

Citrus County Schools

Lecanto 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	11
Planning for Improvement	16
Positive Culture & Environment	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Lecanto Middle School

3800 W EDUCATIONAL PATH, Lecanto, FL 34461

<https://lms.citruschools.org/>

Demographics

Principal: Inge Frederick

Start Date for this Principal: 5/27/2018

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)	89%
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 (52%) 2018-19: B (57%) 2017-18: B (59%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
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 Citrus County School Board on 10/11/2022.

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	11
Planning for Improvement	16
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Lecanto Middle School

3800 W EDUCATIONAL PATH, Lecanto, FL 34461

<https://lms.citruschools.org/>

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;">89%</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;">22%</p>

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Citrus County School Board on 10/11/2022.

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.

We believe at LMS that together we will achieve excellence through culture, innovation, and rigor. We can, we care, we connect, we are LMS

Provide the school's vision statement.

Excellence for everyone everyday.

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
Frederick, Inge	Principal	The goals of a Principal is to provide the leadership and vision necessary to develop and implement a comprehensive program of instruction and support services which optimize available resources to establish and maintain safe, caring and enriching environment that is conducive to learning and student success.
Stukes, Tony	Assistant Principal	The goal of an Assistant Principal is to assist the Principal with administrative and instructional functions to meet the educational needs of students and carry out the mission and goals of the school and the District.
Goolsby, Dianna	Assistant Principal	The goal of an Assistant Principal is to assist the Principal with administrative and instructional functions to meet the educational needs of students and carry out the mission and goals of the school and the District.
Filipic, Kelly	Instructional Coach	The goal of an Instructional Coach is to provide leadership in planning, developing, implementing and evaluating educational programs designed to meet the needs of students.
Kane, Connie	Behavior Specialist	The goal of the Behavior Specialist is to work in connection with the educational core team in the development, planning and implementation of behavioral, social ,and academic programs for exceptional education students and student at risk. This includes facilitating student behavior interventions and monitoring their impact.
James, Ingrid	Other	The goal of an ESE specialist is to ensure that ESE students are afforded their rights under the law through due process and to improve the academic achievement, behavioral/social skills, and emotional well-being of students either through direct contact with students or consultations with parents and/ or other professionals.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Sunday 5/27/2018, Inge Frederick

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.*

19

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

51

Total number of students enrolled at the school

819

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

11

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

11

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	284	267	271	0	0	0	0	822
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	47	63	77	0	0	0	0	187
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	25	51	50	0	0	0	0	126
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	31	57	0	0	0	0	99
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	24	16	57	0	0	0	0	97
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	46	60	64	0	0	0	0	170
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	54	56	59	0	0	0	0	169
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	46	64	56	0	0	0	0	166

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	51	69	100	0	0	0	0	220

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	30	30	26	0	0	0	0	86
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	2

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 8/15/2022

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	266	270	284	0	0	0	0	820
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	53	46	54	0	0	0	0	153
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	28	68	53	0	0	0	0	149
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	42	28	0	0	0	0	85
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	37	17	11	0	0	0	0	65
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	48	62	56	0	0	0	0	166
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	56	73	58	0	0	0	0	187
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	51	73	65	0	0	0	0	189

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	7	3	0	0	0	0	10
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5	0	0	0	0	8

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	266	270	284	0	0	0	0	820
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	53	46	54	0	0	0	0	153
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	28	68	53	0	0	0	0	149
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	42	28	0	0	0	0	85
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	37	17	11	0	0	0	0	65
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	48	62	56	0	0	0	0	166
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	56	73	58	0	0	0	0	187
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	51	73	65	0	0	0	0	189

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	7	3	0	0	0	0	10
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5	0	0	0	0	8

