

Marion County Public Schools

# Lake Weir Middle School



## 2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

---

## Table of Contents

---

<b>School Demographics</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>Positive Culture &amp; Environment</b>	<b>22</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>23</b>

# Lake Weir Middle School

10220 SE SUNSET HARBOR RD, Summerfield, FL 34491

[ no web address on file ]

## Demographics

**Principal: Jason Jacobs**

Start Date for this Principal: 5/30/2018

<b>2019-20 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Middle School 6-8
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2019-20 Title I School</b>	Yes
<b>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
<b>2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students* Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students*
<b>School Grades History</b>	2018-19: C (49%) 2017-18: C (47%) 2016-17: C (45%) 2015-16: D (38%)
<b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>	
<b>SI Region</b>	Northeast
<b>Regional Executive Director</b>	<a href="#">Cassandra Brusca</a>
<b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>	N/A
<b>Year</b>	N/A
<b>Support Tier</b>	N/A
<b>ESSA Status</b>	TS&I

\* 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 Marion 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](http://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

---

<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>Title I Requirements</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>23</b>

## Lake Weir Middle School

10220 SE SUNSET HARBOR RD, Summerfield, FL 34491

[ no web address on file ]

### School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2019-20 Title I School	2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Middle School 6-8	Yes	78%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	54%

### School Grades History

Year	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17
Grade	C	C	C	C

### School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Marion 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.**

Lake Weir Middle School exists to prepare middle school learners, within three years, for participation in rigorous academic and vocational programs at any secondary school.

#### **Provide the school's vision statement.**

Lake Weir Middle School will be a safe and caring school environment that equips learners with knowledge, skills, and a desire to succeed. Learners will leave with Lakeside Pride prepared for a future that includes high school graduation, college and workforce readiness, and citizenship that promotes positive social change.

### School Leadership Team

#### **Membership**

Identify the name, email address, position title, and job duties/responsibilities for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Greene, Brian	Principal	Vision and mission within a safe and supportive school environment.
McCleery, Jessica	Assistant Principal	Student Services, ESE Self-Contained, Paraprofessionals, Orderly Campus Coordination and Duty Stations, Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports, and School Facilities.
Helfrey, Edward	Instructional Coach	Instructional Support/Coaching, Pedagogy, Content Expertise, and PLCs.
Hamel, Helen	Instructional Coach	Magent Coordinator, MYP Implementation, Advance Academy, and Awards Ceremonies.
Kutz, Laura	Instructional Media	Media Services and Literacy Implementation.
Turner, Miranda	Administrative Support	SIG Staff, After-School Programs, Unit Recovery, At-Risk Learner Intervention and Transition.
Brooks, Michelle	School Counselor	School Counseling Services, Multi-Disciplinary Team, Social Service Coordination, and Student/Family Support.
Wulff, Carey	School Counselor	School Counseling Services, Multi-Disciplinary Team, Social Service Coordination, and Student/Family Support.
Styles, Jennifer	School Counselor	School Counseling Services, Multi-Disciplinary Team, Social Service Coordination, and Student/Family Support.
Anderson, Henry	Dean	Student Services, Positive Behavior Support, and Proactive Discipline.
Choquette, Nora	Instructional Coach	Instructional Support/Coaching, Pedagogy, Content Expertise, and PLCs.
Shelton, Tami	Instructional Coach	Instructional Support/Coaching, Pedagogy, Content Expertise, and PLCs.

## Demographic Information

### Principal start date

Wednesday 5/30/2018, Jason Jacobs

**Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective.** *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

6



**Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective.** *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

19

**Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school**

60

### Demographic Data

<b>2020-21 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Middle School 6-8
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2019-20 Title I School</b>	Yes
<b>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
<b>2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students* Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students*
<b>School Grades History</b>	2018-19: C (49%) 2017-18: C (47%) 2016-17: C (45%) 2015-16: D (38%)
<b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>	
<b>SI Region</b>	Northeast
<b>Regional Executive Director</b>	<a href="#">Cassandra Brusca</a>
<b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>	N/A
<b>Year</b>	N/A
<b>Support Tier</b>	N/A
<b>ESSA Status</b>	TS&I
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, <a href="#">click here</a> .	

