Desoto Middle School

2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Desoto Middle School

420 E GIBSON ST, Arcadia, FL 34266

http://dms.desotoschools.com/

Demographics

Principal: David Boland

Start Date for this Principal: 6/15/2021

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
2021-22 Title I School	Yes
2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2021-22 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	2021-22: D (38%) 2018-19: C (43%) 2017-18: C (47%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	N/A
Support Tier	N/A
ESSA Status	CSI
* 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 Desoto 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

Desoto Middle School

420 E GIBSON ST, Arcadia, FL 34266

http://dms.desotoschools.com/

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	**2021-22 Title I School**	**2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
Middle School 6-8	Yes	100%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	69%

School Grades History

Year	2021-22	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19
Grade	D		C	C

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Desoto 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 DeSoto Middle School is to provide all students a positive learning environment focused on building relationships, high levels of student engagement and setting high expectations with academic rigor.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The vision of DeSoto Middle School is to provide a positive school culture that is student-focused, promoting the development of the whole child and inspiring lifelong learners.

School Leadership Team

Membership
For each member of the school leadership team, select the employee name and email address from the dropdown. Identify the position title and job duties/responsibilities.**:**

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Jones, Damien	Principal	
Edsall, Timothy	Assistant Principal	
Hines, Brittany	Dean	
Northern, Paula	Dean	
Weems, Keith	Dean	
Holland, Carrie	Instructional Coach	
Staples, Dan	Instructional Coach	

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Tuesday 6/15/2021, David Boland

Number of teachers with a 2022 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.*
0

Number of teachers with a 2022 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.*
17

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

Total number of students enrolled at the school
1,204

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2021-22 school year.
6

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2022-23 school year.
10

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

Using prior year's data, complete the table below with the number of students by current 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	461	375	318	0	0	0	0	1154
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	19	16	31	0	0	0	0	66
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	60	81	80	0	0	0	0	221
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	109	67	138	0	0	0	0	314
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	168	112	147	0	0	0	0	427
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	172	154	140	0	0	0	0	466
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	211	155	137	0	0	0	0	503
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	172	154	140	0	0	0	0	466

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level who have 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	8	32	46	0	0	0	0	86

Using current year data, complete the table below with the number of students identified as being "retained.":

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	58	9	3	0	0	0	0	70
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 8/8/2022

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

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	365	330	313	0	0	0	0	1008
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	105	11	21	0	0	0	0	137
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	54	37	53	0	0	0	0	144
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	92	69	78	0	0	0	0	239
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	75	72	80	0	0	0	0	227
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	92	69	78	0	0	0	0	239

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	270	251	237	0	0	0	0	758

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	1	2	1	0	0	0	0	4
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	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	30%	30%	50%				35%	35%	54%
ELA Learning Gains	36%						46%	46%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	25%						40%	40%	47%
Math Achievement	29%	26%	36%				36%	36%	58%
Math Learning Gains	43%						38%	38%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	46%						32%	32%	51%
Science Achievement	28%	29%	53%				30%	30%	51%
Social Studies Achievement	49%	43%	58%				46%	46%	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	2022					
	2019	33%	32%	1%	54%	-21%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2022					
	2019	29%	29%	0%	52%	-23%
Cohort Comparison		-33%				
08	2022					
	2019	40%	40%	0%	56%	-16%
Cohort Comparison		-29%				

MATH						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
06	2022					
	2019	37%	36%	1%	55%	-18%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2022					
	2019	34%	33%	1%	54%	-20%
Cohort Comparison		-37%				
08	2022					
	2019	9%	8%	1%	46%	-37%
Cohort Comparison		-34%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
06	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
07	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2022					
	2019	30%	29%	1%	48%	-18%
Cohort Comparison		0%				

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	**School**	**District**	**School Minus District**	**State**	**School Minus State**
2022					
2019					
CIVICS EOC					
Year	**School**	**District**	**School Minus District**	**State**	**School Minus State**
2022					
2019	44%	43%	1%	71%	-27%
HISTORY EOC					
Year	**School**	**District**	**School Minus District**	**State**	**School Minus State**
2022					
2019					

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	87%	40%	47%	61%	26%
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	0%	39%	-39%	57%	-57%