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	48%	46%	50%				57%	56%	54%
ELA Learning Gains	44%						48%	53%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	36%						38%	46%	47%
Math Achievement	54%	30%	36%				65%	62%	58%
Math Learning Gains	57%						56%	54%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	53%						50%	44%	51%
Science Achievement	45%	48%	53%				67%	55%	51%
Social Studies Achievement	72%	47%	58%				76%	76%	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	56%	52%	4%	54%	2%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2022					
	2019	55%	55%	0%	52%	3%
Cohort Comparison		-56%				
08	2022					
	2019	57%	54%	3%	56%	1%
Cohort Comparison		-55%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2022					
	2019	56%	51%	5%	55%	1%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2022					
	2019	62%	62%	0%	54%	8%
Cohort Comparison		-56%				
08	2022					
	2019	49%	49%	0%	46%	3%
Cohort Comparison		-62%				

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	63%	52%	11%	48%	15%
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	75%	74%	1%	71%	4%
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	97%	70%	27%	61%	36%
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	100%	57%	43%	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	15	26	17	13	43	40	14	37			
ELL	13	19		31	63						
ASN	75	60		75	80						
BLK	33	50		36	52			73			
HSP	45	43	41	52	58	48	27	68	40		
MUL	48	46		40	55			62			
WHT	48	43	34	55	56	55	49	72	63		
FRL	39	38	34	47	53	50	41	66	55		
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	15	33	34	15	26	27	17	29			
ELL	8	46	50	8	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	95	89		95	58				92		
BLK	39	67		31	38	50					
HSP	43	53	47	42	53	56	33	75			
MUL	52	57		41	33						
WHT	48	48	36	50	42	32	46	73	58		
FRL	42	45	38	41	38	37	39	67	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	23	35	24	29	44	37	33	50			
ASN	96	78		100	89			100	94		
BLK	46	54	55	32	32	27					
HSP	47	52	42	55	61	67	57	67	50		
MUL	43	37		60	63						
WHT	57	47	35	65	54	48	68	77	54		
FRL	49	45	38	58	52	51	60	67	34		

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	52
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	471
Total Components for the Federal Index	9
Percent Tested	99%

Subgroup Data

Students With Disabilities

Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	26
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	1

English Language Learners

Federal Index - English Language Learners	32
---	----

English Language Learners	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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	49
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	47
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	50
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	53
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	47
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?

Our mathematics assessment data from the 2022 assessments demonstrated a positive trend with overall achievement moving from 50% 3 and above to 54% 3 and above. Our mathematics overall Learning Gains and Learning Gains of the Lowest 25% have increased from 43% to 57% and 36% and 53%, respectively. Our ELA data has been trending negatively or has been making very modest gains. In ELA our overall achievement of 3 and above dropped one percentage point from 49% to 48%. Overall Learning Gains dropped from 50% to 44% and Learning Gains of the Lowest 25% dropped from 40% to 36%. Acceleration data trended upwards, going from 60% to 62%, and Social Studies and Science Achievement each dropped by 1% but have been consistent overall. Our English Language Learners and Students with Disabilities are the two subgroups that have been identified as underperforming with Federal Index scores of 32% and 26% respectively.

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

Our 2022 assessment data indicates that English Language Arts is an area of need, especially within our Students with Disabilities and English Language Learners subgroup who have an overall Federal Index Score of 26% and 32% respectively. Our percent 3 and above has dropped from 57% in 2019 to 48% in 2022. Our Learning Gains dropped from 48% in 2019 to 44% in 2022 and our Lowest 25% Learning Gains dropped from 38% to 36%.

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

Due to the circumstances of COVID, we had increased student absences, an increase of students going to virtual school and then returning to brick & mortar several times within a school year, as well as high turnover of our teachers who teach our Students in our Lowest 25%, particularly in ELA. During the 2 years of COVID (2020/2021 & 2021/2022) we lost 9 ELA/ESE teachers to retirement, promotion, relocation, and virtual education, which required us to hire and train teachers to meet the needs of our Students with Disabilities. This lack of consistency in instruction impacted the growth of our neediest students. This year we are strategically placing our ELA/ESE teachers with all of our Lowest Quartile students and adding extra support staff resources to create a lower teacher/student ratio so that more time in small group and one individual instruction can occur. We are also using evidence-based reading programs. Additionally we are giving all content-area teachers planning with their grade level content-area peers so that they can participate in PLCs, plan units collaboratively, discuss implementation of BEST ELA and Math standards, and analyze formative assessment data.