**Early Warning Systems****Current Year****The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:**

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	431	342	362	0	0	0	0	1135
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	124	90	115	0	0	0	0	329
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	94	66	85	0	0	0	0	245
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	8	11	0	0	0	0	24
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5	7	0	0	0	0	18
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	132	92	128	0	0	0	0	352
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	177	84	120	0	0	0	0	381

**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	70	64	72	0	0	0	0	206

**The number of students identified as retainees:**

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	0	0	0	0	20
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

**Date this data was collected or last updated**

Sunday 8/30/2020

**Prior Year - As Reported****The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:**

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	355	359	358	0	0	0	0	1072
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	83	73	87	0	0	0	0	243
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	121	117	112	0	0	0	0	350
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	19	24	25	0	0	0	0	68
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	116	157	125	0	0	0	0	398

**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	169	164	224	0	0	0	0	557

**The number of students identified as retainees:**

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

**Prior Year - Updated****The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:**

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	355	359	358	0	0	0	0	1072
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	83	73	87	0	0	0	0	243
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	121	117	112	0	0	0	0	350
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	19	24	25	0	0	0	0	68
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	116	157	125	0	0	0	0	398

**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	169	164	224	0	0	0	0	557

**The number of students identified as retainees:**

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

**Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis****School Data**

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	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	38%	49%	54%	36%	45%	52%
ELA Learning Gains	53%	54%	54%	42%	48%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	50%	46%	47%	30%	36%	44%

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
Math Achievement	45%	54%	58%	39%	47%	56%
Math Learning Gains	52%	58%	57%	51%	54%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	44%	50%	51%	44%	45%	50%
Science Achievement	36%	46%	51%	38%	44%	50%
Social Studies Achievement	57%	70%	72%	53%	64%	70%

### EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)			Total
	6	7	8	
	(0)	(0)	(0)	0 (0)

### Grade Level Data

**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	2019	39%	45%	-6%	54%	-15%
	2018	35%	44%	-9%	52%	-17%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	35%	46%	-11%	52%	-17%
	2018	37%	43%	-6%	51%	-14%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2019	41%	50%	-9%	56%	-15%
	2018	40%	49%	-9%	58%	-18%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison		4%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2019	42%	46%	-4%	55%	-13%
	2018	33%	42%	-9%	52%	-19%
Same Grade Comparison		9%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	41%	49%	-8%	54%	-13%
	2018	47%	49%	-2%	54%	-7%
Same Grade Comparison		-6%				
Cohort Comparison		8%				
08	2019	28%	41%	-13%	46%	-18%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	31%	43%	-12%	45%	-14%
Same Grade Comparison		-3%				
Cohort Comparison		-19%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2019	35%	44%	-9%	48%	-13%
	2018	41%	46%	-5%	50%	-9%
Same Grade Comparison		-6%				
Cohort Comparison						

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	57%	65%	-8%	71%	-14%
2018	50%	64%	-14%	71%	-21%
Compare		7%			
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	91%	54%	37%	61%	30%
2018	88%	57%	31%	62%	26%
Compare		3%			
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					

**Subgroup Data**

<b>2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS</b>											
<b>Subgroups</b>	<b>ELA Ach.</b>	<b>ELA LG</b>	<b>ELA LG L25%</b>	<b>Math Ach.</b>	<b>Math LG</b>	<b>Math LG L25%</b>	<b>Sci Ach.</b>	<b>SS Ach.</b>	<b>MS Accel.</b>	<b>Grad Rate 2017-18</b>	<b>C &amp; C Accel 2017-18</b>
SWD	16	36	34	24	40	31	11	41			
ELL	27	56	50	40	49	37	19	35	69		
ASN	36	45		64	36						
BLK	32	53	65	41	59	50	22	52	69		
HSP	38	57	47	42	49	42	40	62	72		
MUL	37	43		37	43	20	31	41			
WHT	42	52	46	48	52	46	39	58	70		
FRL	35	52	51	43	51	44	32	54	68		
<b>2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS</b>											
<b>Subgroups</b>	<b>ELA Ach.</b>	<b>ELA LG</b>	<b>ELA LG L25%</b>	<b>Math Ach.</b>	<b>Math LG</b>	<b>Math LG L25%</b>	<b>Sci Ach.</b>	<b>SS Ach.</b>	<b>MS Accel.</b>	<b>Grad Rate 2016-17</b>	<b>C &amp; C Accel 2016-17</b>
SWD	16	35	34	17	47	42	20	19			
ELL	11	33	40	29	41	27	11	41			
BLK	28	38	34	29	49	42	22	46			
HSP	29	38	37	40	54	33	29	50	42		
MUL	40	59	60	37	54		29	53			
WHT	43	51	51	48	58	50	47	55	69		
FRL	35	44	43	40	55	43	37	49	62		
<b>2017 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS</b>											
<b>Subgroups</b>	<b>ELA Ach.</b>	<b>ELA LG</b>	<b>ELA LG L25%</b>	<b>Math Ach.</b>	<b>Math LG</b>	<b>Math LG L25%</b>	<b>Sci Ach.</b>	<b>SS Ach.</b>	<b>MS Accel.</b>	<b>Grad Rate 2015-16</b>	<b>C &amp; C Accel 2015-16</b>
SWD	8	30	28	13	43	38	8	29			
ELL	17	33	20	20	38	40	21	30			
BLK	25	39	38	24	43	30	25	29	61		
HSP	31	36	21	41	58	51	32	56	70		
MUL	33	39	9	43	56	50	33	60			
WHT	41	46	31	43	52	50	45	57	74		
FRL	32	41	29	36	49	41	33	48	68		

