

Seminole County Public Schools

Rock Lake Middle School



2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	18
Positive Culture & Environment	19
Budget to Support Goals	0

Rock Lake Middle School

250 SLADE DR, Longwood, FL 32750

<http://www.scps.k12.fl.us/schools/schoolinfopage.cfm?schoolnumber=0621>

Demographics

Principal: Martin Dunlop

Start Date for this Principal: 11/3/2019

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)	35%
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 (66%) 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 Seminole County School Board.

SIP Authority

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

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

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	18
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Rock Lake Middle School

250 SLADE DR, Longwood, FL 32750

<http://www.scps.k12.fl.us/schools/schoolinfopage.cfm?schoolnumber=0621>

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	37%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	40%

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 Seminole County School Board.

SIP Authority

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

The mission of Rock Lake Middle School is to prepare students to become productive citizens, future leaders and lifelong learners by inspiring and empowering them to excel academically, technologically, physically, creatively and socially.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Rock Lake Middle School will provide a safe and culturally diverse and supportive environment to promote learning for all students. We will acknowledge their intellectual, personal, social, physical and creative needs. We will meet these needs within an educational setting that encourages cooperative involvement from all stakeholders to provide a challenging and engaging curriculum, which is rich in technology and celebrates diversity with high expectations for all students.

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
Dunlop, Martin	Principal	Oversee day to day operations and monitor a variety of organizational tasks to determine overall efficiency
Wysong, Nicole	Assistant Principal	Supervise and evaluate teachers and paraprofessionals, IEP and 504 compliance, MTSS, EWS, Clinic Supervisor, SAC Liaison, SIP, Transition, Interns and Observers, Title IX Coordinator, Threat Assessment Team
Delfiaccio, MaryBeth	Assistant Principal	Supervise and evaluate teachers, master schedule, testing, professional development, field trips, ESOL compliance
Hogan, Beau	Dean	Discipline, textbooks, supervise custodians, facilities, Sonitrol contact, school events calendar, clubs, Threat Assessment Team

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Sunday 11/3/2019, Martin Dunlop

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.*

5

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.*

18

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

52

Total number of students enrolled at the school

987

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

9

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

5

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	308	315	361	0	0	0	0	984
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	1	2	1	0	0	0	0	4
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	21	26	0	0	0	0	57
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	7	14	0	0	0	0	36
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	29	35	46	0	0	0	0	110
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	39	33	46	0	0	0	0	118
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	13	15	0	0	0	0	41

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	48	45	17	0	0	0	0	110
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

Wednesday 9/1/2021

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	339	404	322	0	0	0	0	1065
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	26	26	0	0	0	0	52
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	23	11	0	0	0	0	35
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	30	27	45	0	0	0	0	102
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	19	37	32	0	0	0	0	88

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	1	9	5	0	0	0	0	15

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	20	20	21	0	0	0	0	61
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	339	404	322	0	0	0	0	1065	
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	26	26	0	0	0	0	52	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	23	11	0	0	0	0	35	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	30	27	45	0	0	0	0	102	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	19	37	32	0	0	0	0	88	

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	1	9	5	0	0	0	0	15	

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	20	20	21	0	0	0	0	61
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				66%	61%	54%	62%	60%	53%
ELA Learning Gains				57%	57%	54%	58%	56%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				49%	45%	47%	46%	43%	47%
Math Achievement				77%	66%	58%	71%	66%	58%
Math Learning Gains				77%	64%	57%	67%	64%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				64%	52%	51%	48%	48%	51%
Science Achievement				68%	59%	51%	60%	62%	52%
Social Studies Achievement				78%	75%	72%	84%	74%	72%

Grade Level Data Review - State Assessments

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

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2021					
	2019	62%	60%	2%	54%	8%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2021					
	2019	61%	58%	3%	52%	9%
Cohort Comparison		-62%				
08	2021					
	2019	71%	61%	10%	56%	15%
Cohort Comparison		-61%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2021					
	2019	73%	65%	8%	55%	18%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2021					
	2019	71%	61%	10%	54%	17%
Cohort Comparison		-73%				
08	2021					
	2019	73%	32%	41%	46%	27%
Cohort Comparison		-71%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2021					
	2019	68%	57%	11%	48%	20%
Cohort Comparison						

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019					
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	76%	74%	2%	71%	5%

HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019					
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	98%	61%	37%	61%	37%
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	100%	64%	36%	57%	43%

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

Common District Created Benchmark Assessments were utilized to progress monitor:

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

Grade 6				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	214/78%	175/67%	236/81%
	Economically Disadvantaged	66/70%	46/51%	78/75%
	Students With Disabilities	13/37%	8/29%	19/51%
	English Language Learners	7/47%	6/40%	10/59%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	223/80%	219/78%	238/80%
	Economically Disadvantaged	70/73%	70/73%	79/75%
	Students With Disabilities	20/57%	18/51%	21/55%
	English Language Learners	11/79%	11/73%	11/69%

