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## Lake Nona Middle

## 13700 NARCOOSSEE RD, Orlando, FL 32832

https://lakenonams.ocps.net/

## Demographics

## Principal: Jennifer Fugate

| 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) | 37\% |
| 2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented <br> (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Students With Disabilities* <br> English Language Learners <br> Asian Students <br> Black/African American Students <br> Hispanic Students <br> Multiracial Students <br> White Students <br> Economically Disadvantaged <br> Students |
| School Grades History | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 2021-22: A }(74 \%) \\ & 2018-19: \mathrm{A}(76 \%) \\ & 2017-18: \mathrm{A}(73 \%) \end{aligned}$ |
| 2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information* |  |
| SI Region | Southeast |
| Regional Executive Director | LaShawn Russ-Porterfield |
| Turnaround Option/Cycle | N/A |
| Year |  |
| Support Tier |  |
| ESSA Status | N/A |
| * 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 Orange 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\&l:

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 noncharter 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.
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## Lake Nona Middle

13700 NARCOOSSEE RD, Orlando, FL 32832
https://lakenonams.ocps.net/

## School Demographics



School Grades History

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

## School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Orange 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 noncharter 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.
With the support of families and the community, we create enriching and diverse pathways that lead our students to success.

Provide the school's vision statement.
To ensure every student has a promising and successful future.

## 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.:

The principal serves as the instructional leader and chief administrator of the school which involves developing, implementing, and supporting policies, programs, curriculum activities, and budgets in a manner that promotes the educational development of each student as well as the professional development of each staff member.

Assistant
Principal
Berson, Assistant

## Huerta- ELL

Kirkland, Compliance Teresa Specialist

The ESOL Compliance Specialist assists in the coordination of eligibility and placement of ESOL students. They provide leadership for improving instruction for ESOL students.
The assistant principals' position is to assist the building principal in organizing and fostering a positive, safe
environment that is conducive to best meeting the needs of all students, staff and parents. This includes responsibilities such as: leading, directing,counseling and supervising a variety of personnel and programs. Assistant principals are key in creating effective parent, teacher, and student communications. The also
support, encourage, mentor and evaluate staff. They foster teamwork between teachers, staff and parents.

The assistant principals' position is to assist the building principal in organizing and fostering a positive, safe
environment that is conducive to best meeting the needs of all students, staff and parents. This includes responsibilities such as: leading,
directing,counseling and supervising a variety of personnel and programs.
Assistant principals are key in creating effective parent, teacher, and student communications. The also
support, encourage, mentor and evaluate staff. They foster teamwork between teachers, staff and parents.
Powers, Instructional
Sharon Media

Support personnel like instructional coaches provide job embedded and ongoing professional development for teachers, staff, and administration. The coaches interface with the principal to work towards the vision of high quality of teaching and learning.

## Gill, Roxanne <br> Other

The 504 coordinator works closely with the staffing specialist and ESE department to ensure that our students with health concerns and/or disabilities are cared for.

Munich, Lynette

Dean
The academic deans of students have a responsibility of protecting the health and welfare of our students. They assist students in establishing high standards of conduct and address the improvement of student attendance and discipline.

Nuckels,
Dustin

Dean
The academic deans of students have a responsibility of protecting the health and welfare of our students. They assist students in establishing high

## Name Position Title Job Duties and Responsibilities

standards of conduct and address the improvement of student attendance and discipline.

Alfonzo- Curriculum
Reyes, Resource Luzeana Teacher

The instructional coach leads and supports PLC meetings weekly. The instructional coach also assists with testing and analyzing data.

## Baez, Administrative

Anne Support

Sella, Other Rebeca Other worker to support our

## Demographic Information

## Principal start date

Tuesday 7/13/2021, Jennifer Fugate
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.
27
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.