**ESSA Data**

This data has been updated for the 2018-19 school year as of 7/16/2019.

<b>ESSA Federal Index</b>	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	TS&I
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	76
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	520

ESSA Federal Index	
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	29
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	2
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	46
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	45
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	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	36
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES

Multiracial Students	
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	50
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	51
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

## Analysis

### Data Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources (see guide for examples for relevant data sources).

**Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year's low performance and discuss any trends.**

The area with the lowest performance was our Science Achievement, dropping 3% from 2018 to 2019 and 2% from 2017, currently at 36% from the 2019 assessment results. We had been increasing slowly (7% from 2015 to 2018), but last year we saw a drop in performance. Our Science Achievement is also below the district average (44%) and state average (48%). We had a significant turnover in our science department and we are working on helping our early career teachers to understand not only the standards, but also the rigor of the standard needed to guide instruction. We are also helping our Science team understand the importance of each grade level's instruction on the 8th grade NGSSS exam, as this information is cumulative over the three years of instruction (6th to 8th). Another factor is our ELA achievement, at 38% from 2019 assessment results. A learner's ability to read, comprehend, and analyze the text at a proficient level, does play a role in their overall proficiency on the science assessment.

**Which data component showed the greatest decline from the prior year? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this decline.**

Our math learning gains showed the greatest decline from the prior year, dropping from 56% in 2018 to 52% in 2019. We had quite a bit of turnover in one of our three seventh grade math positions, filling it twice during the 2019 year and still ending up with a position that was filled by a permanent substitute by the end of the 2019 school year. When looking at the seventh grade data, this is the grade level we had the most trouble filling a permanent teacher into a math position. Our same grade



comparison showed a 2% decrease and our cohort comparison showed no growth or decline. Our 8th grade also struggled with a new 8th grade pre-Algebra teacher in 2019, filling 1/3 of the positions in 8th grade. This also contributed to the overall decline in learning gains for math. Finally, we have a number of learners who are non-proficient in math and there is a greater need for intensive math positions within our school, to help support the remedial needs of these students.

**Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends.**

While reviewing the data, the area that has the greatest gap to the state average is in ELA Achievement. In 2019 we were at 38%, while the state average is 54%, a 16% gap. We have had continued gains in this area, growing over the prior three school years to 38% in 2019. Since 2016, we have grown 4%, a rate between 1% to 2% each year of growth. While we had growth in our ELA learning gains this year, many of our learners remain non-proficient. This means that while our learners are still working toward growth each year, they remain level 1 or level 2 non-proficient readers.

**Which data component showed the most improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?**

The area that we have shown the most improvement is in our ELA learning gains, growing from 46% in 2018 to 53% in 2019. This represents 7% growth overall. Many of our learners arrive as non-proficient, but we work very hard through intensive reading courses, literacy as a school focus, and deliberate scheduling to help support this growth. We have instituted Drop Everything And Read time each day to support our learners in gaining the necessary skills to improve their reading, writing, and comprehension. We have also given a whole school focus to reading, discussing, and writing to learn through the formation of a literacy committee, targeted professional development with our teachers, collaboration built around literacy, and formative feedback based around literacy. We have also incorporated literacy into all aspects of the school, from the discipline and school counseling offices to after school and summer programs.

**Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern?**

As a school, we have been working hard to remove barriers for learners so that they are at school learning. This shows in the decrease of learners earning a level 1 on their FSA from the 2018 to 2019 school year. We saw a decrease in the number of learners with course failures, two or more suspensions, and those who have at least two early warning indicators from 2019 to 2020. However, we recognize the fourth quarter of the 2020 school year was in a distance learning format and impacted these figures. We continued to recognize the amount of learners who are missing school (excused and/or unexcused), which is applicable to some of our most struggling learners not attending school, as evidenced by their difficulty academically and/or behaviorally. Attendance and building a school culture of doing what's right, doing our best, and treating others the way we wish to be treated must continue to be a focus for our staff and learners to support and problem solve.

**Rank your highest priorities (maximum of 5) for schoolwide improvement in the upcoming school year.**

1. ELA Achievement - Although we continue to show growth, we need to push in this area to grow past our 38% achievement.
2. Science Achievement - We must turn around the slide and show growth.
3. Math Achievement - While our overall math achievement did increase 3% from 2018 to 2019, we need to continue to focus on this area.
4. Social Studies Achievement - We did show a 6% increase in this area, but we are still below the state average.
5. Math lowest 25th percentile - We showed no change in this area from 2018 to 2019, and we had a

decrease in math learning gains from 2018 to 2019. If we focus on our lowest 25th percentile, we will show an increase in this area and we will also have the ability to produce positive math learning gains overall.

### Part III: Planning for Improvement

#### Areas of Focus:

**#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Professional Learning**

<b>Area of Focus Description and Rationale:</b>	<p>If Lake Weir Middle School engages learners through literacy, then learner achievement will improve by 3%, as measured by the Florida Standards Assessment.</p> <p>If embedded literacy skills (reading, discussing, and writing to learn) are applied daily across all subjects, then learners will be better equipped and prepared to apply the skills of reading, discussion and writing in their daily learning objectives and mastery of the state standards. However, this effectively occurs if learners are engaged through rigorous and relevant instruction.</p> <p>A need to improve literacy instructional practice through professional learning was identified during administrative debriefing of walkthroughs, informal and formal observations, and ongoing data review (State and local assessment data). It was evident that teachers were in need of additional support when trying to successfully incorporate literacy across content areas, while engaging learners through rigorous and relevant instruction. This focus will affect learner engagement and performance in ELA, Math, Civics, Science, and acceleration achievement.</p>
<b>Measurable Outcome:</b>	<p>If Lake Weir Middle School engages learners through literacy (reading, discussing, and writing to learn), then learner achievement will improve by 3%, as measured by the Florida Standard Assessment. The intended outcome for: 1) English Language Arts at 41% or greater proficiency, 56% or greater learning gains, and 53% or greater learning gains of the bottom quartile, 2) Math at 48% or greater proficiency, 55% or greater learning gains, and 47% or greater learning gains of the bottom quartile, 3) Civics at 57% or greater proficiency, and 4) Science at 39% or greater proficiency.</p>
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome:</b>	<p>Brian Greene (brian.greene@marion.k12.fl.us)</p>
<b>Evidence-based Strategy:</b>	<p>Core: 1) All professional learning around the school's literacy goal utilizing a standard literacy rubric, 2) collaborative literacy artifact from weekly literacy PLCs around monthly/ 20-day lesson plans, 3) targeted formative literacy feedback to teachers based on level of need, and 4) development and reflection of literacy SMART goals for all teachers.</p> <p>Culture for learning and engagement:</p> <p>-Learning Environment: Learners 1) encouraged to take risk and persevere through productive struggle, 2) praised for demonstrating commitment to learning, 3) demonstrate respect for peers, teacher, and learning environment, and 4) clear classroom learning procedures and routines are visible and consistently implemented.</p> <p>-Active Participation: 1) Learners remain on-task and respond to frequent opportunities for active engagement throughout the lesson, 2) lesson is led by both teacher and learner, where learners productively progress through new learning, and 3) lesson provides multiple strategies designed to maximize learner engagement, where contribution is monitored to ensure full participation.</p>
<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:</b>	<p>Data from the countries most rapidly improving schools based on research from the International Center for Leadership in Education, and showcased at the annual Model Schools conference, demonstrates evidence that supports the essential focus of engaging learning environments in order for schools to attain relevance and rigor of their intended goal(s) (literacy integration) and outcomes (growth in learner achievement). Vast data and research also supports a core focus on literacy integration, where disciplinary literacy is the vessel to not only learner achievement within school, but for graduation and beyond for successful employment, enlistment, and/or enrollment.</p>

### Action Steps to Implement

1) Literacy committee comprised of members from all subject content at the school. Monthly literacy team core meetings have been established throughout the year with the task of developing cross curricular literacy initiatives that are teacher/team developed and lead, 2) All professional learning built around literacy integration using a standardized framework for implementation (literacy rubric), 3) all collaborative built around literacy integration within lesson plans, 4) weekly instructional focus meetings focused on literacy integration, 5) formative literacy teacher feedback based on level of need, and 6) literacy integration across all school departments (discipline office, learner generated monthly learner newsletter and quarterly parent newsletter, morning show, school counseling office, parent/guardian messages, after school and summer programs...).

