Mt. Dora Middle School

2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Mt. Dora Middle School

1405 LINCOLN AVE, Mount Dora, FL 32757

https://mms.lake.k12.fl.us//

Demographics

Principal: Jennifer Farnsworth

Start Date for this Principal: 8/2/2021

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	No
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 (53%) 2017-18: B (55%) 2016-17: C (46%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	[Lucinda Thompson](#)
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 Lake 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

Mt. Dora Middle School

1405 LINCOLN AVE, Mount Dora, FL 32757

https://mms.lake.k12.fl.us//

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	82%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	55%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Lake 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.

Recognizing that all students are unique, the mission of Mt. Dora Middle School is to ensure that all students feel loved, respected, and encouraged while being inspired, educated, and prepared to achieve their fullest potential as lifelong learners and productive citizens in our global society.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Mt. Dora Middle School will create and support a safe, caring learning environment in which all students and adults feel welcomed, respected, and an important part of the school community. We believe each student deserves to be successful. Our family centered environment strives to develop confidence in students as we learn together and support one another, value differences in others, and become responsible citizens.

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
Farnsworth, Jennifer	Principal	
Feld, Charles	Assistant Principal	
Williams, Charlotte	Assistant Principal	
Porter, Erin	School Counselor	
Cornwell, Miranda	Instructional Technology	
McCulloch, Heidi	Teacher, ESE	
Randolph, Shena	Other	
Killion, Kelli	Reading Coach	
Evans, Bethany	School Counselor	

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Monday 8/2/2021, Jennifer Farnsworth

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.*
12

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

53

Total number of students enrolled at the school

823

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

21

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

19

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	254	289	280	0	0	0	0	823
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	67	81	71	0	0	0	0	219
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	15	23	0	0	0	0	49
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	19	1	0	0	0	0	24
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	20	17	0	0	0	0	40
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	68	70	64	0	0	0	0	202
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	67	82	71	0	0	0	0	220
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	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	115	218	152	0	0	0	0	485

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	1	3	4	0	0	0	0	8

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 8/31/2021

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	259	255	249	0	0	0	0	763
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	28	34	41	0	0	0	0	103
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	21	13	35	0	0	0	0	69
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	4	8	0	0	0	0	28
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	4	8	0	0	0	0	28
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	54	55	0	0	0	0	109
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	54	55	0	0	0	0	109

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	183	157	215	0	0	0	0	555

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	2	4	1	0	0	0	0	7

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	259	255	249	0	0	0	0	763
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	28	34	41	0	0	0	0	103
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	21	13	35	0	0	0	0	69
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	4	8	0	0	0	0	28
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	4	8	0	0	0	0	28
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	54	55	0	0	0	0	109
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	54	55	0	0	0	0	109

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	183	157	215	0	0	0	0	555

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	2	4	1	0	0	0	0	7

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				53%	50%	54%	52%	49%	53%
ELA Learning Gains				52%	52%	54%	50%	50%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				39%	44%	47%	42%	45%	47%
Math Achievement				62%	56%	58%	61%	55%	58%
Math Learning Gains				48%	55%	57%	63%	56%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				41%	46%	51%	57%	47%	51%
Science Achievement				48%	49%	51%	47%	51%	52%
Social Studies Achievement				63%	70%	72%	63%	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	50%	52%	-2%	54%	-4%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2021					
	2019	46%	49%	-3%	52%	-6%
Cohort Comparison		-50%				
08	2021					
	2019	58%	54%	4%	56%	2%
Cohort Comparison		-46%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2021					
	2019	52%	53%	-1%	55%	-3%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2021					
	2019	54%	58%	-4%	54%	0%
Cohort Comparison		-52%				
08	2021					
	2019	46%	39%	7%	46%	0%
Cohort Comparison		-54%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2021					
	2019	47%	49%	-2%	48%	-1%
Cohort Comparison						

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	0%	66%	-66%	67%	-67%
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	61%	71%	-10%	71%	-10%
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%	52%	40%	61%	31%

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	100%	49%	51%	57%	43%

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

We used the Fall and Winter Lake Standards Assessment Data (Traditional Student Schedule) to compile this data.

