zero gain in ELA from 2016-2018 and in 2019 there was a decrease in proficiency (covid virtual).

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

The lowest 25th percentile.

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

Lack of access to at-home resources to study and complete homework. Open media, Pull out in school, Help academy RSA and in-school tutoring.

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

I-READY

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

Classroom strategies, Student motivators embedded in the I-ready program. I-Ready embedded into the ELA curriculum. Monitoring plan, data chats, parental involvement.

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

Student incentive program for accelerated completion of learning goals.

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.

I-ready training, Nearpod training.

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

Professional developments have been added to the calendar to increase teacher pedagogy. PLC data monitoring.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	The lowest 25% in ELA and students with disabilities showed the lowest performance. Subgroups may have been affected by grouping, instructional approaches, and a need for improved differentiated instruction based on formative and summative assessments. School/State: ELA lowest 25th percentile scored a 46%; the state was a 48%. Students with disabilities scored 36%. Teachers need to review common assessments and provide differentiated instructions. Teacher aid needed to provide instructional support in areas of need.
Measurable Outcome:	Florida State Assessment (FSA) will be used to measure the lowest 25% in ELA and students with disabilities. Our goal is that the lowest 25% in ELA will increase from 46 to 52 percent. Students with disabilities will increase from 36 to 41 percent in the 2022 state assessment.
Monitoring:	School-Based testing scores will be monitored throughout the year and instruction /strategies will be adjusted based on the outcomes to maximize student achievement.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Vernicca Wynter (vernicca.wynter@browardschools.com)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Reading comprehension is a complex skill that places significant demands on students, beginning with elementary school and continuing through the secondary grades. The evidence-based strategies that will be implemented are: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Unwrapping Standards with students 2. Delivering explicit instructions aligned to the text 3. Vertical Alignment of Standards (grade level comparison) 4. Personalize classroom interventions through student work
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Unwrapping Standards with students- building connections with the learning and frontload any misconceptions. Using the standards to drive the instruction fo the teachers to understand 2. Delivering explicit instructions aligned to the text 3. Vertical Alignment of Standards (grade level comparison) 4. Personalize classroom interventions through work

Action Steps to Implement

1. Identify students who constitute the bottom 25% based on 2021 ELA FSA data.
2. Communicate these names to the classroom teachers.
3. Teachers plan to include these students in targeted small group instruction during the daily ELA block.
4. Teachers plan to include these students in targeted tier 2 intervention groups outside of the daily ELA block.
5. Teachers invite these students to our weekly tutoring beginning in September.
6. Teachers collect and record tier 1 data using classroom common assessments.
7. Teachers collect and graph tier 2 intervention data.
8. Teachers and leadership team members review student progress monthly at MTSS meetings.
9. The MTSS team determines the need for tier 3 instruction and a plan is put in place if applicable.
10. Instruction of these students is observed and actionable feedback is provided regarding adjustments to instructional strategies and/or materials.

Person Responsible Vernicca Wynter (vernicca.wynter@browardschools.com)

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.

Lyons Creek Middle School will focus on Literacy and Students with Learning Disabilities. By June of 2022, SWD will score at or above 41% FPPI. To bridge the performance gap Lyons Creek Middle School we will utilize the MTSS (RTI system) to guide interventions and provide deliberate support for students with SWD. A student with Learning Disability who does not show mastery in ELA will be brought up for RTI and placed on a Tier 2 intervention. In addition, teachers will provide instructional support within the classroom by differentiating the instruction and remediating students who are not proficient.

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.

Lyons Creek Middle School continues to strive for a high expectation of student buy in towards the school wide "Lions Pride Foundations Program". This program outlines the behavior expectations that students are expected to display in different areas of the school. During the first week of school teachers were instructed to review the program with their students and go over the expectations of each area of the school with different class periods. Each step of the program covered a different area and showed examples of how students need to behave. School staff is asked to reward students for displaying this positive behavior as seen through out campus. Students are rewarded with a ticket titled "Caught you showing pride". This ticket allows students to enter a weekly drawing on Friday mornings. Two students are selected from each grade level and given a bag full of prizes for being selected.

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

Lions Pride Foundation Committee was responsible for creating the program and hosting professional development to teachers during Pre-Planning week. The Members of this committee were; Mrs. Shena

Wright, Mrs. Tonya Mays, Mr. Chis Murray, and Ms. Jamie Caliendo. The committee is overseen by 8th Grade Administrator Mr. Erick Gurreonero. This committee of teachers would use data from previous school years to see which areas were the most troubled in the school. Once certain areas were targeted, the guidelines were then created to make sure that behavior would improve and less infractions take place.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities	\$0.00
Total:			\$47,516.00