

Okaloosa County School District

Clifford Meigs 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 | 14 |
| Positive Culture & Environment | 0 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 0 |

Clifford Meigs Middle School

150 RICHBOURG AVE, Shalimar, FL 32579

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Melissa Powell

Start Date for this Principal: 8/28/2022

| | |
|--|---|
| 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 | No |
| 2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3) | 60% |
| 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: C (50%) 2018-19: A (67%) 2017-18: A (64%) |
| 2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information* | |
| SI Region | Northwest |
| Regional Executive Director | Rachel Heide |
| 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 is pending approval by the Okaloosa 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 | 14 |
| Title I Requirements | 0 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 0 |

Clifford Meigs Middle School

150 RICHBOURG AVE, Shalimar, FL 32579

[no web address on file]

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 | No | 60% |
| Primary Service Type (per MSID File) | Charter School | 2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2) |
| K-12 General Education | No | 37% |

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Okaloosa 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.

We improve the lives of our students and community by teaching students how to be safe, respectful, and responsible by owning their actions.

Provide the school's vision statement.

We inspire the next generation of student leaders.

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 |
|-----------------|---------------------|---|
| Bowell, Melissa | Principal | Instructional leader who oversees and holds everyone accountable for the instruction of students. |
| Jones, Rachel | Assistant Principal | Student Services/Guidance Office Oversight |
| Yoder, Nathan | Teacher, ESE | ESE Math Teacher |
| Little, Christy | Teacher, ESE | ESE ELA Teacher |

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Sunday 8/28/2022, Melissa Bowell

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.*

2

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

36

Total number of students enrolled at the school

629

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

4

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

5

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 | 235 | 177 | 217 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 629 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 27 | 36 | 33 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 96 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 15 | 21 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 40 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 18 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 17 |
| Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 46 | 40 | 52 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 138 |
| Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 55 | 40 | 41 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 136 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 46 | 40 | 52 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 138 |

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 | 60 | 49 | 57 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 166 |

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 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 |

Date this data was collected or last updated

Sunday 8/28/2022

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

| Indicator | Grade Level | Total |
|--|-------------|-------|
| Number of students enrolled | | |
| Attendance below 90 percent | | |
| One or more suspensions | | |
| Course failure in ELA | | |
| Course failure in Math | | |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment | | |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment | | |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | | |

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

| Indicator | Grade Level | Total |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|-------|
| Students with two or more indicators | | |

The number of students identified as retainees:

| Indicator | Grade Level | Total |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|-------|
| Retained Students: Current Year | | |
| Students retained two or more times | | |

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 | 169 | 207 | 200 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 576 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 37 | 31 | 36 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 104 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 16 | 19 | 30 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 65 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 16 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 48 | 57 | 48 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 153 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 49 | 47 | 50 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 146 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 48 | 57 | 48 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 153 |

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 | 45 | 46 | 50 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 141 |

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 | 7 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 |

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 | 49% | 55% | 50% | | | | 62% | 67% | 54% |
| ELA Learning Gains | 37% | | | | | | 59% | 59% | 54% |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | 24% | | | | | | 55% | 56% | 47% |
| Math Achievement | 53% | 36% | 36% | | | | 74% | 75% | 58% |
| Math Learning Gains | 56% | | | | | | 65% | 65% | 57% |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 46% | | | | | | 74% | 63% | 51% |
| Science Achievement | 61% | 63% | 53% | | | | 70% | 71% | 51% |
| Social Studies Achievement | 71% | 66% | 58% | | | | 82% | 81% | 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 | 61% | 63% | -2% | 54% | 7% |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 07 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 54% | 58% | -4% | 52% | 2% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -61% | | | | |
| 08 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 64% | 66% | -2% | 56% | 8% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -54% | | | | |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 06 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 69% | 62% | 7% | 55% | 14% |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 07 | 2022 | | | | | |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|-------------------|-------------|---------------|-----------------|-----------------------------------|--------------|--------------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| | 2019 | 73% | 73% | 0% | 54% | 19% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -69% | | | | |
| 08 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 52% | 65% | -13% | 46% | 6% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -73% | | | | |

| 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 | 69% | 67% | 2% | 48% | 21% |
| 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 | 78% | 77% | 1% | 71% | 7% |

| 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 | 92% | 77% | 15% | 61% | 31% |