Subgroup Data Review

2022 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 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21
SWD	16	31	22	15	39	39	14	24			
ELL	14	26	24	20	39	45	8	36			
ASN	60			60							
BLK	24	34	23	18	35	43	32	36			
HSP	26	34	26	29	42	47	26	48	68		
MUL	33	53		33	44						
WHT	36	39	23	33	46	45	31	53	51		
FRL	26	34	27	25	41	48	27	46	63		
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	12	23	24	16	21	19	9	41			
ELL	25	35	34	20	17	32	3	33			
BLK	28	30	27	18	21	18	20	27			
HSP	32	34	24	28	23	27	19	36	62		
MUL	40	45		26	21						
WHT	38	42	38	32	32	26	37	51	75		
FRL	29	33	28	22	22	23	22	32	68		
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	16	40	31	17	30	28	17	35			
ELL	15	40	38	26	37	39	18	23	69		
BLK	26	41	39	21	29	27	15	41			
HSP	32	46	44	36	39	34	30	41	82		
MUL	32	56		15	21						
WHT	40	46	34	41	41	30	33	53	81		
FRL	29	45	40	31	35	29	24	43	76		

ESSA Data Review

This data has not been updated for the 2022-23 school year.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	CSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	37
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	YES
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	6
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	30
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	374
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	98%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	23
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	3
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	27
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	1
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%	0
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	60
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	31
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	3

Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	38
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	41
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
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%	0
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	40
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	36
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Part III: Planning for Improvement

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?

In ELA, overall achievement levels declined (-5%). Learning gains amongst bottom quartile students declined (-5%), and overall learning gains decreased (-1%). In Math, overall achievement levels raised slightly (+1%), while bottom quartile learning gains increased (+13%), and overall learning gains increased (+16%). Science achievement increased (+2%), and Civics achievement increased (+7%).

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

ELA/Reading is the top priority regarding achievement. While Science did increase slightly, achievement still needs to show improvement, as we are still well below state average. Math achievement, 29%, is well below the state average of 53%.

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

Low levels of expectations, teacher placement, and rigor contributed to low performance. In ELA, all teachers will receive instruction from a certified teacher. Low performing students will receive additional support via intensive reading coursework, which will include explicit instruction in foundational skills. Vertical alignment in Science will contribute to growth, along with common planning of all grade levels.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

Although math achievement increased only slightly (+1%), the lower quartile (+13%) and overall learning gains (+16%) increased. Civics showed growth as well (+7%). These numbers are consistent with STAR and benchmark progress monitoring data.

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

Consistent, grade-level instruction was a key component in Math, as opposed to previous years in which there were several non-certified teachers delivering instruction. In Civics, there was focus on planning/pacing to ensure all standards were covered. Also, benchmark data was utilized effectively to address student needs.

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

Strategies include a focus on developing lesson plans using Marzano strategies, and analyzing student placement. There will also be a focus on incorporating literacy in all content areas.

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.

School-wide PD will focus on implementing literacy strategies across content areas.

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

Teachers will be supported by school-based instructional coaches, providing assisting in standards-based lesson planning, research-based strategy implementation, and modeling. Additionally, the school will utilize both content coaches and lead teachers to support the professional development of teachers which will inevitably sustain improvement for the coming years. Data will be reviewed weekly/quarterly by leadership team to ensure effective implementation of strategies.

Areas of Focus
Identify the key Areas of Focus to address your school's highest priorities based on any/all relevant data sources.

:

#1. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Positive Behavior Interventions and Supports	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: **Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.**	During the 2021-22 school year, there were a total of 1903 office discipline referrals submitted, and increase of 8.3%, while only having 10 more students enrolled than the previous school year.
Measurable Outcome: **State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.**	The goal is to decrease the amount of office discipline referrals submitted by 10%, which would be approximately 1712 total referrals.
Monitoring: **Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.**	The Discipline department will analyze school-wide date each month to determine areas of need, and review implemented strategies.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Timothy Edsall (timothy.edsall@desotoschools.com)
Evidence-based Strategy: **Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.**	Full implementation of PBIS is ongoing, in an effort to address the need for a positive culture and an effect method of modifying student behavior.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: **Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.**	PBIS strategies are research-based and proven to create positive trends of student behavior and culture on school campuses.

Action Steps to Implement
List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Teachers participate in school-wide training, focusing on basic principles of PBIS implementation and strategies best suited to meet the needs of enrolled students.

Person Responsible	Keith Weems (keith.weems@desotoschools.com)

Student incentives and reward program scheduled and initiated.

Person Responsible	Brittany Hines (brittany.hines@desotoschools.com)

Monthly meetings scheduled, in which school-wide discipline data effectiveness of implemented PBIS strategies will be measured.