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

Our mathematics assessment data from the 2022 assessments demonstrated a positive trend with overall achievement moving from 50% 3 and above to 54% 3 and above. Our mathematics overall Learning Gains and Learning Gains of the Lowest 25% have increased from 43% to 57% and 36% and 53%, respectively. Additionally, Acceleration data trended upwards, going from 60% to 62%, and Social Studies and Science Achievement each dropped by 1% but have been consistent overall.

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

We placed all Level 1 math students in an Intensive Math class with a Highly Qualified/Highly Effective teacher who used the evidence-based program ALEKS to formatively assess students to determine skill gaps and then provided daily small group instruction that was tailored to student needs. Additionally, we provided two support staff members to lower the adult/student ratio in the classroom so that all students could be closely monitored. Additionally, IXL was implemented in all math classrooms as remediation and extra practice to support grade level standards mastery. All teachers monitored their students progress and developed incentive programs to reward students for progress.

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

Pairing evidenced-based programs such as ALEKS, IXL, Achieve 3000, Lexia, Gizmos and Gimkit with research-based instructional strategies proven to raise student achievement such as using graphic organizers, anchor charts, higher-order thinking activities, and critical writing. Working to

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.

We will participate in weekly PLC's (Professional Learning Committee) on the following topics: (one day per week, 45-minute sessions)

1. Classroom Learning Environment
2. Learning Goals & Essential Questions
3. Lesson Assessment
4. Graphic Organizers
5. Assessment Prompts
6. Learning Activities
7. Activating Strategies
8. Vocabulary Strategies
9. ELA and Math Best Standards Implementation

Staff will complete online learning modules on these topics prior to attending weekly PLC meetings. During our PLC's we will collaboratively plan, analyze student formative assessment data, and create plans for remediation. We will also share artifacts of learning with resources that were used in lessons.

Staff will be trained on best practices in the use of Achieve 3000, Lexia, IXL, ALEKS, Gizmos, and Gimkit with follow-up coaching sessions provided, as needed.

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

We will complete weekly classroom walk through observations in addition to daily informal walk throughs. Additionally, we will meet with all new teacher (new to teaching) once per month to review the book, *The First Days of School* (Wong) and watch videos detailing best practices and classroom

management best practices. We will also meet with new teachers once per month to review lesson plans, formative assessments, and provide support in any area of need.

Areas of Focus

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

:

#1. 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.

A comparison of State assessment data from Spring 2019 to Spring 2022 demonstrated that Learning Gains dropped from 48% to 44% and Learning Gains of the Bottom Quartile dropped from 38% to 36%. Our overall percentage of 3 and above dropped from 57% to 48%, which was 2 percentage points above the District average but 2 percentage points below the State average.

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

1. 60% of all students will make Learning Gains in ELA
2. 60% of students in the Bottom Quartile will make Learning Gains in ELA

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

1. Weekly PLC Meetings where formative data is analyzed and monitored.
2. Study Island & SAVVAS standard mastery data will be used in all Advanced ELA classes.
3. Achieve 3000 Level Set Data will be used in all Level 2 Intensive ELA Courses.
4. Lexia Data of minutes spent in the program and Units earned, as well as Lexile levels in the Comprehension section of the Lexia Program for all Level 1 Intensive Reading classes.
5. Achieve 3000 Level Set data will also be used in all Level 1 Intensive Reading classes to monitor lexile growth.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Inge Frederick (fredericki@citruschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being

Students scoring a Level 1 or a Level 2 on the Spring FSA ELA Assessment will be placed in a 55-minute Intensive ELA or Reading course in which evidence-based programs and strategies are used. Level 1 students will be placed in an Intensive Reading course with an ESE and Reading Endorsed teacher who is an expert in using the Lexia Level-Up program. This program motivates students to learn, when facilitated by a teacher with expertise with the program, and supports students in working towards grade-level standards by scaffolding their assignments into small chunks of knowledge and providing teacher led, small group lessons, throughout. Level 2 students will be placed in an

implemented for this Area of Focus. Intensive Language Arts class with a Middle Grades ELA certified teacher who will be using the Achieve 3000 program that provides individualized instruction that is tailored to each students current Lexile level and scaffolds to grade level passages.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The Lexia Power-Up Literacy program and Achieve 3000 Reading program both are designed to accelerate literacy gains for below grade-level, struggling readers. Both programs scaffold to grade-level reading passages and skills while allowing students to work on their current level. The programs adapt and provide more challenging material as students progress through the levels.

