

Seminole County Public Schools

Greenwood Lakes Middle School



2022-23 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 | 15 |
| Positive Culture & Environment | 0 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 0 |

Greenwood Lakes Middle School

601 LAKE PARK DR, Lake Mary, FL 32746

<http://www.scps.k12.fl.us/schools/schoolinfopage.cfm?schoolnumber=0671>

Demographics

Principal: Breezi Erickson

Start Date for this Principal: 7/2/2016

| | |
|--|--|
| 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) | 66% |
| 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* Asian Students Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students* White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students |
| School Grades History | 2021-22: B (57%) 2018-19: B (61%) 2017-18: B (59%) |
| 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 | ATSI |
| * As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here . | |

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Seminole County School Board on 10/25/2022.

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 | 15 |
| Title I Requirements | 0 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 0 |

Greenwood Lakes Middle School

601 LAKE PARK DR, Lake Mary, FL 32746

<http://www.scps.k12.fl.us/schools/schoolinfopage.cfm?schoolnumber=0671>

School Demographics

| | | |
|--|---|--|
| <p>School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Middle School 6-8</p> | <p>2021-22 Title I School</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Yes</p> | <p>2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">66%</p> |
| <p>Primary Service Type (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">K-12 General Education</p> | <p>Charter School</p> <p style="text-align: center;">No</p> | <p>2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">62%</p> |

School Grades History

| | | | | |
|--------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|
| Year | 2021-22 | 2020-21 | 2019-20 | 2018-19 |
| Grade | B | B | B | B |

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Seminole County School Board on 10/25/2022.

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 Greenwood Lakes Middle School is to ensure that all students require the knowledge, skills, and attitudes to be productive citizens.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The vision of Greenwood Lakes Middle School is to engage students through academic learning time, academic and behavioral interventions, introduce levels of cognitive complexity, provide literacy across all content areas, decrease the achievement gap through relationship, instructional relevance and rigor, and instructional technology for the 21st century learner.

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 |
|------------------|---------------------|--|
| Erickson, Breezi | Principal | Oversees and Evaluates Literacy Team. Analyzes Student Data |
| Fletcher, Rendon | Assistant Principal | Assistant Principal and Principal's Designee |
| Hall, Jacqueline | Assistant Principal | Collaboratively develops and implements instructional framework |
| Sokolowsky, Evan | Other | Title I Compliance, Facilities, and Testing Coordinator |
| Smith, Latasha | Dean | Supports teachers in managing classroom behaviors and other related district initiatives |
| Fletcher, Gary | Dean | Supports teachers in managing classroom behaviors and other related district initiatives |

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Saturday 7/2/2016, Breezi Erickson

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.*

1

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.*

22

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

42

Total number of students enrolled at the school

1,004

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

20

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

13

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 | 351 | 331 | 337 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1019 |
| 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 | 7 | 9 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 27 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 12 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 23 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 5 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 24 |
| Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 83 | 58 | 63 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 204 |
| Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 126 | 89 | 61 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 276 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |

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 | 20 | 16 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 46 |

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 | 27 | 18 | 31 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 76 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 8/16/2022

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 | 348 | 348 | 295 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 991 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14 | 15 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 38 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 23 | 15 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 47 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 74 | 62 | 57 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 193 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 116 | 76 | 48 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 240 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

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

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | Total | |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|---|----|----|-------|----|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | | 12 |
| Students with two or more indicators | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 29 | 17 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 56 |

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 | 74 | 61 | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 153 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 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 | 348 | 348 | 295 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 991 |
| 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 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14 | 15 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 38 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 23 | 15 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 47 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 74 | 62 | 57 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 193 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 116 | 76 | 48 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 240 |
| 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 | 29 | 17 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 56 |

