Umatilla Middle School

2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Umatilla Middle School

305 E LAKE ST, Umatilla, FL 32784

https://ums.lake.k12.fl.us

Demographics

Principal: Andrea Pyatt
Start Date for this Principal: 8/26/2022

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Middle School 6-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2021-22 Title I School	Yes
2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
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* Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students* White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2021-22: C (52%) 2018-19: B (59%) 2017-18: C (51%)
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 is pending approval by the Lake 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.](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

Umatilla Middle School

305 E LAKE ST, Umatilla, FL 32784

https://ums.lake.k12.fl.us

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	**2021-22 Title I School**	**2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
Middle School 6-8	Yes	100%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	25%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Lake 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.

It is the mission of Umatilla Middle School that all students will grow and learn to become life long learners in a positive atmosphere where faculty, staff, parents, and students are enthusiastic about the teaching and learning process utilizing data-driven instruction and research-based materials and programs.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Umatilla Middle School strives to empower all students to be college and career ready by providing a positive, safe, and supportive community.

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
Pyatt, Andrea	Principal	
Fielder, Amanda	Assistant Principal	
Noland, Patsy	School Counselor	
McLaughlin, Kerry	Teacher, K-12	Math Core Team Leader
White, Andrea	Teacher, K-12	Social Studies Core Team Leader
Logan, Emily	Teacher, K-12	Science Core Team Leader
Yates , Amanda	Teacher, K-12	ELA Core Team Leader
Howard, David	Teacher, Career/Technical	
Avramidis, Laura	Teacher, ESE	
Yates , Jeffrey	Dean	
Sheckler, Tiffany	Other	

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Friday 8/26/2022, Andrea Pyatt

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.*

6

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

42

Total number of students enrolled at the school

592

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

4

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

3

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	180	180	208	0	0	0	0	568
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	79	88	104	0	0	0	0	271
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	27	37	25	0	0	0	0	89
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	1	0	0	0	0	8
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	0	0	0	0	4
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	24	29	53	0	0	0	0	106
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	36	45	28	0	0	0	0	109
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	91	124	130	0	0	0	0	345

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	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	2
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	2

Date this data was collected or last updated

Friday 8/26/2022

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	169	172	211	0	0	0	0	552
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	29	50	67	0	0	0	0	146
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	21	20	19	0	0	0	0	60
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	11	0	0	0	0	0	14
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	0	0	0	0	0	8
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	23	21	26	0	0	0	0	70
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	37	31	29	0	0	0	0	97
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	69	118	132	0	0	0	0	319

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

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	169	172	211	0	0	0	0	552
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	29	50	67	0	0	0	0	146
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	21	20	19	0	0	0	0	60
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	11	0	0	0	0	0	14
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	0	0	0	0	0	8
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	23	21	26	0	0	0	0	70
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	37	31	29	0	0	0	0	97
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	69	118	132	0	0	0	0	319

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

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	44%	45%	50%				46%	50%	54%
ELA Learning Gains	41%						51%	52%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	30%						51%	44%	47%
Math Achievement	56%	33%	36%				64%	56%	58%
Math Learning Gains	56%						69%	55%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	55%						57%	46%	51%
Science Achievement	50%	50%	53%				41%	49%	51%
Social Studies Achievement	68%	54%	58%				76%	70%	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	49%	52%	-3%	54%	-5%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2022					
	2019	45%	49%	-4%	52%	-7%
Cohort Comparison		-49%				
08	2022					
	2019	39%	54%	-15%	56%	-17%
Cohort Comparison		-45%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2022					
	2019	65%	53%	12%	55%	10%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2022					
	2019	64%	58%	6%	54%	10%
Cohort Comparison		-65%				
08	2022					
	2019	40%	39%	1%	46%	-6%
Cohort Comparison		-64%				

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	40%	49%	-9%	48%	-8%
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	74%	71%	3%	71%	3%