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.

Instructional Staff will participate in a refresher training for The Fundamental 5: The Formula for Quality Instruction. The Classroom Walk Through tool that is used by administration includes components of this book and provides data as to how well the components are being implemented school wide.

Person Responsible Inge Frederick (fredericki@citruschools.org)

All instructional staff will participate in the face-to-face professional development, The High Performance Learning-Focused Lesson during pre-planning (August 9th), This introduced and provided an overview of our focus for the year.

Person Responsible Inge Frederick (fredericki@citruschools.org)

All instructional staff will participate in The High Performance Learning-Focused Lesson Micro-PD through Learning-Focused Online. Certificates of completion for each unit will be provided by staff.

Person Responsible Inge Frederick (fredericki@citruschools.org)

All instructional staff will participate in a weekly Professional Learning Community (PLC). We are giving all content-area teachers planning with their grade level content-area peers so that they can participate in PLCs, plan units collaboratively, discuss implementation of BEST ELA and Math standards, discuss learning from Learning Focused Micro-Pd, and analyze formative assessment data. Minutes of these meetings will be kept and shared.

Person Responsible Inge Frederick (fredericki@citruschools.org)

Level 1 and Level 2 Intensive Reading and ELA teachers will meet with Mrs. Frederick the last Friday of the month during planning to review Lexia or Achieve Data and review intervention plans for students. Will keep record of appointments in Outlook.

Person Responsible Inge Frederick (fredericki@citruschools.org)

To effectively address the ELL population that is below the 41% Federal Index, we will focus on our instructional strategies utilized in both our ELA and Reading classrooms. This will be supported by purposeful, data driven PLC groups that will assess data, create lessons, and build assessments collaboratively.

Person Responsible Inge Frederick (fredericki@citruschools.org)

#2. 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.

In a comparison of State assessment data from Spring 2021 to Spring 2022, it was demonstrated that the Learning Gains of all students sixth through eighth grade Mathematics went from 43% to 57% and Learning Gains of the Bottom Quartile in Mathematics went from 36% to 53%.

Measurable**Outcome:**

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

- 1) 60% of all students in grades sixth through eighth will make Learning Gains in Mathematics.
- 2) 60% of students in the Bottom Quartile in Mathematics will make Learning Gains.

Monitoring:

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

- 1) Weekly PLC Meetings where formative data is analyzed and monitored.
- 2) Data from both the first and second administration of the F.A.S.T. (Florida's Assessment of Students Thinking) Progress Monitoring Assessments will be utilized to assist in the modification and improvement instruction strategies.
- 3) The online program, ALEKS, will be used in all Level 1 Intensive math classes.
- 4) The online program, IXL, will be used in all 6th through 8th math classes.
- 5) Diagnostics from the online textbook, Saavas, will be used in all 6th through 8th grade math courses.

Person

responsible for monitoring outcome:

Dianna Goolsby (goolsbyd@citruschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy:

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

All Level 1 math students will be placed in an additional intensive math class with their same highly qualified regular math teacher. Within this intensive math class, the evidence-based program, ALEKS, will be utilized to formatively assess students to determine skill gaps and then provided daily small group instruction that will be tailored to student needs. Additionally, IXL will be implemented in all 6 - 8 math classrooms as remediation and extra practice to support grade level standards mastery.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

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

ALEKS is an evidence-based, online learning program that offers course products for Math, Chemistry, Statistics, and more. This program assists teachers understand each student's knowledge and learning progress in depth, and provides the individual support required for every student to achieve mastery. IXL is a personalized learning platform that utilizes comprehensive K-12 curriculum, Real-Time Diagnostic, personalized guidance, and actionable Analytics to give teachers what they need to differentiate instruction.