| GEOMETRY EOC | | | | | |
|--------------|--------|----------|-----------------------|-------|--------------------|
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2022 | | | | | |
| 2019 | 100% | 73% | 27% | 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 | 22 | 31 | 23 | 26 | 38 | 36 | 40 | 56 | 31 | | |
| ELL | 23 | 35 | 35 | 40 | 48 | 50 | 40 | 72 | | | |
| ASN | 80 | | | 80 | 60 | | | | | | |
| BLK | 35 | 38 | 31 | 32 | 55 | 43 | 38 | 54 | | | |
| HSP | 30 | 30 | 30 | 49 | 56 | 48 | 43 | 79 | 48 | | |
| MUL | 50 | 40 | 21 | 49 | 56 | 38 | 86 | 53 | 52 | | |
| WHT | 54 | 38 | 21 | 57 | 56 | 48 | 61 | 73 | 58 | | |
| FRL | 37 | 33 | 21 | 41 | 54 | 46 | 46 | 65 | 41 | | |
| 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 | 35 | 33 | 24 | 32 | 25 | 22 | 55 | 27 | | |
| ELL | 34 | 55 | 53 | 30 | 41 | 42 | | 54 | | | |
| ASN | | | | 80 | 80 | | | | | | |
| BLK | 63 | 74 | 64 | 29 | 14 | 17 | 41 | 47 | 60 | | |
| HSP | 54 | 51 | 30 | 41 | 29 | 26 | 41 | 72 | 50 | | |
| MUL | 45 | 42 | 25 | 44 | 28 | 29 | 71 | 65 | 50 | | |
| WHT | 59 | 54 | 49 | 55 | 36 | 32 | 61 | 79 | 59 | | |
| FRL | 46 | 48 | 40 | 37 | 31 | 29 | 50 | 62 | 52 | | |
| 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 | 27 | 43 | 43 | 45 | 69 | 68 | 48 | 65 | | | |
| ELL | 52 | 58 | 55 | 76 | 76 | 80 | | | | | |
| ASN | 77 | 67 | | 85 | 75 | | | | | | |
| BLK | 43 | 50 | 52 | 52 | 58 | 70 | 46 | 62 | 44 | | |
| HSP | 63 | 60 | 58 | 73 | 76 | 85 | 86 | 67 | 45 | | |
| MUL | 63 | 64 | 50 | 68 | 74 | 85 | 67 | 79 | 67 | | |
| WHT | 65 | 59 | 56 | 78 | 63 | 70 | 73 | 86 | 67 | | |
| FRL | 56 | 59 | 54 | 67 | 67 | 74 | 59 | 78 | 51 | | |

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 | 50 |
| 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 | 42 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 496 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 10 |
| Percent Tested | 99% |
| Subgroup Data | |
| Students With Disabilities | |
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities | 34 |
| 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 | 43 |
| 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 | 73 |
| 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 | 41 |
| 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 | 46 |

| Hispanic Students | |
|--|-----|
| 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 | 49 |
| 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 | 52 |
| 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 | 43 |
| 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?

The trends indicate that students at Meigs have dropped across the board.

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

Students with disabilities demonstrate the greatest need for improvement, though all student groups also need to improve.

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

Our lowest 25% did not grow. Tier 1 instruction needs to change to include giving students access to on grade level texts/ questions with interactive whole group instruction while during the day pull-out remediation should occur to focus on Tier 2 and Tier 3 with the SWD subgroup.

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

6th grade math, Civics, 8th grade science, Algebra I Honors, and Geometry all saw gains compared

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

We had a new 8th grade science teacher who varied her lessons and focused on spiraling the 6th and 7th grade science standards.

6th grade math had a new teacher as well who focused on the standards and remediation in class. Algebra I Honors grew enrollment and increased % of students who passed the EOC as did Geometry. This can be attributed to the planning and vertical alignment between and among the Algebra and Geometry teacher.

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

Tier 1 instruction across Meigs Middle School needs to change to make interactive whole group instruction, student talk, and cooperative groups the norm. These strategies will help accelerate on grade-level learning while plan of care tutoring (Tier 2 and Tier 3) (both during the day and after school) will help remediate any learning gaps.

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.

1. Text Marking and TDQ PD
2. Instructional Rounds
3. Small Groups and Stations
4. District-Based PD which focuses on the new benchmarks and standards

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

1. Common planning with grade level content "buddies"
2. Additional professional development days
3. Fidelity of implementation of our own School Performance Plan

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:

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

Our SWD demographic didn't make 41% gains. These students, based on the data, are a critical need.