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	80%	52%	28%	61%	19%

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019					

Subgroup Data Review

2022 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS										
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21
SWD	20	32	23	29	53	53	23	48			
ELL	19	35	42	39	68	64	31	64			
BLK	40	54		38	43						
HSP	35	45	44	43	62	57	32	74	50		
MUL	43	43		60	60						
WHT	46	40	26	60	56	55	53	70	75		
FRL	36	36	31	48	54	49	38	62	67		
2021 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS										
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
SWD	20	24	16	26	46	48	21	46			
ELL	21	32	33	46	36			43			
BLK	18	7		35	27						

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
HSP	34	43	36	52	52	45	45	54	47		
MUL	64	55		73	55						
WHT	49	45	28	60	50	51	50	69	74		
FRL	37	40	27	45	46	46	36	55	54		

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	47	46	30	50	50	21	33			
ELL	33	42	27	48	59	42		58			
BLK	23	38		46	69						
HSP	53	55	47	57	68	52	41	76			
MUL	70	72		85	78						
WHT	45	49	52	65	68	58	40	76	71		
FRL	39	50	52	58	66	56	34	71	71		

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	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	472
Total Components for the Federal Index	9
Percent Tested	98%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	35
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	45
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO

English Language Learners	
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	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	44
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	49
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	52
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?

The overall data for ELA and Math proficiency shows a decline from 2019 to current in all grade levels. Our progress monitoring data showed consistency with the state testing for ELA but for Math, we were above the district and state in several categories. This did not transfer as expected and something that our team will continue to focus on as we move forward. We saw only a slight decrease in ELA Learning Gains but our trend for Math Learning Gains and Lower Quartile is showing an increase. We saw a slight increase in Science but for both Science and Social Studies there was minimal growth. Our students with disabilities continues to be below average.

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

The state assessment data and progress monitoring data for the 21-22 SY continues to show that our greatest need for improvement is in the area of ELA. Our Learning Gains slightly decreased but we showed a slight increase in Lower Quartile. We put an aggressive reading program in place with strong interventions about midway through the school year. There is beginning evidence that this plan will provide an increase in all grade levels for ELA including an increase in overall proficiency for our students with disabilities.

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

The ELA team implemented new curriculum along with new standards. The ELA team will continue to meet throughout the week to include early release days. They will work to strengthen their understanding of the new standards, new curriculum and common formative assessments.

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

The most improved area according to our state assessment data and progress monitoring data is our Grade 8 students in ELA and Math. Our Grade 8 math increased significantly along with our Grade 8 ELA. This was a focus area that was targeted for Intervention through our Tiger Time Plan using progress monitoring data throughout the school year.

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

There was a focus at UMS for Interventions and opportunities for our students to Accelerate their learning. The strategic use of Tiger Time, our intervention and acceleration block, to address and re-address Grade 8 assessed standards. This work was systematic with purpose.

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

A continued focus on essential standards in core content areas would be a strategy to accelerate learning. Through collaborative planning, the teams at UMS are able to use their common formative assessment data to strengthen standards work and allow time for pacing to accelerate and or content knowledge and skills to deepen student understanding.

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.

The professional learning opportunities that will be provided at the school site will be professional learning in real-time through the Professional Learning Communities process. What do we want students to learn, how will they learn it, what will we do if they have not learned it and what do we do if they already have learned it. These four questions drive the work that teacher teams do within their collaborative planning time. The data generated from this process is used with purpose to determine student intervention and acceleration.

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

The leadership team will continue to participate in district learning in order to provide targeted feedback to teachers and teacher teams on their work with students and throughout the PLC process. This work with strengthen as teacher team relationships are built and success in the classroom of the work with students is evident.