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.

Instructional staff will participate in a refresher training for The Fundamental 5: The Formula for Quality Instruction. The Classroom Walk Through Tool that will be used by administration includes components of this book and provides data as to how well the components are being implemented school wide.

Person Responsible Dianna Goolsby (goolsbyd@citruschools.org)

All instructional staff will participate in the face-to-face professional development, The High Performance Learning-Focused Lesson during pre-planning (August 9, 2022). This introduced and provided an overview of our focus for the school year.

Person Responsible Dianna Goolsby (goolsbyd@citruschools.org)

All instructional staff will participate in The High Performance Learning-Focused Lesson Micro-PD through Learning-Focused Online. Certificates of Completion for each unit will be provided by staff and in-service points will be earned.

Person Responsible Dianna Goolsby (goolsbyd@citruschools.org)

All math teachers will meet during a monthly department meeting to discuss best practices and assist in planning for student learning and instruction aligned to the new Florida's Benchmarks for Excellent Student Thinking (B.E.S.T.) Standards.

Person Responsible Dianna Goolsby (goolsbyd@citruschools.org)

To effectively address the ELL population that is below the 41% Federal Index, we will focus on our instructional strategies utilized in both our Math and Intensive Math classrooms. This will be supported by purposeful, data driven PLC groups that will assess data, create lessons, and build assessments collaboratively.

Person Responsible Dianna Goolsby (goolsbyd@citruschools.org)

#3. 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.

Lecanto Middle School was identified for Targeted Support & Improvement (TS&I) due to the Subgroup Federal Index score of 26% for our Students with Disabilities. This has been an area of TS&I since 2019 when our Students with Disabilities scored a 34%.

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

For the 2022-2023 school, Lecanto Middle School's goal is to improve by at least 15 points to 41% or above.

1. 43% of students will make learning gains in ELA.
2. 52% will make learning gains in Math.
3. 43% will make a 3 or above on the Civics EOC.
4. 43% will make a 3 or above on the Science FCAT.

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

1. Weekly PLC Meetings where formative data is analyzed and monitored.
2. ELA - Achieve 3000 Level Set Data will be used in all Level 2 Intensive ELA Courses.
3. ELA - Lexia Data of minutes spent in the program and Units earned, as well as Lexile levels in the Comprehension section of the Lexia Program for all Level 1 Intensive Reading classes.
4. ELA - Achieve 3000 Level Set data will also be used in all Level 1 Intensive Reading classes.
5. ALEKS Data for Intensive Math (Level 1) and IXL Data for on grade-level and accelerated math classes.
6. Progress Learning Data for Civics
7. Gizmos for Science

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Tony Stukes (stukest@citruschools.org)

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

Students with Disabilities will receive specially designed instruction, as indicated on their IEP, by an ESE certified teacher. Additionally they will get support from evidenced-based programs which will be used to monitor student learning so that teachers can make adjustments in instruction, as needed.

1. Achieve3000® Reading is designed to help students advance their nonfiction reading skills by providing differentiated online instruction.
2. Lexia Reading has students start the program exactly where they need to be based on their abilities and progress at their own pace through personal learning pathways.
3. ALEKS is an online learning program for Math that uses personalized learning and adaptive assessments and quickly and accurately determines exactly what a student is most ready to learn.
4. IXL is an online learning program for math that combines curriculum, a Continuous Diagnostic, individual guidance, and real-time analytics to help teachers differentiate instruction for each of their students.
5. Progress Learning Data for Civics provides online custom assessments, instructional resources, district reporting, performance monitoring and test prep questions.
6. Gizmos are captivating online simulations of key science concepts that enhances student comprehension of challenging concepts through inquiry and exploration.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: 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.

All instructional staff will participate in The High Performance Learning-Focused Lesson Micro-PD through Learning-Focused Online. Certificates of completion for each unit will be provided by staff.