Grade 6				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	52	48	
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	42	36	
	English Language Learners	43	53	
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	59	39	
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	47	30	
	English Language Learners	51	41	

Grade 7				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	56	52	
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	42	42	
	English Language Learners	41	40	
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	49	38	
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	42	30	
	English Language Learners	44	38	
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Civics	All Students	56	44	54
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	54	34	43
	English Language Learners	46	34	38

Grade 8				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	41	44	
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	26	36	
	English Language Learners	33	39	
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	33	32	
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	28	29	
	English Language Learners	32	31	
Science	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	52		53
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	38		45
	English Language Learners	34		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	17	32	24	20	32	32	6	58			
ELL	30	44	34	27	40	50	7	63			
BLK	33	40	29	30	32	26	27	54	43		
HSP	39	44	34	37	31	30	19	71	43		
MUL	40	41		50	50		36	63			
WHT	52	46	44	54	37	49	43	75	63		
FRL	32	38	34	30	28	32	13	67	39		
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	36	33	27	41	38	24	33			
ELL	23	38	30	33	48	43	17	52			
ASN	60	40		90	80						

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
BLK	42	30	19	41	38	33	39	55	58		
HSP	46	50	34	49	45	36	35	56	69		
MUL	41	62	58	62	54		54	40	58		
WHT	62	57	49	74	52	46	56	72	75		
FRL	43	47	36	49	47	40	36	49	64		

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	15	32	28	22	49	47	15	37			
ELL	30	58	52	41	66	61		9			
ASN	83	71		92	86						
BLK	29	35	31	31	49	58	26	61	42		
HSP	42	47	43	52	54	47	29	52	39		
MUL	42	40	29	57	54	53	38	60			
WHT	62	55	46	72	71	68	58	70	65		
FRL	41	46	41	51	60	58	36	57	48		

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	41
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	445
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
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	37

English Language Learners	
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	
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	35
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	39
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	47
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	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	35
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?

Based on FSA 2021 data, there was a trend of a decline of all core content areas with the exception of civics. Students in math meeting high standards and achieving learning gains had a significant decline. The drop in math scores also created a significant decline in acceleration. The percentage of lowest quartile students making learning gains in ELA and math were also significantly low. Contributing factors appear to be a lack of structure during intervention time as well as a lack of strategic focus on these students during instructional time.

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

The greatest need for improvement is in science achievement and math meeting high standards, achieving learning gains, and achieving learning gains with the lowest quartile.

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

A certified math teacher moved into the AVID position to offer additional support with math tutorials. Weekly the students will have structures in place during Advisory time to have targeted remediation based off ALEKS progress checks and data.

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

Achievement in Civics increased by 8 percentage points.

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

The civics teachers collaborated to discuss student achievement data and then adjusted instruction. Teachers used Advisory time to work with students. Advisorty time is our intervention/enrichment time built in four days per week.

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

We will be offering tutoring before and after school for students. Algebra will be offered to 7th graders and geometry to 8th graders. In addition, we will utilize a variety of data sources to help create meaningful learning experiences during our advisory block, which is our 32 minute period (4x per week) reserved for every student to either participate in remediation, intervention or acceleration.

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.

Modeling lowest quartile data chats by coaches. Learning walks through advisory block based on best practices and expert teachers. Monthly PD led by coaches and administrators to focus on best strategies for "what do we do when students don't learn (remediation)" and "what do we do we we students have learned (acceleration)."