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 Standards-aligned Instruction	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: **Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.**	UMS teachers will plan, deliver and differentiate standards-aligned instruction in all content areas while purposefully incorporating reading, writing, thinking and talking every day every class. Teachers will receive support on the District Instructional Framework and the PLC questions.
	UMS will increase reading, writing, thinking and talking in all subject areas based on evidence from Learning Walk data from baseline to midyear. Purpose for Learning on the District Framework.
Measurable Outcome: **State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.**	We will increase student achievement in ELA from 44% to 50%, learning gains from 41% to 51% and lower quartile from 30% to 40%. We will increase student achievement in Math from 56% to 64%, learning gains from 56% to 66% and lower quartile from 55% to 65%. We will increase student achievement in Science from 50% to 55%. We will increase student achievement in Social Studies from 68% to 74%.
Monitoring: **Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.**	This work will be monitored by the collection of data during Learning Walks, Collaborative Planning, School, District and State Progress Monitoring data and Professional Learning Days.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Andrea Pyatt (pyatta@lake.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy: **Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.**	Differentiated Instruction, Small Group Instruction, Intervention and Acceleration and Common Formative Assessments.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: **Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.**	If students receive differentiated instruction on essential standards and data is generated to determine who has learned and who has not and intervention and acceleration is implemented then,

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.

1. Create and establish a collaborative planning schedule.
2. Define norms and protocols for collaborative planning.
3. Train teacher leaders and support team on the PLC process.
4. Train teacher leaders and support team on the District Instructional Framework, specifically purpose with standards-aligned instruction. Teachers may use IXL, Generation Genius and or USA Test Prep (Progress Learning) to help support standards-aligned instruction.
5. Train teacher leaders and support team on the process of creating common formative assessments.
6. Define expectations on common formative assessments.

7. Analyze data to assess collaborative learning of teachers and students.

8. Provide on-going feedback and re-teach if necessary.

Person Responsible   Andrea Pyatt (pyatta@lake.k12.fl.us)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Small Group Instruction	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: **Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.**	Students identified as lower quartile in both ELA and Math will receive differentiated standards-based instruction to address mastery of standards. Additional time is blocked off within the mater schedule to provide intervention and acceleration to meet the needs of all learners including our students with disabilities.
	UMS will increase learning gains and proficiency in the areas of ELA and Math on all assessments.
Measurable Outcome: **State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.**	We will increase student achievement in ELA from 44% to 50%, learning gains from 41% to 51% and lower quartile from 30% to 40%. We will increase student achievement in Math from 56% to 64%, learning gains from 56% to 66% and lower quartile from 55% to 65%. We will increase student achievement in Science from 50% to 55%. We will increase student achievement in Social Studies from 68% to 74%.
Monitoring: **Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.**	This will be monitored by the collection of data during Learning Walks, Progress Monitoring, participation in collaborative planning and professional learning.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Andrea Pyatt (pyatta@lake.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy: **Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.**	Small group instruction with content experts win ELA, Math, Science and Social Studies will work with studnets who have not mastered grade-level standards.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: **Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.**	If students receive small group instruction on essential standards then students will make gains on all assessments.

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.

1. Create intervention/acceleration block (Tiger Time) in the master schedule four days a week.
2. Use data from common formative assessments to monitor student mastery of standards.
3. Teachers will create small group intervention/acceleration to support students. Writing teams will be utilized to develop lesson to target standards.
4. Teachers will utilize Chromebooks, ViewSonic Interaction Touch Screens to assist with student mastery.
5. Teachers will utilize resources from Scholastic, Commonlit.org, IXL, USATestPrep, and ALEKS to assist with intervention and acceleration.

Person Responsible	Andrea Pyatt (pyatta@lake.k12.fl.us)

#3. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Early Warning Systems	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: **Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.**	Umatilla Middle School will continue to develop a healthy culture and school environment by increasing attendance and positive student behaviors using the UMS attendance plan and restorative practices.
Measurable Outcome: **State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.**	By focusing on this area, we expect to see a decrease in absenteeism in school level data, EWS data, or classroom walkthrough data both qualitative and quantitative.
Monitoring: **Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.**	The UMS Attendance plan will be followed with checkpoints and progress monitoring. Attendance reports will be ran weekly and monitored.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Amanda Fielder (fieldera@lake.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy: **Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.**	UMS Teachers will be trained on the components of the attendance plan where they utilize the call log, make referrals to guidance for follow up and participate in child study meetings. Teachers will be training on Restorative Practices.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: **Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.**	If teachers are trained on the plans for attendance and behavior then attendance will increase and behavior referrals will decrease.