8

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
106
Total number of students enrolled at the school
1,703
Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2021-22 school year. 30

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2022-23 school year. 30

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 | 34 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |  |
| Number of students enrolled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 0 | 0 | 00 | 0 | 79 | 89 | 118 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 286 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 00 | 0 | 5 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 00 | 0 | 7 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 |
| Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 00 | 0 | 1 | 90 | 72 | 117 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 280 |
| Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 00 | 0 | 1 | 87 | 44 | 98 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 230 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 0 | 0 | 0 | 00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
|  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level who have two or more early warning indicators:

| Indicator | K | $\mathbf{1}$ | $\mathbf{2}$ | $\mathbf{3}$ | $\mathbf{4}$ | $\mathbf{5}$ | $\mathbf{6}$ | $\mathbf{7}$ | $\mathbf{8}$ | $\mathbf{9}$ | $\mathbf{1 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 1}$ | $\mathbf{1 2}$ | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Students with two or more indicators | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 65 | 50 | 97 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 213 |

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

| Indicator | $\mathbf{K}$ | $\mathbf{1}$ | $\mathbf{2}$ | $\mathbf{3}$ | $\mathbf{4}$ | $\mathbf{5}$ | $\mathbf{6}$ | $\mathbf{7}$ | $\mathbf{8}$ | $\mathbf{9}$ | $\mathbf{1 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 1}$ | $\mathbf{1 2}$ | Total |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Retained Students: Current Year | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |

## Date this data was collected or last updated

Friday 9/2/2022

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

| Indicator | Grade Level |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | K | 1 | 23 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 |  | 11 | 12 |  |
| Number of students enrolled | 0 | 0 | 00 | 0 | 0 | 446 | 481 | 493 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1420 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 0 | 00 | 0 | 0 | 36 | 77 | 69 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 182 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 00 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 8 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 16 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 00 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 6 | 34 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 44 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 00 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 19 | 28 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 52 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 00 | 0 | 0 | 36 | 49 | 43 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 128 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 00 | 0 | 0 | 33 | 50 | 40 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 123 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 0 | 0 | 00 | 0 | 0 | 36 | 49 | 43 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 128 |

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

| Indicator | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |

The number of students identified as retainees:

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Indicator | $\mathbf{K}$ | $\mathbf{1}$ | $\mathbf{2}$ | $\mathbf{3}$ | $\mathbf{4}$ | $\mathbf{5}$ | $\mathbf{6}$ | $\mathbf{7}$ | $\mathbf{8}$ | $\mathbf{9}$ | $\mathbf{1 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 1}$ | $\mathbf{1 2}$ | Total |
| Retained Students: Current Year | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |

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

| Indicator | Grade Level |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total |
| Number of students enrolled | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 446 | 481 | 493 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1420 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 36 | 77 | 69 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 182 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 3 | 8 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 16 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 6 | 34 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 44 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 5 | 19 | 28 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 52 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 36 | 49 | 43 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 128 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 33 | 50 | 40 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 123 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 36 | 49 | 43 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 128 |

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

| Indicator | Grade Level |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | K 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |  | 8 | 9 | 1 |  |  | 12 |  |
| Students with two or more indicators | 00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 24 | 52 | 54 | 0 |  |  |  | 0 | 130 |
| The number of students identified as retainees: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Indicator | Grade Level |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total |
| Retained Students: Current Year | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |

## 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 | $69 \%$ | $49 \%$ | $50 \%$ |  |  |  | $77 \%$ | $52 \%$ | $54 \%$ |
| ELA Learning Gains | $63 \%$ |  |  |  |  |  | $71 \%$ | $52 \%$ | $54 \%$ |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | $51 \%$ |  |  |  |  |  | $68 \%$ | $45 \%$ | $47 \%$ |
| Math Achievement | $79 \%$ | $36 \%$ | $36 \%$ |  |  |  | $83 \%$ | $55 \%$ | $58 \%$ |
| Math Learning Gains | $80 \%$ |  |  |  |  |  | $73 \%$ | $55 \%$ | $57 \%$ |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | $69 \%$ |  |  |  |  |  | $66 \%$ | $50 \%$ | $51 \%$ |
| Science Achievement | $74 \%$ | $55 \%$ | $53 \%$ |  |  |  | $67 \%$ | $51 \%$ | $51 \%$ |
| Social Studies Achievement | $88 \%$ | $61 \%$ | $58 \%$ |  |  |  | $88 \%$ | $67 \%$ | $72 \%$ |