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

An experienced math teacher is working with all AVID students for tutorials, tutoring before and after school, advisory block and designated time each week for common planning and data chats. As an administrative team we will continue classroom learning walks and meet weekly as a leadership team.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Based upon FSA data Needs Assessment/Analysis section instructional practice specifically related to standards-aligned instruction is one of our most critical areas of focus. With high expectations, teachers will understand, plan, deliver, and differentiate standards-based instruction in all content areas for all students while intentionally incorporating setting the purpose, modeling thinking, guided instruction, collaborative learning, and independent learning; students will be able to state what they are learning, why they are learning it, how they know they have learned it. If we monitor and support common planning, then teachers will have the opportunity to plan for and evaluate student formative assessments/work products in order to increase student achievement. If we support the district's instructional framework, then teachers will understand and utilize modeling, guided instruction, collaborative and independent learning with high expectations for all students. This area of focus supports our goal of increasing overall proficiency and learning gains in all areas, as well as targeting the three ESSA components that are below 41%. We currently have three groups below the 41% and will focus on improving student achievement in these subgroups: English Language Learners, Students with Disabilities and African American Students. We will hold
Measurable Outcome:	Increase Reading, Thinking, Talking, and Writing as well as build capacity in setting the purpose for the lesson as well as teacher clarity. This will be evidenced by quarterly increases from the learning walk tool from baseline to mid-year. Increase student achievement in Math proficiency from 45% to 62%, Math learning gains from 35% to 48%, Math lowest quartile learning gains from 36% to 41%, ELA lowest quartile from 36% to 41%, and Science proficiency from 33% to 48%. Increase all ESSA components to at least 41%.
Monitoring:	Classroom walk-through data, department quarterly data chats of LSA's and APM data, lowest quartile data chats
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Jennifer Farnsworth (farnsworthj1@lake.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Common planning will be used to increase teacher capacity, therefore, leading to increases in student achievement. The new AMPLIFY curriculum will be implemented with fidelity and using technology resources available through the curriculum. To monitor this strategy classroom walk-throughs will be analyzed monthly to ensure transfer into instructional delivery from common planning is occurring.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	If we implement, monitor, and support common planning, then teachers will have the opportunity to plan for and evaluate student formative assessments/work products in order to increase student achievement.

Action Steps to Implement

Create a professional development series that focuses on the district instructional framework and PLC. The specific focus for the 2021-2022 school year will be setting purpose/teacher clarity.

Who: Administration and literacy coach

When: Monthly
Evidence: Professional development schedule, presentations, sign-in sheets, and CWT data.

3. Increase access to and enrollment in CTE Certification Classes, Algebra, & Geometry
Who: Scheduling Administrator
When: Each Semester
Evidence: Number of courses available and students enrolled in the courses
Frequency: Re-evaluate quarterly
Evidence: Schedule, Norms, List of protocols, and deliverables

2. Create a professional development series that focuses on the district instructional framework. The specific focus for the 2020-2021 school year will be setting purpose/teacher clarity.
Who: Administration and literacy coach
When: Monthly
Evidence: Professional development schedule, presentations, sign-in sheets, and CWT data.

Person Responsible	Kelli Killion (killionk@lake.k12.fl.us)

Create and establish a common planning schedule with identified facilitator/coach, clearly defined protocols, planning time frame, and expected products.
Who: Administration and literacy coach
When: 9/07/21, End 5/24/22
Frequency: Re-evaluate quarterly
Evidence: Schedule, Norms, List of protocols, and deliverables

Person Responsible	Jennifer Farnsworth (farnsworth.jennifer@mybradford.us)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Differentiation	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Based upon the lowest quartile data in ELA and Math from the Needs Assessment/Analysis section list interventions for the lowest quartile is one of our most critical areas of focus. This area of focus was identified as a critical area of need because for lowest quartile students, only 33% in Math and 36% in ELA made learning gains which impacts their ability to be success on statewide assessments. There are also three sub-groups performing under the required 41% in Students with disabilities, African American, and English Language Learners.
Measurable Outcome:	By focusing on this area, we expect to see increase in state level data from 36% to 41% in Math lowest quartile learning gains. We expect to see all sub-groups performing at or above the required 41% by ESSA.
Monitoring:	Classroom learning walks during advisory block, monthly data chats from progress monitoring tools.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Charles Feld (feldc@lake.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	A structured intervention time (Advisory block) will be used for students to work in ALEKS which will help to increase the lowest quartile learning gains in Math from 36% to 41%. Reading teacher will have structured intervention time with lowest quartile students which will help to increase lowest quartile learning gains from 36% to 41%. The new AMPLIFY curriculum will be implemented with fidelity and using technology resources available through the curriculum during intervention block. The intervention time will also address our identified sub-groups performing below the required 41% by ESSA. To monitor this strategy school/state/district level data, EWS data, and classroom walk-through data will be analyzed quarterly by the teacher support team.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	If we implement, monitor, and support a structured intervention time and how the then there will be an increase in our lowest quartile data as evidenced in school/state/district level data.