Person Responsible	Timothy Edsall (timothy.edsall@desotoschools.com)

Establish program for teacher-student mentorship.

Person Responsible	[no one identified]

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: **Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.**	Overall proficiency for the 21-22 school year in ELA was 29%, with 35% learning gains and 25% bottom quartile gains. In 6th grade, proficiency was 31%, with 35% learning gains and 23% bottom quartile gains. In 7th grade, proficiency was 14% with 29% learning gains and 31% bottom quartile gains. In 8th grade, there was 12% proficiency with 25% learning gains and 23% bottom quartile gains.
Measurable Outcome: **State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.**	By Spring of 2023, 50% or more of students will show proficiency in ELA as measured by state assessments and district-based progress monitoring. By Spring of 2023, 85% or more of classroom teachers will show effective implementation of standards-based lessons and assessments, made evident by classroom walkthroughs and progress monitoring data. By Spring of 2023, Instructional Coach, will train/model to 100% of ELA teachers effective reading and writing strategies made evident by administrative classroom walkthroughs.
Monitoring: **Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.**	This focus will be monitored via administrative walk throughs, close analysis of data generated by classroom-based assessments, statewide learning assessments, and district assessments.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Damien Jones (damien.jones@desotoschools.com)
Evidence-based Strategy: **Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.**	Capacity-building by leading staff through the process of curriculum alignment, which will increase their understanding of curriculum, its design, lesson planning, and developing standards-based assessments. Small-group instructional strategies will be fused into daily instruction, targeting individual student needs. Common assessments and data analysis will be used to monitor student progress. In addition, instruction will be monitored for curriculum alignment and instructional delivery.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: **Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.**	By having aligned curriculum, standards-based assessments, and differentiated instruction, students will experience significant academic growth.

Action Steps to Implement
List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Provide coaching and professional development to staff in curriculum alignment procedures.

Person Responsible	Carrie Holland (carrie.holland@desotoschools.com)

Identify targeted students, based on previous year's reading assessments and placing them in classes specifically designed for intensive reading instruction.

Person Responsible   Damien Jones (damien.jones@desotoschools.com)

Utilizing the Blended Learning Model, students will receive targeted instruction in whole group, small group, and independently through the adaptive program in intensive reading classes.

Person Responsible   Carrie Holland (carrie.holland@desotoschools.com)

Teachers will monitor data on a daily/weekly basis and lead data chats with students in an effort increase awareness and motivation of students regarding their own individual achievement.

Person Responsible   Carrie Holland (carrie.holland@desotoschools.com)

Teacher implementation and student progress will be monitored by administration and instructional coach via classroom walkthroughs, lesson plans, and analysis of school, district, and state mandated progress monitoring tools.

Person Responsible   Damien Jones (damien.jones@desotoschools.com)

Integrate research-based curriculum, Read 180, geared towards our low-performing students and those who require a higher tier of support

Person Responsible   Carrie Holland (carrie.holland@desotoschools.com)

Utilizing the DBQ Project, students will receive additional supports in learning to read, write, and develop critical thinking skills.

Person Responsible   Keith Weems (keith.weems@desotoschools.com)

Develop and train an ELA task force to evaluate and create aligned curriculum.

Person Responsible   Carrie Holland (carrie.holland@desotoschools.com)

Weekly collaborative planning by content area is utilized to plan instruction, share instructional strategies, and analyze data.

Person Responsible   Damien Jones (damien.jones@desotoschools.com)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: **Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.**	Overall proficiency for the 21-22 school year in Math was 29%, with 43% learning gains and 46% bottom quartile gains. In 6th grade, proficiency was 34%, with 41% learning gains and 30% bottom quartile gains. In 7th grade, proficiency was15% with 42% learning gains and 50% bottom quartile gains. In 8th grade, there was 15% proficiency with 41% learning gains and 44% bottom quartile gains.
Measurable Outcome: **State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.**	By Spring of 2023, 50% or more of students will show proficiency in Math as measured by state assessments and district-based progress monitoring. By Spring of 2023, 85% or more of classroom teachers will show effective implementation of standards-based lessons and assessments, made evident by classroom walkthroughs and progress monitoring data. By Spring of 2023, Instructional Coach, will train/model to 100% of Math teachers effective methods of checking for understanding, made evident by administrative classroom walkthroughs and progress-monitoring data.
Monitoring: **Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.**	This focus will be monitored via administrative walk throughs, close analysis of data generated by classroom-based assessments, statewide learning assessments, district assessments.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Damien Jones (damien.jones@desotoschools.com)
Evidence-based Strategy: **Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.**	Capacity-building by leading staff through the process of curriculum alignment, which will increase their understanding of curriculum, its design, lesson planning, and developing standards-based assessments. Small-group instructional strategies will be fused into daily instruction, targeting individual student needs. Common assessments and data analysis will be used to monitor student progress. In addition, instruction will be monitored for curriculum alignment and instructional delivery.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: **Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.**	By having aligned curriculum, standards-based assessments, and differentiated instruction, students will experience significant academic growth.