## 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 | 70\% | 52\% | 18\% | 54\% | 16\% |
| Cohort Comparison |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 07 | 2022 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 2019 | 71\% | 48\% | 23\% | 52\% | 19\% |
| Cohort Comparison |  | -70\% |  |  |  |  |
| 08 | 2022 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 2019 | 74\% | 54\% | 20\% | 56\% | 18\% |
| Cohort Comparison |  | -71\% |  |  |  |  |


| MATH |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Grade | Year | School | District | School- District Comparison | State | School- State Comparison |
| 06 | 2022 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 2019 | 73\% | 43\% | 30\% | 55\% | 18\% |
| Cohort Comparison |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 07 | 2022 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 2019 | 77\% | 49\% | 28\% | 54\% | 23\% |
| Cohort Comparison |  | -73\% |  |  |  |  |
| 08 | 2022 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 2019 | 57\% | 36\% | 21\% | 46\% | 11\% |
| Cohort Comparison |  | -77\% |  |  |  |  |


| 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 | 62\% | 49\% | 13\% | 48\% | 14\% |
| 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 | 86\% | 66\% | 20\% | 71\% | 15\% |
| HISTORY EOC |  |  |  |  |  |
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2022 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2019 |  |  |  |  |  |


| ALGEBRA EOC |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Year | School | District | School <br> Minus <br> District | State | School <br> Minus <br> State |  |  |  |
| 2022 |  |  | $28 \%$ | $61 \%$ | $30 \%$ |  |  |  |
| 2019 | $91 \%$ | $63 \%$ | GEOMETRY EOC |  |  |  |  |  |
| School <br> Minus <br> District |  |  |  |  |  |  | State | School <br> Minus <br> State |
| Year | School | District | Ster |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2022 |  |  | $45 \%$ | $57 \%$ | $41 \%$ |  |  |  |
| 2019 | $98 \%$ | $53 \%$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Subgroup Data Review