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.

1. Review all plans with the teachers, faculty and staff.
2. Train key personnel in Restorative Practices.
3. Train teachers in Restorative Practices.
4. Implement plan and monitor.
5. Re-access as needed.

Person Responsible   Amanda Fielder (fieldera@lake.k12.fl.us)

#4. 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.	UMS teachers will plan, deliver and differentiate standards-aligned instruction in all content areas while purposefully incorporating reading, writing, thinking and talking every day every class. Teachers will receive support on the District Instructional Framework and the PLC questions specifically to address our students with disabilities. Students who are identified as a student with a disability in both ELA and Math will receive differentiated standards-based instruction to address mastery of standards. Additional time is blocked off within the mater schedule to provide intervention and acceleration to meet the needs of all learners including our students with disabilities.
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	UMS will increase reading, writing, thinking and talking in all subject areas based on evidence from Learning Walk data from baseline to midyear. An increase in students understanding Purpose for Learning on the District Framework will also show and increase from baseline to midyear. We will increase student achievement in ELA from 44% to 50%, learning gains from 41% to 51% and lower quartile from 30% to 40%. We will increase student achievement in Math from 56% to 64%, learning gains from 56% to 66% and lower quartile from 55% to 65%. We will increase our ESSA Subgroup - students with disabilities student achievement from 35% to 41%. We will increase student achievement in Science from 50% to 55%. We will increase student achievement in Social Studies from 68% to 74%.
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	This work will be monitored by the collection of data during Learning Walks, Collaborative Planning, School, District and State Progress Monitoring data, Students with Disabilities Check In Days, and Professional Learning Days.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	[no one identified]
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.	Small group instruction with content experts in ELA, Math, Science and Social Studies will work with students who have not mastered grade-level standards. Pull-outs will be utilized to provide additional support for our students with disabilities.

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

If students with disabilities receive small group instruction and or are pulled out for instruction on essential standards then students with disabilities will make gains on all assessments.

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.

1. Create intervention/acceleration block (Tiger Time) in the master schedule four days a week.
2. Use data from common formative assessments to monitor students with disabilities mastery of standards.
3. ESE Teachers will create small group intervention/acceleration to support students with disabilities.
4. ESE Teachers will utilize Chromebooks, ViewSonic Interaction Touch Screens to assist with student mastery for our students with disabilities.
5. ESE Teachers will utilize resources from Scholastic, Commonlit.org, IXL, USATestPrep, and ALEKS to assist with intervention and acceleration.

Person Responsible

Andrea Pyatt (pyatta@lake.k12.fl.us)

Positive Culture & Environment

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

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment.

The school addresses building a positive school culture and environment through interaction with faculty, staff, students, parents, families and other community stakeholders to fulfill the mission and vision of the school. Interaction includes positive communication within the classrooms with students, campus events, and social media engagement.

UMS provides an orientation for our incoming Grade 6 students where they may familiarize themselves with all programs and activities on campus. We host school events where our campus is open and stakeholders can interact and engage with our faculty and staff.

UMS does effectively communicate with the high school and the elementary school to ensure a solid transition from school to school for any student.

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

The school leadership team focuses on promoting "believe in yourself", "work hard", and "never give up". These statement drive our work at UMS. The leadership team plans strategic use of SAI, IDEA, Title I, and Title IX Homeless funds to support all students in ELA and Math. The lower quartile students will be identified and supported through the additional funding as well. This work will promote a positive culture as students realize success.
UMS is an AVID school which promotes and teaches students skills needed to succeed in College and in the workforce. There is also a solid relationship with College Board Florida Partnership and they provide PSAT assessments to all Grade 8 students.