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Provide professional development regarding methods of checking for understanding and student engagement.

Person Responsible	Damien Jones (damien.jones@desotoschools.com)

Provide coaching and professional development to staff in curriculum alignment procedures.

Person Responsible	Dan Staples (dan.staples@desotoschools.com)

Teachers will monitor data on a daily/weekly basis and lead data chats with students in an effort increase awareness and motivation of students regarding their own individual achievement.

Person Responsible   Damien Jones (damien.jones@desotoschools.com)

Implement administrative walk throughs, close analysis of data generated by classroom-based assessments, statewide learning assessments, and district assessments.

Person Responsible   Damien Jones (damien.jones@desotoschools.com)

Weekly collaborative planning by content area is utilized to plan instruction, share instructional strategies, and analyze data.

Person Responsible   Dan Staples (dan.staples@desotoschools.com)

Utilize supplemental resources to increase student engagement and close learning gaps.

Person Responsible   Dan Staples (dan.staples@desotoschools.com)

Develop and train a Math task force to evaluate and create aligned curriculum.

Person Responsible   Dan Staples (dan.staples@desotoschools.com)

Provide teacher resources for scaffolding math instruction.

Person Responsible   Damien Jones (damien.jones@desotoschools.com)

#4. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: **Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.**	Overall student proficiency was 28% at or above grade level.
Measurable Outcome: **State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.**	By Spring of 2023, 50% or more of students will show proficiency in Math as measured by state assessments and district-based progress monitoring. By Spring of 2023, 85% or more of classroom teachers will show effective implementation of standards-based lessons and assessments, made evident by classroom walkthroughs and progress monitoring data. By Spring of 2023, Instructional Coach, will train/model to 100% of Science teachers on effective implementation of standards-based lessons, made evident by administrative classroom walkthroughs.
Monitoring: **Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.**	This focus will be monitored via administrative walk throughs, close analysis of data generated by classroom-based assessments, statewide learning assessments, and district assessments.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	[no one identified]
Evidence-based Strategy: **Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.**	Capacity-building by leading staff through the process of curriculum alignment, which will increase their understanding of curriculum, its design, lesson planning, and developing standards-based assessments. Small-group instructional strategies will be fused into daily instruction, targeting individual student needs. Common assessments and data analysis will be used to monitor student progress. In addition, instruction will be monitored for curriculum alignment and instructional delivery
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: **Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.**	By having aligned curriculum, standards-based assessments, and differentiated instruction, students will experience significant academic growth.

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Develop and train a Science task force to evaluate and create aligned curriculum.

Person Responsible	Dan Staples (dan.staples@desotoschools.com)

Weekly collaborative planning by content area is utilized to plan instruction, share instructional strategies, and analyze data.

Person Responsible	Dan Staples (dan.staples@desotoschools.com)

Utilize supplemental resources to increase student engagement and close learning gaps.

Person Responsible	Keith Weems (keith.weems@desotoschools.com)

Implement administrative walk throughs, close analysis of data generated by classroom-based assessments, statewide learning assessments, and district assessments.

Person Responsible   Damien Jones (damien.jones@desotoschools.com)

Provide professional development regarding methods of checking for understanding and student engagement

Person Responsible   Damien Jones (damien.jones@desotoschools.com)

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 is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies that impact the school culture and environment. 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.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment.

The school addresses building a positive school culture and environment by being all-inclusive in the decision making processes of the school. All immediate stakeholders have a voice including teachers, parents, students, and community members. The doors to the school are always open to those who wish to see all that the school has to offer. Spearheaded by the PBIS committee, teachers and students are celebrated through various measures including incentive-based recognition. Ongoing data analysis lends toward a fluid method of improving implemented strategies as the school year progresses.

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

Keith Weems-PBIS Coordinator
Administration Team-Implementation of PBIS strategies and data analysis
Guidance Team-Student scheduling and counseling
Parents-participation on SAC committee assisting with direction of school and utilization of funds