**Person Responsible** Brian Greene (brian.greene@marion.k12.fl.us)

Teacher and support team learning walks focused on the integration of authentic literacy (read, discuss, write) in rigorous and relevant ways (rubric driven).

**Person Responsible** Nora Choquette (nora.choquette@marion.k12.fl.us)

Professional learning and training development and implementation around reading, discussing, and writing to learn rubric.

**Person Responsible** Nora Choquette (nora.choquette@marion.k12.fl.us)

**#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Multi-Racial**

If Lake Weir Middle School focuses resources for academic intervention on learners with disability and multiracial learners, then their overall achievement gap will begin to narrow, as measured by the Every Student Succeeds Act subgroup ratings.

**Area of  
Focus  
Description  
and  
Rationale:**

A need to narrow the overall achievement gap of learners with disabilities and multiracial learner subgroups was identified during the 2018-2019 and 2019-2020 school year. It was evident that learners falling within these subgroups struggled with self-efficacy, particularly when trying to apply the intervention skills of reading, writing, and math computation into their daily English Language Arts and Math courses for growth toward mastery of the state standards. This ultimately affected their engagement and performance in ELA, Math, Civics, and Science. As an effort to reduce the achievement gap, in addition to the core school literacy goal, Lake Weir Middle will ensure the following:

- An inclusive model of scheduling for learners with disability.
- Expanding advanced academic offerings by broadening English Language Arts (ELA) advanced courses and adding 8th grade advanced ELA for greater inclusivity of learners with disabilities and Multiracial learners.
- Increasing learner self-efficacy through the expanded advanced course offerings.
- School Improvement Grant staff (three staff members) expanding the transition program to include those learners with disability and multiracial learners for targeted intervention focused on academic advisement, goal setting, mentorship, and related intervention.
- Providing priority enrollment into the after school 21st Century program and before/ afterschool academic advising/tutoring program for learners with disability and multiracial learners.

If LWMS provides academic intervention for learners with disability and multiracial learners, then their overall achievement gap will narrow, as measured by ESSA. Intended outcomes:

**Measurable  
Outcome:**

- Learners with disability:
  - 1) English Language Arts 20% or greater proficiency, 40% or greater learning gains, and 38% or greater learning gains of the bottom quartile,
  - 2) Math 28% or greater proficiency, 45% or greater learning gains, and 35% or greater learning gains of the bottom quartile,
  - 3) Civics 44% or greater proficiency, and
  - 4) Science 15% or greater proficiency

- Multiracial learners:
  - 1) English Language Arts 40% or greater proficiency, and 50% or greater learning gains, and 50% or greater learning gains of the bottom quartile,
  - 2) Math 40% or greater proficiency, 47% or greater learning gains, and 40% or greater learning gains of the bottom quartile,
  - 3) Civics 45% or greater proficiency, and
  - 4) Science 35% or greater proficiency.

**Person  
responsible  
for  
monitoring  
outcome:**

Brian Greene (brian.greene@marion.k12.fl.us)

**Evidence-  
based  
Strategy:**

- Targeted enrollment of learners with disability and multiracial learners for after school programming through the 21st Century program and academic advisement through tutoring before and after school.
- Florida Inclusion Network scheduling for learners with disability, which also affects 9% of

the current multiracial population at the school.

-Scheduling of learners in self-contained settings, includes some multiracial learners, rotations where they are able to have multiple teachers for greater self-efficacy.

-Expanded advanced English Language Arts offerings throughout all grades, as identified in the additional school-wide improvement priorities, expanded diversity of these classes, inclusive of multiracial learners. This also improves upon self-efficacy.

-Using the Florida Inclusion Network model to schedule inclusion learners upon bringing in inclusion teachers to look at learner needs and placement with appropriate inclusion/ classroom teacher. Throughout the year, the inclusion teachers will be working closely with school administration to monitor these learners and to make adjustments, as needed.