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 | 74 | 61 | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 153 |
| 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 | 55% | 59% | 50% | | | | 55% | 61% | 54% |
| ELA Learning Gains | 52% | | | | | | 58% | 57% | 54% |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | 40% | | | | | | 50% | 45% | 47% |
| Math Achievement | 50% | 37% | 36% | | | | 60% | 66% | 58% |
| Math Learning Gains | 59% | | | | | | 66% | 64% | 57% |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 58% | | | | | | 59% | 52% | 51% |
| Science Achievement | 53% | 62% | 53% | | | | 55% | 59% | 51% |
| Social Studies Achievement | 76% | 62% | 58% | | | | 61% | 75% | 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 | 54% | 60% | -6% | 54% | 0% |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 07 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 49% | 58% | -9% | 52% | -3% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -54% | | | | |
| 08 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 56% | 61% | -5% | 56% | 0% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -49% | | | | |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 06 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 52% | 65% | -13% | 55% | -3% |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 07 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 48% | 61% | -13% | 54% | -6% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -52% | | | | |
| 08 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 51% | 32% | 19% | 46% | 5% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -48% | | | | |

| 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 | 53% | 57% | -4% | 48% | 5% |
| Cohort Comparison | | 0% | | | | |

| BIOLOGY EOC | | | | | |
|--------------|--------|----------|-----------------------|-------|--------------------|
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2022 | | | | | |
| 2019 | 0% | 71% | -71% | 67% | -67% |
| CIVICS EOC | | | | | |
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2022 | | | | | |
| 2019 | 59% | 74% | -15% | 71% | -12% |
| 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 | 85% | 61% | 24% | 61% | 24% |
| GEOMETRY EOC | | | | | |
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2022 | | | | | |
| 2019 | 100% | 64% | 36% | 57% | 43% |

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 | 20 | 38 | 32 | 23 | 52 | 56 | 25 | 42 | 36 | | |
| ELL | 35 | 40 | 27 | 34 | 54 | 59 | 16 | 68 | | | |
| ASN | 60 | 68 | | 72 | 73 | | | | | | |
| BLK | 34 | 50 | 41 | 24 | 52 | 53 | 31 | 50 | 68 | | |
| HSP | 53 | 46 | 33 | 47 | 59 | 58 | 49 | 77 | 71 | | |
| MUL | 39 | 42 | 36 | 55 | 42 | 38 | 55 | 73 | | | |
| WHT | 67 | 57 | 47 | 62 | 62 | 67 | 65 | 87 | 74 | | |
| FRL | 47 | 50 | 37 | 41 | 55 | 56 | 41 | 68 | 68 | | |
| 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 | 20 | 35 | 31 | 20 | 34 | 33 | 17 | 43 | 38 | | |
| ELL | 38 | 53 | 43 | 33 | 41 | 26 | 22 | 46 | | | |

| 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 |
| ASN | 68 | 67 | | 58 | 28 | | | | | | |
| BLK | 31 | 35 | 27 | 28 | 29 | 28 | 22 | 46 | 64 | | |
| HSP | 50 | 52 | 37 | 45 | 40 | 39 | 41 | 72 | 72 | | |
| MUL | 52 | 46 | | 46 | 39 | | | 55 | | | |
| WHT | 69 | 57 | 45 | 63 | 45 | 47 | 54 | 81 | 72 | | |
| FRL | 46 | 46 | 34 | 40 | 38 | 36 | 33 | 64 | 66 | | |

| 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 | 24 | 49 | 45 | 27 | 54 | 51 | 28 | 25 | | | |
| ELL | 24 | 56 | 57 | 39 | 63 | 58 | 24 | 23 | | | |
| ASN | 70 | 78 | | 78 | 78 | | | 69 | | | |
| BLK | 35 | 51 | 48 | 41 | 61 | 59 | 34 | 54 | 84 | | |
| HSP | 48 | 56 | 51 | 53 | 62 | 58 | 39 | 48 | 80 | | |
| MUL | 63 | 61 | | 63 | 89 | | 73 | | | | |
| WHT | 67 | 62 | 47 | 71 | 68 | 59 | 72 | 71 | 88 | | |
| FRL | 43 | 54 | 50 | 51 | 63 | 57 | 44 | 54 | 84 | | |