## 2022 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS

| 2022 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Subgroups | ELA <br> Ach. | $\begin{gathered} \text { ELA } \\ \text { LG } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{\|c} \hline \text { ELA } \\ \text { LG } \\ \text { L25\% } \end{array}$ | Math <br> Ach. | Math LG | $\begin{gathered} \text { Math } \\ \text { LG } \\ \text { L25\% } \end{gathered}$ | Sci Ach. | SS <br> Ach. | MS Accel. | $\begin{gathered} \text { Grad } \\ \text { Rate } \\ 2020-21 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \text { C \& C } \\ \text { Accel } \\ 2020-21 \\ \hline \end{array}$ |
| SWD | 29 | 36 | 24 | 35 | 61 | 60 | 28 | 52 |  |  |  |
| ELL | 48 | 58 | 55 | 65 | 71 | 61 | 54 | 75 | 87 |  |  |
| ASN | 84 | 73 | 20 | 93 | 96 | 100 | 78 | 82 | 95 |  |  |
| BLK | 55 | 54 | 32 | 59 | 73 | 56 | 56 | 81 | 91 |  |  |
| HSP | 63 | 60 | 53 | 76 | 77 | 69 | 70 | 86 | 87 |  |  |
| MUL | 76 | 70 |  | 87 | 90 |  | 92 | 100 | 93 |  |  |
| WHT | 82 | 68 | 70 | 88 | 82 | 72 | 84 | 92 | 91 |  |  |
| FRL | 50 | 53 | 46 | 68 | 76 | 67 | 59 | 78 | 84 |  |  |
| 2021 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Subgroups | ELA <br> Ach. | $\begin{gathered} \text { ELA } \\ \text { LG } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { ELA } \\ \text { LG } \\ \text { L25\% } \end{gathered}$ | Math <br> Ach. | Math LG | $\begin{gathered} \text { Math } \\ \text { LG } \\ \text { L25\% } \end{gathered}$ | Sci Ach. | SS <br> Ach. | MS <br> Accel. | $\begin{gathered} \text { Grad } \\ \text { Rate } \\ 2019-20 \end{gathered}$ | C \& C <br> Accel <br> $2019-20$ |
| SWD | 23 | 40 | 34 | 29 | 48 | 38 | 23 | 57 | 38 |  |  |
| ELL | 46 | 59 | 54 | 61 | 61 | 60 | 44 | 74 | 79 |  |  |
| ASN | 77 | 66 | 50 | 88 | 73 |  | 85 | 91 | 93 |  |  |
| BLK | 63 | 57 | 22 | 56 | 55 | 39 | 68 | 77 | 85 |  |  |
| HSP | 61 | 58 | 53 | 70 | 60 | 57 | 58 | 82 | 76 |  |  |
| MUL | 70 | 62 |  | 83 | 57 |  |  | 91 | 100 |  |  |
| WHT | 79 | 60 | 55 | 84 | 64 | 58 | 81 | 94 | 88 |  |  |
| FRL | 53 | 51 | 49 | 62 | 57 | 53 | 57 | 75 | 68 |  |  |
| 2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Subgroups | ELA <br> Ach. | $\begin{gathered} \text { ELA } \\ \text { LG } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{\|c\|c\|} \hline \text { ELA } \\ \text { LG } \\ \text { L25\% } \\ \hline \end{array}$ | Math <br> Ach. | $\begin{gathered} \text { Math } \\ \text { LG } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Math } \\ \text { LG } \\ \text { L25\% } \end{gathered}$ | Sci Ach. | SS <br> Ach. | MS <br> Accel. | $\begin{gathered} \text { Grad } \\ \text { Rate } \\ 2017-18 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \text { C \& C } \\ \text { Accel } \\ 2017-18 \\ \hline \end{array}$ |
| SWD | 40 | 49 | 41 | 46 | 61 | 59 | 44 | 61 | 75 |  |  |
| ELL | 59 | 72 | 70 | 70 | 74 | 69 | 43 | 74 | 82 |  |  |
| ASN | 87 | 71 |  | 97 | 80 |  | 83 | 95 | 97 |  |  |
| BLK | 74 | 67 | 68 | 81 | 69 | 52 | 55 | 90 | 91 |  |  |
| HSP | 71 | 70 | 68 | 77 | 72 | 66 | 58 | 84 | 84 |  |  |
| MUL | 84 | 79 |  | 84 | 84 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| WHT | 87 | 74 | 67 | 92 | 74 | 73 | 91 | 95 | 94 |  |  |
| FRL | 65 | 71 | 70 | 71 | 69 | 64 | 44 | 80 | 83 |  |  |

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

| ESSA Federal Index |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| ESSA Category (TS\&I or CS\&I) | N/A |
| OVERALL Federal Index - All Students | 71 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41\% All Students | NO |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 0 |
| Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency | 50 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 712 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 10 |
| Percent Tested | 99\% |
| Subgroup Data |  |
| Students With Disabilities |  |
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities | 41 |
| Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41\% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32\% | 0 |
| English Language Learners |  |
| Federal Index - English Language Learners | 62 |
| 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 | 80 |
| 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 | 62 |
| 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 | 69 |
| :--- | :---: |
| Federal Index - Hispanic Students | NO |
| Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41\% in the Current Year? | 0 |
| Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32\% |  |
| Multiracial Students | 87 |
| Federal Index - Multiracial Students | NO |
| Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41\% in the Current Year? | 0 |
| Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32\% |  |
| Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students Students | N/A |
| Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41\% in the Current Year? | 0 |
| Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32\% |  |
|  | White Students |
| Federal Index - White Students | NO |
| White Students Subgroup Below 41\% in the Current Year? | 0 |
| Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32\% | 63 |
|  | Economically Disadvantaged Students |
| Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students | 0 |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41\% in the Current Year? |  |
| Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32\% |  |