**Rationale  
for  
Evidence-  
based  
Strategy:**

Research on the effects of self-efficacy and through the work of The Opportunity Gap, demonstrates the ability for closing the achievement gap when learners are provided the same opportunities as their non-disabled and non-minority peers (i.e. expanded advanced course offerings, inclusion of more traditional scheduling with elective opportunity for those who are self-contained...). When high expectations are in place and built on the belief of the teacher and learner that achievement will occur, gaps in achievement are narrowed. This evidence-based rationale is in combination to the school's focus on literacy integration across all content.

### Action Steps to Implement

1. Inclusive scheduling with the Florida Inclusion Network model of scheduling for learners with disability.
2. Expanding advanced academic offerings by broadening English Language Arts (ELA) advanced courses and adding 8th grade advanced ELA for greater inclusivity of learners with disabilities and Multiracial learners.
3. Increasing learner self-efficacy through the expanded advanced course offerings.
4. School Improvement Grant staff (three staff members) expanding the transition program to include those learners with disability and multiracial learners for targeted intervention focused on academic advisement, goal setting, mentorship, and related intervention.
5. Providing priority enrollment into the after school 21st Century program and before/after school academic advising/tutoring program for learners with disability and multiracial learners.

**Person Responsible** Brian Greene (brian.greene@marion.k12.fl.us)

### Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities.

**1) Learner self-efficacy by adding 8th grade ELA advanced and through greater identification of learners who are placed into advanced ELA courses to address overall ELA proficiency and learning gains, as well as greater diversity in advanced classes, 2) At-risk learner identification with targeted and individualized support through the transition program funded with School Improvement Funds, 3) Ongoing attendance initiative targeting each month those who miss 10-25% or more of school to identify and work through barriers to school attendance, and 4) Greater relationship focus through integration of Habitudes and its alignment to the school monthly character traits and SAVE promise club activities for Social Emotional integration and support through all content areas.**

## Part IV: Positive Culture & Environment



A positive school culture and environment reflects: a supportive and fulfilling environment, learning conditions that meet the needs of all students, people who are sure of their roles and relationships in student learning, and a culture that values trust, respect and high expectations. Consulting with various stakeholder groups to employ school improvement strategies that impact the positive school culture and environment are critical. Stakeholder groups more proximal to the school include teachers, students, and families of students, volunteers, and school board members. Broad stakeholder groups include early childhood providers, community colleges and universities, social services, and business partners.

Stakeholders play a key role in school performance and addressing equity. Consulting various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment ensuring all stakeholders are involved.

-Ongoing reference and support of "way of the work" initiatives focused around the school's relationships theme, "We develop positive relationships to create the necessary conditions for social and emotional learning. We help learners to feel seen, understood, valued, and cared for. We cultivate our learners to become comfortable with vulnerability, as they develop positive self-perceptions and the capacity to persevere. We connect with learners and lead with empathy to extend compassion and to establish trust."

-Integration of Tier 1 relationship based social emotional programming with all of our learners through the Peers Making Peace (SAVE promise) Club, monthly Habitudes lessons, Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports integration, and monthly Eagle Character Trait.

-Weekly MultiDisciplinary Team meeting (MDT) to discuss learners who have been referred by parents/guardians, teachers, staff, or community members. Once BESS screened, the MDT members review the referral and gather data (attendance, grades, discipline, mental health info, IEP info, etc.) to help discuss and evaluate the needs of the learner. These learners may be referred to Tier 2 Interventions led by our school counselors, school psychologist, social worker, or a team of appropriate personnel. The learners may also be referred to

community based interventions, if deemed appropriate, through the MDT team meetings. Finally, those that exhibit a growing need are given Tier 3 interventions from our school psychologist and/or other applicable trained staff, who can counsel or assist in referral to community based resources.

-Integration of weekly positive postcard mailings from each instructional staff/related staff member that ties to our school-wide expectations and/or one of our 10 Eagle Character traits.

-Integration of ongoing early career teacher induction for relationship building through the interchange of planning, classroom management, mentorship, and professional learning (Fundamental Five, Teach Like a Champion...).

-Ongoing integration of business and volunteer partnership program through The Rock.

### **Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link**

The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.

## **Part V: Budget**

**The approved budget does not reflect any amendments submitted for this project.**

<b>1</b>	<b>III.A.</b>	<b>Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Professional Learning</b>	<b>\$0.00</b>
<b>2</b>	<b>III.A.</b>	<b>Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Multi-Racial</b>	<b>\$0.00</b>
<b>Total:</b>			<b>\$0.00</b>