Midway Elementary School

2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Midway Elementary School

2368 BRISSON AVE, Sanford, FL 32771

http://www.scps.k12.fl.us/schools/schoolinfopage.cfm?schoolnumber=0301

Demographics

Principal: Mallory Lambert

Start Date for this Principal: 5/6/2017

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
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)	88%
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 (49%) 2017-18: C (45%) 2016-17: C (46%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	[LaShawn Russ-Porterfield](#)
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, [click here](#).	

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Seminole County School Board.

SIP Authority

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

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

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Table of Contents

Midway Elementary School

2368 BRISSON AVE, Sanford, FL 32771

http://www.scps.k12.fl.us/schools/schoolinfopage.cfm?schoolnumber=0301

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)
Elementary School PK-5	Yes	85%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	87%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Seminole County School Board.

SIP Authority

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

Midway Elementary School of the Arts provides a positive academic and arts-linked experience, where all students reach their highest potential and become life-long learners.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Midway Elementary School is a place where all students are encouraged to strive for excellence academically, socially, and emotionally in a safe and supportive atmosphere. Our goal is to work in a partnership with our parents and community to create an environment where students are empowered to discover their strengths and to achieve their maximum potential. Opportunities are available for enrichment, intervention, and remediation as necessary. We set high expectations for all students. Our entire school community shares the belief that all children can and will learn. Our staff, students and community are one family!

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
Lambert, Mary	Principal	Leads the school, monitors school achievement data and progress monitoring, PLC effectiveness across all grade levels using data, oversees systems management; MTSS and SST, 5 Essentials, oversees curriculum and effective interventions, facilitates communication with staff, community, SAC and PTA, and serves as an instructional leader.
Wood, Olga	Assistant Principal	Oversees ESE & ELL scheduling and monitors for effectiveness, Manages tutorial, Supervises Professional Development, Truancy, Discipline, CSM, oversees PLCs Math K - 5 and Science 3 - 5 for effectiveness, Testing Coordinator, monitors school achievement data, and serves as an instructional leader...assists the principal.
Quinn, Scheshin	Instructional Coach	Lead PLCs & Professional Development, Coach Conditions for Learning & Instructional Best Practices
Buchanan, Marie	School Counselor	Supports MTSS, Social Emotional Learning, and Family Resources.
Pombonyo, Christopher	Assistant Principal	Title One Liaison, Oversees Magnet, Family Involvement, Scheduling of school events, assigns staff/custodial duties, oversees PLCs ELA K - 5 for effectiveness, textbooks and other inventories, school-wide scheduling, monitors the effectiveness of PBIS, Testing Coordinator, monitors school achievement data, and serves as an instructional leader....assists the principal.
Slaughter, Nikhail	Instructional Coach	Lead PLCs & Professional Development, Coach Conditions for Learning & Instructional Best Practices
Dudley, Kimberly	Reading Coach	Leads Reading PLCS & Professional Development, Analyze & Monitor School – Wide Reading Data and Instructional Best Practices

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Saturday 5/6/2017, Mallory Lambert

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.*
1

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

67

Total number of students enrolled at the school

749

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.

9

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	105	117	141	140	129	118	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	750
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Course failure in ELA	2	23	17	15	7	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	69
Course failure in Math	1	7	7	3	5	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	30
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	4	38	28	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	70
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	4	34	36	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	74
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	33	44	58	59	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	194

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	3	31	24	19	56	46	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	179

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	3	15	18	33	30	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	119
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 8/30/2021

2020-21 - As Reported

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	117	142	149	142	130	123	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	803
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	9	21	21	8	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	65
Course failure in Math	9	8	15	4	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	39
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	8	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	27
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	3	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	27
	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	1	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14

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	10	17	42	39	23	32	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	163
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	117	142	149	142	130	123	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	803
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	9	21	21	8	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	65
Course failure in Math	9	8	15	4	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	39
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	8	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	27
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	3	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	27
	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	1	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14

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	10	17	42	39	23	32	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	163
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				49%	67%	57%	46%	63%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				55%	61%	58%	47%	58%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				59%	51%	53%	49%	47%	48%
Math Achievement				54%	70%	63%	52%	68%	62%
Math Learning Gains				46%	66%	62%	43%	62%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				37%	50%	51%	34%	46%	47%
Science Achievement				43%	62%	53%	41%	66%	55%