Grade 7				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	280/84%	268/82%	318/91%
	Economically Disadvantaged	92/72%	88/72%	116/86%
	Students With Disabilities	24/53%	27/66%	31/74%
	English Language Learners	6/43%	5/42%	11/65%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	296/88%	263/79%	272/77%
	Economically Disadvantaged	103/77%	88/67%	86/61%
	Students With Disabilities	33/67%	26/57%	23/50%
	English Language Learners	8/57%	11/85%	7/41%
Civics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	306/91%	234/72%	230/73%
	Economically Disadvantaged	108/82%	72/59%	75/61%
	Students With Disabilities	35/73%	17/45%	14/39%
	English Language Learners	9/60%	4/31%	4/29%

Grade 8				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	228/85%	188/70%	225/82%
	Economically Disadvantaged	76/75%	65/64%	76/75%
	Students With Disabilities	19/57%	14/38%	16/44%
	English Language Learners	5/71%	3/43%	4/57%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	192/76%	213/84%	199/74%
	Economically Disadvantaged	67/74%	74/80%	65/66%
	Students With Disabilities	16/44%	20/59%	14/39%
	English Language Learners	4/57%	5/71%	3/43%
Science	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	153/75%	136/67%138/64%	62/72%
	Economically Disadvantaged	62/72%	54/61%	48/54%
	Students With Disabilities	14/40%	9/28%	14/40%
	English Language Learners	4/57%	3/43%	2/29%

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	30	30	29	29	20	21	35	36		
ELL	33	52	53	54	57	47		33			
ASN	70	67		83	75		85	64	88		
BLK	52	44	24	58	30	20	39	47	80		
HSP	54	54	40	63	52	36	55	64	65		
MUL	71	46		61	52	60		75			
WHT	68	58	34	78	61	31	67	78	73		
FRL	49	46	32	59	45	31	47	59	61		
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	31	26	30	54	54	30	27			
ELL	32	42	31	59	62	63					

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	74	61		91	78		90		80		
BLK	56	54	37	63	73	59	69	80			
HSP	58	49	50	68	71	56	56	68	41		
MUL	73	59		73	77		70	77			
WHT	69	60	49	82	80	69	71	81	67		
FRL	51	51	48	64	70	62	56	70	49		
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	19	45	43	24	31	26	24	45			
ELL	26	60	57	37	48	25					
ASN	88	71		100	78				100		
BLK	45	53	36	41	61	46	24	68			
HSP	51	54	38	59	61	45	46	79	63		
MUL	79	52		79	67						
WHT	66	59	52	77	69	49	64	88	57		
FRL	53	54	38	58	60	46	50	79	51		

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	60
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	74
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	601
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	91%
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	50
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	76
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	44
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	56
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	61
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	51
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Analysis

Data Analysis

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Grade 6-7 reflects the most improvement.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Increasing academic achievement of students with disabilities. ESSA Federal Percent of Points Index indicates this is a high priority need and focusing on the success of these students will reduce achievement gaps and prepare these students for future academic success.
Measurable Outcome:	Increase achievement and learning gains for students with disabilities.
Monitoring:	This area of focus will be monitored through classroom walk throughs, review of progress monitoring data and through data chats with professional learning communities.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Martin Dunlop (martin_dunlop@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 Martin Dunlop (martin_dunlop@scps.k12.fl.us)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

Rock Lake uses discipline data to determine which areas to address with students in the form of character education, school wide reminders, and individual conversations and mentoring of students. While RLMS scored in the "low" range in some categories, we cored in the "medium" range in regard to areas such as harassment, threat or intimidation, fighting, and sexual harassment. Also, the number of in-school suspensions has remained about the same. If we are able to educate and mentor our students to make better choices, we will see a continued decrease in in-school suspensions and see a steadier decrease in out of school 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.

Rock Lake Middle School staff works to promote a safe environment in which students have opportunities and can find a sense of belonging. Students understand that there are multiple adults on campus they can access when they need physical and emotional assistance. We have a Mindfulness Room in which students can find a few moments of peace and reduce anxiety. We have a supportive Guidance team, which works very closely with administration, the District Mental Health Counselor, and the Social Worker to support students and families. Faculty and staff, as well parents describe Rock Lake as a family environment. There are many opportunities for students on campus, such as before and after school clubs (video gaming, robotics competition, BETA Club, leadership, student government, etc.), sports (cross country, track, volleyball, basketball) and PIT Crew (Peer Inclusion Team).

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

Rock Lake Middle School works with all stakeholders to promote a positive culture and environment. Administrators work to develop relationships with teachers, students, families, volunteers, and community members. The School Advisory Council (SAC) meets monthly and is comprised of teachers, staff, parents, and community members. The SAC receives updates on school and student progress, and in turn provides input on the operations and goals of the school. The Parent Teacher Organization (PTO) supports Rock

Lake with fundraising and volunteering. The Program Advisory Council (PAC) meets two to three times a year to support our elective program with resources and industry feedback.