## 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?

As an overall trend, each data component saw improvement throughout the year from Fall to Spring. Of the three sub-groups monitored, students with economically disadvantaged households perform closest to the school average. Students with disabilities are performing significantly lower than the school average, as well as, the other sub-groups.

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

Our greatest need is improvement in proficiency for ELA. We will focus on our bottom $25 \%$ for not only proficiency, but learning gains as well. We will continuously monitor for our students with disabilities and
students with high frequency in their attendance. We stayed the same from the previous year, so we do want to see growth.

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

Students and teachers were not clear on the implications of the test results, and may not have given their best effort. Students in the lowest quartile of Math and SWD need to be targeted for support with B.E.S.T. benchmarks/standards based instruction. Teachers will focus on individual student data and target deficient standards for reteach and remediation.

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

The data component displaying the highest increase was in Math 6-8. This component showed a 19 point increase in all subgroups except Students with Disabilities.

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

The greatest contributing factor to this improvement is the Strategic Triage Plan implemented by the math department. The Math PLC discussed the data on a regular basis and identified the greatest need(s) for these students.

What strategies will need to be implemented in order to accelerate learning?
To accelerate student learning, we will need to implement subject area diagnostics in each subject area. Using that data, teachers will begin to become more familiar with the B.E.S.T. standards. We will then need to address these learning gaps through direct instruction, bellwork and digital practice.

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.

Due to the gaps created by the current shift to the B.E.S.T. standards continuous trainings and resources will be used to address achievement gaps.

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

These efforts will help students to better concentrate on their academics and achievement. Targeted tutoring and small group instruction will be implemented in core subject areas. Additionally, this year we will be taking a new focus on student data and data driven instruction and accountability.

## 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 Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups

Area of
Focus
Description

## and

Rationale: To integrate and monitor resources and strategies that strengthen a culture for social and

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

## Measurable

## Outcome:

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

## Monitoring:

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

## Person

 responsiblefor
monitoring
outcome:
Evidencebased
Strategy:
Describe the evidencebased strategy being implemented

By implementing a strong social and emotional school wide support system, Lake Nona Middle School will decrease the number of students with attendance below 90 percent, decrease the number of major disciplinary infractions that lead to internal or external suspensions, and increase Accreditation Stakeholder Student Survey. Student data will show that over $80 \%$ of students agree/ strongly agree that their social and emotional needs are supported by their school. Our student data will show an increase of 9 percentage points for the topic of "Sense of Belonging" from 41\% in the 2021-2022 school year to 50\% in 2022-2023.

To decrease the number of students with attendance below $90 \%$, we will collect student attendance data weekly. We will utilize classified staff members and guidance counselors to monitor the data and connect with students that are showing a pattern of low attendance.
We will monitor student participation in SEL activities and events through Google Forms and sign-ins. We will monitor parent participation in family engagement event and collect customer satisfaction data at the end of the sessions.

Jill Pritz (36561@ocps.net)

We will facilitate PD sessions centered around the continued implementation of Social and Emotional Learning (SEL) in our school. Teachers will then continue to infuse SEL as part of their normal standards-based instructions. We will also communicate with the parents of these students. As part of this communication, staff will address the student's reason for absenteeism. We will address factors such as: transportation, illness, family issues, and/or mental health. To decrease the number of disciplinary infractions that lead to internal or external suspensions we will continue to utilize the H.E.R.O. system to implement PBIS. Teachers will utilize the minor infraction form to track behavior and parent communication prior to assigning a disciplinary referral.

## for this Area

of Focus.