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
03	2021					
	2019	52%	67%	-15%	58%	-6%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	47%	65%	-18%	58%	-11%
Cohort Comparison		-52%				
05	2021					
	2019	45%	64%	-19%	56%	-11%
Cohort Comparison		-47%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	67%	71%	-4%	62%	5%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	53%	72%	-19%	64%	-11%
Cohort Comparison		-67%				
05	2021					
	2019	42%	65%	-23%	60%	-18%
Cohort Comparison		-53%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	41%	62%	-21%	53%	-12%
Cohort Comparison						

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

iReady Diagnostic Assessments were utilized to progress monitor:
• ELA – Grades 1-5
• Mathematics – Grades 1-5
In Grade 5 Science, teacher based formative assessments were used for progress monitoring. Data is unavailable for these assessments.

Grade 1				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	31/30%	49/41%	73/59%
	Economically Disadvantaged	24/26%	40/37%	60/55%
	Students With Disabilities	2/14%	1/6%	2/13%
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	18/17%	26/22%	60/48%
	Economically Disadvantaged	11/12%	19/18%	47/43%
	Students With Disabilities	4/29%	2/13%	6/40%
	English Language Learners	0	0	0

Grade 2				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	24/20%	42/33%	54/41%
	Economically Disadvantaged	18/17%	33/30%	44/39%
	Students With Disabilities	0	2/11%	2/11%
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	10/8%	27/21%	40/30%
	Economically Disadvantaged	6/6%	20/18%	34/30%
	Students With Disabilities	0	2/10%	4/5%
	English Language Learners	0	0	0

Grade 3				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	14/12%	26/21%	39/29%
	Economically Disadvantaged	13/13%	23/21%	32/27%
	Students With Disabilities	1/8%	3/19%	2/13%
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	18/16%	32/26%	70/51%
	Economically Disadvantaged	15/15%	26/24%	57/48%
	Students With Disabilities	1/7%	2/13%	8/50%
	English Language Learners	0	0	0

Grade 4				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	35/33%	53/47%	63/55%
	Economically Disadvantaged	25/27%	40/41%	50/50%
	Students With Disabilities	1/5%	5/25%	5/25%
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	26/25%	36/32%	68/59%
	Economically Disadvantaged	21/23%	28/29%	56/55%
	Students With Disabilities	2/10%	4/20%	8/38%
	English Language Learners	0	0	0

Grade 5				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	32/30%	43/38%	47/41%
	Economically Disadvantaged	20/22%	33/34%	34/35%
	Students With Disabilities	3/10%	4/13%	1/3%
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	36/34%	51/45%	58/50%
	Economically Disadvantaged	26/29%	39/40%	45/47%
	Students With Disabilities	3/10%	8/26%	8/27%
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
Science	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	0	0	0
	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	23	24	18	24	32	38	18				
ELL	34			31							
BLK	36	35	40	42	40	29	26				
HSP	60	60		43	51		56				
MUL	64			57							
WHT	63			60			80				
FRL	43	42	37	42	44	48	34				
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	44	62	33	44	34	15				
ELL	53	73		31	45						
BLK	34	46	64	46	43	36	28				

2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS										
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
HSP	60	64	50	60	58	46	65				
MUL	61	53		57	27						
WHT	71	69		70	48		49				
FRL	45	54	60	51	43	35	40				
2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS										
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	17	35	50	34	31	26	9				
ELL	33	25		27	8						
BLK	34	44	49	43	38	36	33				
HSP	60	49		61	46	8	48				
MUL	59	79		50	53						
WHT	55	41		65	46		50				
FRL	42	45	48	48	40	34	36				

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	2
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	69
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	378
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%
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	45
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO

English Language Learners	
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	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	57
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	61
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	68
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	45
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Analysis

Data Analysis
Answer the following analysis questions using the progress monitoring data and state assessment data, if applicable.

What trends emerge across grade levels, subgroups and core content areas?

The performance of students with disabilities across all grade levels and content areas is a concerning trend.