Measurable Outcome:

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

41% of Students with Disabilities at Meigs will make growth on their FAST PM test by May 2023.

Monitoring:

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

Growth of SWD from PM1 to PM2 then from PM2 to PM3. The school will also utilize district-level progress monitoring data.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Melissa Bowell (bowellm@okaloosaschools.com)

Evidence-based Strategy:

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

Interactive Whole Group Instruction, Close Reading Strategies, and Teacher-led Small Groups and Stations

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

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

Since we are targeting Tier 1 instruction, interactive whole group instruction, close reading strategies, and teacher-led small groups and stations will help students access on grade-level texts and standards/benchmarks.

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.

2 walk throughs a day per administrator

Person Responsible

Melissa Bowell (bowellm@okaloosaschools.com)

2 walk throughs a day per administrator

Person Responsible

Rachel Jones (rachel.jones@okaloosaschools.com)

Tier 1 Instructional Strategies- all teachers at Meigs

Person Responsible

Nathan Yoder (nathan.yoder@okaloosaschools.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.

Meigs is a PBIS school and our students and teachers are rewarded for being safe, responsible, respectful, and owning their actions. We have a student leadership class and student government association that helps better improve the student culture on campus. Meigs routinely has parent volunteers who help on campus in everything from going door to door to deliver treats to teachers to mentoring students in need. Additionally, we have a strong partnership with community agencies in our town of Shalimar, who also help all of our students, including those who qualify for free/reduced lunch and struggle academically.

This year, we have also had embedded yearly professional development with Growing Beyond the Books, which aims to develop individuals both personally and professionally by helping to improve communication, collaboration, and cohesiveness among all school faculty, staff, and students by promoting empathy to enhance the school environment. Additionally, PD will amplify healthy relationships for all, building a true culture and community on Meigs' campus. It is just as important that teachers feel a deep sense of pride and community within the campus as it is students do.

Homeroom, called Pride Time, is daily for 10 minutes. It is during Pride time that teachers teach basic lessons surrounding our school's vision and mission while also teaching students how to be safe, respectful, responsible, and how to own their actions. Each student's Pride teacher will "follow" them for the 3 years they are at Meigs, building an even deeper relationship with their homeroom teacher. We all know that when a student has a safe space to grow, they foster an even deeper sense of well-being and belonging.

We have routine pep rallies celebrating our school's athletes and coaches and students vote and plan on what will be the theme and focus of the pep rally. Giving students a sense of ownership and a deeper sense of school culture, students look forward to voting on and creating the content of the pep rally. This gives students a sense of Wildcat Pride in coming together to cheer on their favorite female and male athletes.

Another thing we are doing to promote and create school culture is beginning a monthly Club Day. The final Friday of each month, students will go to the club of their choice, sponsored by an adult on campus. Students created the ideas for their favorite clubs and teachers chose what they wanted to sponsor based on the student club interest list. From the jewelry making club to all things ESPN club to the karaoke club, students have chosen a club based on their interests. The sense of community and knowledge that people on campus share their same interests and likes has helped continue to foster and promote school culture with both students and staff.

Monthly "Team Meetings" is another way that we try to promote and better the culture at Meigs. By having grade levels meet monthly, we are able to discuss students who are of concern, whether from behavior or academics. We problem solve as a team and begin reaching out to parents to try to proactively problem solve.

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

Our parent group called, "Parents Advancing Wildcat Spirit" are on campus monthly helping out with pep rallies, dances, sports events, book fair, mentoring, and lunches. This solid group of parents only goal is to advance school spirit. They hold school clean up days and students volunteer to help clean up the campus.

Our SAC Committee, comprised of school staff, business and community leaders, students and parents also plays a role in promoting a positive school culture and environment. Through monthly meetings, they help set the tone by approving cheer and dance, helping to improve the campus, and setting the tone with approval of our School Performance Plan.

Meigs faculty and staff also promote a positive school culture and environment. Through PBIS trainings, Growing Beyond the Books training where they can learn more about how to positively communicate with all other stakeholders, and other school based professional development like Instructional Rounds to observe interactive whole group instruction, close reading, teacher-led small group and stations, all teachers come together for the betterment of each other and our students.