Action Steps to Implement

Create a structured intervention plan to support by non-load bearing staff and AVID tutors to implement ELA/Math interventions for student identified in the lowest quartile in ELA & Math.
students in need.

Who: Administration and literacy coach
When: 9/13/21, End 5/24/22
Frequency: Reevaluate quarterly
Evidence: School/state/district level data

Person Responsible	Kelli Killion (killionk@lake.k12.fl.us)

Implement the usage of ALEKS for all students to support quality instruction during Math & Intervention/ Acceleration block.

Who: Administration and literacy coach
When: 9/13/21, End 5/24/22

Frequency: Reevaluate quarterly
Evidence: School/state/district level data

Person Responsible	Kelli Killion (killionk@lake.k12.fl.us)

Offer before/after-school tutoring for level 1 & level 2 students to provide prescriptive assistance for students in need

Who: Administration and literacy coach
When: 10/1/21, End 4/1/22
Frequency: Available Monday thru Thrusday
Evidence: School/state/district level data

Person Responsible	Jennifer Farnsworth (farnsworth.jennifer@mybradford.us)

#3. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Early Warning Systems

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	By utilizing early warning systems data, Mount Dora Middle will increase attendance, positive student behaviors, and maintain a safe and supportive environment for all students. If we monitor early warning systems data quarterly and work with families to ensure expectations are clear, then we will increase attendance, positive student behaviors, and maintain a safe and supportive environment for all students.
Measurable Outcome:	Reduce the number of student referrals and reduce the number of suspensions each quarter. Reduce the amount of students with 10% or more absences by 10%.
Monitoring:	Quarterly data chats of early warning systems with teachers and administrators.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Charlotte Williams (williamsc1@lake.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Implementation of school-wide positive behavior plan to offer incentives for students demonstrating desired positive behaviors and monitor early warning signs to intervene with students displaying at-risk behaviors. Students will work with the Mental Health Liasion, school counselors, teachers and administrators.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	If we monitor early warning systems data quarterly and work with families and students to ensure expectations are clear, then we will increase attendance, positive student behaviors, and maintain a safe and supportive environment for all students.

Action Steps to Implement

Implementation of school-wide positive behavior plan to offer incentives for students demonstrating desired positive behaviors and monitor early warning signs to intervene with students displaying at-risk behaviors.

Who: Administration and guidance
When: 9/1/21, End 5/24/22

Person Responsible	[no one identified]

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.

MT. DORA MIDDLE SCHOOL reported 5.8 incidents per 100 students. This rate is greater than the Statewide middle/junior school rate of 4.2 incidents per 100 students. A primary concern was the amount of suspension. MDMS ranked 327/553 middles school. In reviewing and monitoring our discipline incidents, we we will implement restorative practices and opportunities for students to reflect on their behaviors in order to avoid suspensions.

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.

MDMS will continue developing a healthy culture and school environment by increasing attendance and positive student behaviors using the PBIS reward system and utilizing restorative practices.

The amount of students missing 10% of school will be decrease by 10%. The amount of students with one or more suspensions will be decreased by 10%.

Restorative Practices PD will be provided to every teacher on the campus.

If teachers are trained and utilize restorative practices then student discipline will decrease.

1. We have an updated behavior tracking/reward system that will allow flexibility for teachers to positively affect behavior.
2. P.A.S.S. class will be utilized to provide students with opportunities for restorative practices.
3. We will educate students on new rules and expectations using clearly defined protocols.

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

Stakeholders are parents, students, teachers, support staff, administrators and community members. Through our SAC and PTO we will collect feedback and work collaboratively with our community members. All Stakeholders play a key role in school performance and addressing equity. Mount Dora Middle School

will consult with various stakeholder groups to assist in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Standards-aligned Instruction				$4,655.37
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2021-22
	5100		0411 - Mt. Dora Middle School	Other		$4,649.48
			Notes: Viewsonic Materials for Amplify			
	5100		0411 - Mt. Dora Middle School	Other		$5.89
			Notes: Classroom Supplies			
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Differentiation				$10,645.63
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2021-22
	5100		0411 - Mt. Dora Middle School	Other		$9,216.79
			Notes: Before and After School Tutoring			
	5100		0411 - Mt. Dora Middle School	Other		$1,428.84
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Early Warning Systems				$0.00
					Total:	**$15,301.00**