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) | ATSI |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students | 55 |
| 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 | 38 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 554 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 10 |
| Percent Tested | 98% |

| Subgroup Data | |
|---|-----|
| Students With Disabilities | |
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities | 33 |
| Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | YES |
| Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |

| English Language Learners | |
|--|-----|
| Federal Index - English Language Learners | 41 |
| English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| 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 | 68 |
| 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 | 45 |
| Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| Hispanic Students | |
| Federal Index - Hispanic Students | 53 |
| Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| Multiracial Students | |
| Federal Index - Multiracial Students | 48 |
| 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 | 65 |
| White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |

| Economically Disadvantaged Students | |
|--|----|
| Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students | 50 |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| 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?

Percentage of students with 10+ absences increased from 28% to 51%.

Black, ELL, and SWD achievement levels significantly below 42% in both ELA and Math

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

C9As:

6th ELA 46%

6th Math 30%

7th Math 33%

8th Math 32%

FSA:

ELA Learning Gains 52%

ELA Lowest 25 40%

Math Achievement 50%

Science 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?

Factors contributing to the low performance of students 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 2022 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

Math LGs: 40-59%

Math LGs from Lowest 25: 36-58%

Science: 44-53%

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?

Teachers working on pedagogy and best practices through effective PLCs.

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 focus on instructional strategies Sustainability of improvement efforts Additional services dedicated to student acceleration include support of standards based instruction across all content areas, 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.

Areas of Focus

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

:

#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.

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

Measurable Outcome: Increase achievement and learning gains for students with disabilities.

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

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.

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Breezi Erickson (breezi_erickson@scps.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy: Lessons aligned to B.E.S.T. benchmarks at the appropriate grade 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.

Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

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.

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

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.

Understanding B.E.S.T. Standards and Implementation of Learning Targets within Classroom Lesson Plans.

Person Responsible Breezi Erickson (breezi_erickson@scps.k12.fl.us)

Ongoing feedback and conversation regarding instructional strategies within the Seminole County Instructional Model. In addition to PLC data chats, parents and students will be included in understanding student data through Title I ESOL Night, Literacy Night, Math Night, Coffee Connections, Student Led Conferences, and SOAR time lessons.

Person Responsible Breezi Erickson (breezi_erickson@scps.k12.fl.us)

Grade Level content areas will meet 1-2 times per week to discuss data, content, instructional strategies, and develop PLC Action Plans.

Person Responsible Breezi Erickson (breezi_erickson@scps.k12.fl.us)

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.

GLMS encourages community involvement and communicates with parents in a number of ways, including: Schedule Pick-Up; Open House - date is published on the school marquee; Skyward Family Access; the GLMS website; paper handouts and flyers sent home with the students; the bi-monthly Eagle Express newsletter; Twitter, Facebook, and Instagram; and the Principal's Update. GLMS hosts a number of before, during, and after-school community activities including: Science Fair; New Student Orientation; Coffee Connections; Literacy Night; Math Night; ESOL Night; Excel Your Eagle; school Spirit Nights with local business partners; Sporting Events; Fine Arts performances, and Arts Alive.

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

Stakeholders play an important role in GLMS' everyday affairs. Active participation in school programs such as the SCPS Dividends program, Lake Mary HS student volunteers, PBS, and SGA help our students succeed and achieve on a daily basis. Financial support and donations from community members such as Kick Off for Kids, Texas Roadhouse, Jeremiah's Italian Ice, and Chic-fil-a help fund programs like our clothing closet and food pantry for our Families in Need. Effective communication, shared vision, and collegiality are extremely important and our stakeholders are tasked with helping us address the diverse needs of our students.