Person Responsible Tony Stukes (stukest@citruschools.org)

All instructional staff will participate in a weekly Professional Learning Community (PLC). We are giving all content-area teachers planning with their grade level content-area peers so that they can participate in PLCs, plan units collaboratively, discuss implementation of BEST ELA and Math standards, discuss learning from Learning Focused Micro-Pd, and analyze formative assessment data. Minutes of these meetings will be kept and shared.

Person Responsible Tony Stukes (stukest@citruschools.org)

Instructional staff in Science, Social Studies, Math, and ELA will share best practices and receive content-area staff development through monthly Department Meetings.

Person Responsible Inge Frederick (fredericki@citruschools.org)

#4. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to English Language Learners

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

Lecanto Middle School was identified for Targeted Support & Improvement (TS&I) due to the Subgroup Federal Index score of 32% for our English Language Learners.

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

For the 2022-2023 school, Lecanto Middle School's goal is to improve overall by at least 10 points to be above the 41% threshold.
 1. 43% of students will make learning gains in ELA.
 2. 52% will make learning gains in Math.
 3. 43% will make a 3 or above on the Civics EOC.
 4. 43% will make a 3 or above on the Science FCAT.

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

1. Weekly PLC Meetings where formative data is analyzed and monitored.
2. ELA - Achieve 3000 Level Set Data will be used in all Level 2 Intensive ELA Courses.
3. ELA - Lexia Data of minutes spent in the program and Units earned, as well as Lexile levels in the Comprehension section of the Lexia Program for all Level 1 Intensive Reading classes.
4. ELA - Achieve 3000 Level Set data will also be used in all Level 1 Intensive Reading classes.
5. ALEKS Data for Intensive Math (Level 1) and IXL Data for on grade-level and accelerated math classes.
6. Progress Learning Data for Civics
7. Gizmos for Science

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Kelly Filipic (filipick@citruschools.org)

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

Our ELL students will receive specially designed instruction, as indicated on their ELL plan. Additionally they will get support from evidenced-based programs which will be used to monitor student learning so that teachers can make adjustments in instruction, as needed.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

1. Achieve3000® Reading is designed to help students advance their nonfiction reading skills by providing differentiated online instruction.
2. Lexia Reading has students start the program exactly where they need to be based on their abilities and progress at their own pace through personal learning pathways.
3. ALEKS is an online learning program for Math that uses personalized learning and adaptive assessments and quickly and accurately determines exactly what a student is most ready to learn.
4. IXL is an online learning program for math that combines curriculum, a Continuous Diagnostic, individual guidance, and real-time analytics to help teachers differentiate instruction for each of their students.
5. Progress Learning Data for Civics provides online custom assessments, instructional resources, district reporting, performance monitoring and test prep questions.
6. Rosetta Stone will be utilized to provide support in English language acquisition.

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.

All instructional staff will participate in The High Performance Learning-Focused Lesson Micro-PD through Learning-Focused Online. Certificates of completion for each unit will be provided by staff.

Person Responsible Tony Stukes (stukest@citruschools.org)

Instructional staff in Science, Social Studies, Math, and ELA will share best practices and receive content-area staff development through monthly Department Meetings.

Person Responsible Inge Frederick (fredericki@citruschools.org)

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.

At Lecanto Middle School, we...

- 1) create meaningful parent involvement that allows families to feel part of our school community.
- 2) focus on recognizing both student and staff achievements and do so publicly and privately.
- 3) have established school norms that build values through our four ROAR Core Values of Respect, On Task, Attitude, and Responsibility.
- 4) strive to set and enforce consistent rules and expectations throughout the campus.
- 5) seek input from our students through a multitude of methods and consult with the student body leaders to help drive the changes that have been identified as a need.
- 6) work closely with our teacher leaders to continually revisit our processes, procedures and structures in order to make changes as needs are identified.

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

Administration: Areas addressed - 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, and 6

Teachers and Staff: Areas addressed - 1,2, 3, 4, 5, and 6

Students: Areas addressed - 2, 3, and 4

Parents/Families: Areas addressed - 1, 2, 3, and 6

Community Members and Local Business Partners: Areas addressed - 2 and 6

District Administration and School Board Members: Areas addressed - 2 and 6