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

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

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

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

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

Progress monitoring data reflects improvement for ELA and mathematics at all grade levels.

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

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

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

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

Based on the contributing factors and strategies identified to accelerate learning, describe the professional development opportunities that will be provided at the school to support teachers and leaders.

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

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

Additional services dedicated to student acceleration include social emotional learning support for students and families, data driven tutoring and acceleration support; and expanded use of SCPS early warning tracking and MTSS based support.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Increasing academic achievement of students with disabilities. ESSA Federal Percent of Points Index indicates this is a high priority need and focusing on the success of these students will reduce achievement gaps and prepare these students for future academic success.
Measurable Outcome:	Increase achievement and learning gains for students with disabilities.
Monitoring:	This area of focus will be monitored through classroom walk throughs, review of progress monitoring data and through data chats with professional learning communities.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Mary Lambert (mary_lambert@scps.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Lessons aligned to Florida Standards at the appropriate level of complexity with ongoing feedback loops between leadership and teachers, students and teachers and student with students and PLCs focused on data, instructional planning and student evidence of learning.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Standards based lessons differentiated to meet the needs of these specific student groups and data driven deliberate action planning will improve achievement and learning gains for our students. This strategy is aligned to having high expectations for all learners and teachers.

Action Steps to Implement

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

Person Responsible	Mary Lambert (mary_lambert@scps.k12.fl.us)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Improving Reading/ELA instruction for all students. FSA achievement data reflects that less than 50% of students scored a level 3 or above on the 2021 FSA.
Measurable Outcome:	The measurable outcome will be an increase in the percentage of students scoring level 3 or above on the spring 2022 FSA.
Monitoring:	This area of focus will be monitored through strategic, data aligned PLC planning and collaboration, common formative assessment data, DRA and iReady outcomes.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Mary Lambert (mary_lambert@scps.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Research reflects a 0.47 effect size for small group learning.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	By working with students in small groups, teachers can provide targeted lessons and feedback to quickly accelerate student learning through both differentiation in the core and intervention.

Action Steps to Implement

Developing highly collaborative PLCs strategically focused on the use of formative assessment data.
Utilizing results of DRA and iReady diagnostics to design reading acceleration support for students.
Utilizing SCPS Early Warning/MTSS systems to support interventions.
Reading walk-throughs focused on identifying standards-based and differentiated whole group instruction and small group instruction.
Utilizing pacing calendars and research based instructional materials and practices in 90-minute block.
Utilizing additional research-based intervention curriculum for tier 2 and 3 students.
See Seminole County Public Schools' School Improvement Plan for additional details.

Person Responsible	Mary Lambert (mary_lambert@scps.k12.fl.us)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the SafeSchoolsforAlex.org, compare the discipline data of the school to discipline data across the state and provide primary or secondary areas of concern that the school will monitor during the upcoming school year. Include how the school culture and environment will be monitored through the lens of behavior or discipline data.

Midway Elementary has weekly Discipline and Conditions for Learning meetings to discuss the weekly data and create alternative discipline actions to address the current needs. Our behavior support team; Behavior Support Teacher, School Counselor, School Social Worker, MHC, our Staffing Specialist, and Administration observe and develop behavior plans, strategies, and professional development for our teachers to implement in order to support our students.

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.

Midway Elementary School uses a squad system to motivate students and staff to build a positive school culture and environment. Each student and staff member participates in monthly squad meetings and restorative circles to develop social emotional skills and a school community. Students and staff attend monthly squad rallies based on leadership characteristics to celebrate student learning and success. Students earn squad points for their teams and towards a squad store where they can shop quarterly. Teachers and staff implement a unique positive reward system to reinforce positive behaviors within their own classrooms. School-wide, students participate in a morning positive affirmation to build self-confidence. Families and students attend monthly family involvement events to stay connected to our school community and their child's learning.

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

Administration Oversee Teacher led committees for the planning school-wide events Motivate teachers and students to reach their highest potential Teachers Facilitate planning committees and provide students with opportunities to participate in activities within their classrooms Support Staff Facilitates committees and provides students with opportunities to participate in activities school - wide Students Participate in school-wide activities Families Support the school's goals Volunteers Support the school's goals