## Rationale for

Evidence- In order to achieve large-scale and sustainable improvement, it is necessary to invest in based the collective capacity of a school building. To create a culture of social and emotional Strategy: learning with adults and students, it is critical to harness the professional skills and Explain the leadership capabilities of everyone in the school. Through a distributive leadership model, rationale for our school will strengthen the team dynamics necessary to collectively support positive selecting this specific strategy.
Describe the resources/ criteria used for selecting organizational improvement and change.
By closely monitoring student attendance data from the beginning, we will be able to address the needs of both the students and their families that may be causing the student to miss valuable instruction time. Similarly, by getting the student's family involved early when minor infractions occur, we can prevent the student from missing classes due to escalation of student behavior. The idea is to create a solid community of support between the student, the family and our school. 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.
Facilitate Social Emotional PD'S and Support to all Staff Members.

## Person Responsible <br> Veronica Pragel (veronica.pragel@ocps.net)

Implement PBIS using the H.E.R.O. system.
Person
Responsible
Steven Berson (steven.berson@ocps.net)

## \#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to B.E.S.T. Standards

## Area of Focus

Description and

## Rationale:

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

## Monitoring:

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

## Person responsible

 for monitoring outcome:
## Evidence-based

Strategy:
Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.
Rationale for
Evidence-based
Strategy:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.
Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

The areas of focus related to the B.E.S.T Standards aligned instruction for LNMS are to focus on our lowest $25 \%$ for ELA.

By enhancing our instructional practices specifically related to B.E.S.T. standards-based instruction, Lake Nona Middle School will increase the percent of students in the lowest $25 \%$ in ELA that will make learning gains as well as, increase the number of students showing proficiency.

Lake Nona Middle School will implement early diagnostic/ baseline assessments. We will be progress monitoring throughout the year by utilizing standards-based common assessments, district-wide Progress Monitoring Assessments (PMA) and frequent formative assessments. Teachers will engage in peer observations and share weekly feedback during Professional Learning Community Meetings (PLC).

Robert McCloe (robert.mccloe@ocps.net)

Teachers will participate in department data chats, one-on-one data chats with admin, and student data chats. Teachers will use the data collected from assessments to drive student learning and the differentiation of instruction, reteach and remediate difficiant standards.

## 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.
Progress Monitoring will give teachers a baseline data point for all students at the beginning of the 2022-2023 school year.
Person Responsible Jill Pritz (36561@ocps.net)
Identify students that need additional differentiated ESOL support.

Person Responsible Teresa Huerta-Kirkland (teresa.huerta-kirkland@ocps.net)
Identify students that need additional differentiated ESE support.
Person Responsible Roxanne Gill (roxanne.gill@ocps.net)

## 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.

Lake Nona Middle School celebrates student personal achievement with award programs. Students receive recognition for All A's each nine-week marking period; Science Fair school and district level placement winners; Sun Games placement winners; Spelling Bee participants; French and Spanish Honor Society inductions; Chess Club district winners; and more. All of these accomplishments are recognized in the weekly newsletter for parents, students and members of our community to celebrate. Lake Nona Middle School established school norms that build positive values. We use the HERO system to award students for applying our norms and use the data from the HERO system to track positive and challenging areas.

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

Lake Nona Middle School generates clear, open communication with the parents of our students. LNMS uses a weekly newsletter, "The Kingdom's Chronicle," that gives us a platform for feedback on classroom activities or school programs. LNMS uses Facebook, Canvas and Instagram for reminders of activities or deadlines for parents and students. Parents, the community and other stakeholders utilize these platforms as a means to communicate with school administration and teachers.
We use HERO as an additional tool to keep parents informed of student behavior and attendance. Parents may also communicate with teachers and deans using this program. Our School Advisory Committee of parents and community members monitors the progress of our School Improvement Plan (SIP). Parents on this committee support the SIP by providing Teacher Grants with funds in order to furnish materials for a teacher initiated activity.

