

Lake County Schools

Mt. Dora Middle School



2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	15
Positive Culture & Environment	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Mt. Dora Middle School

1405 LINCOLN AVE, Mount Dora, FL 32757

<https://mms.lake.k12.fl.us/>

Demographics

Principal: Jennifer Farnsworth

Start Date for this Principal: 7/26/2021

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)	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 (49%) 2018-19: C (53%) 2017-18: B (55%)
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.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	15
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Mt. Dora Middle School

1405 LINCOLN AVE, Mount Dora, FL 32757

<https://mms.lake.k12.fl.us/>

School Demographics

<p>School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Middle School 6-8</p>	<p>2021-22 Title I School</p> <p style="font-size: 24px;">No</p>	<p>2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p style="font-size: 24px;">100%</p>
<p>Primary Service Type (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">K-12 General Education</p>	<p>Charter School</p> <p style="font-size: 24px;">No</p>	<p>2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p style="font-size: 24px;">57%</p>

School Grades History

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

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.

The mission of Mount Dora Middle School is to create a welcoming and safe environment for students to become life-long learners and critical thinkers. We will prepare our students to be successful citizens equipped with skills and knowledge to thrive in the world.

Provide the school's vision statement.

As a collaborative learning community, we will work together to clarify what each student must learn, monitor our students' learning and provide systematic intervention and acceleration for each student. By building positive relationships with our students and stakeholders, we will create a loving and supportive environment where each student can thrive socially and academically.

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
Farnsworth , Jennifer	Principal	
Williams, Charlotte	Assistant Principal	
Feld, Charles	Assistant Principal	
Laios, Amanda	Dean	
Rackowski, Greg	Other	
Randolph, Shena	Other	
Porter, Erin	School Counselor	
Rigby, Gina	Instructional Coach	
Mattison , Toyin	School Counselor	

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 7/26/2021, Jennifer Farnsworth

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.*

3

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.*

9

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

56

Total number of students enrolled at the school

838

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

19

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

20

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	275	249	314	0	0	0	0	838
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	91	88	105	0	0	0	0	284
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	32	33	0	0	0	0	76
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	57	66	101	0	0	0	0	224
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	68	66	72	0	0	0	0	206
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
25	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	128	135	178	0	0	0	0	441

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

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

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	254	289	280	0	0	0	0	823
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	67	81	71	0	0	0	0	219
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	15	23	0	0	0	0	49
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	19	1	0	0	0	0	24
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	20	17	0	0	0	0	40
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	68	70	64	0	0	0	0	202
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	67	82	71	0	0	0	0	220
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	115	218	152	0	0	0	0	485

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

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	254	289	280	0	0	0	0	823
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	67	81	71	0	0	0	0	219
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	15	23	0	0	0	0	49
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	19	1	0	0	0	0	24
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	20	17	0	0	0	0	40
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	68	70	64	0	0	0	0	202
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	67	82	71	0	0	0	0	220
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	115	218	152	0	0	0	0	485

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

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data Review

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school, or combination schools).

School Grade Component	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	44%	45%	50%				53%	50%	54%
ELA Learning Gains	41%						52%	52%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	38%						39%	44%	47%
Math Achievement	49%	33%	36%				62%	56%	58%
Math Learning Gains	49%						48%	55%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	49%						41%	46%	51%
Science Achievement	47%	50%	53%				48%	49%	51%
Social Studies Achievement	64%	54%	58%				63%	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	50%	52%	-2%	54%	-4%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2022					
	2019	46%	49%	-3%	52%	-6%
Cohort Comparison		-50%				
08	2022					
	2019	58%	54%	4%	56%	2%
Cohort Comparison		-46%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2022					
	2019	52%	53%	-1%	55%	-3%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2022					
	2019	54%	58%	-4%	54%	0%
Cohort Comparison		-52%				
08	2022					
	2019	46%	39%	7%	46%	0%
Cohort Comparison		-54%				

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	47%	49%	-2%	48%	-1%
Cohort Comparison		0%				

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	0%	66%	-66%	67%	-67%
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	61%	71%	-10%	71%	-10%
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019					
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	92%	52%	40%	61%	31%
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	100%	49%	51%	57%	43%

Subgroup Data Review

2022 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21
SWD	24	37	34	27	44	42	24	28			
ELL	25	36	37	33	45	60	15	44			
ASN	80			55	50						
BLK	30	42	47	32	45	44	24	47	50		
HSP	33	39	37	43	50	50	38	54	43		
MUL	38	42	55	53	44	33	62	80	60		
WHT	57	41	27	59	49	57	55	78	63		
FRL	34	41	43	37	43	48	33	48	47		
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	17	32	24	20	32	32	6	58			
ELL	30	44	34	27	40	50	7	63			

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
BLK	33	40	29	30	32	26	27	54	43		
HSP	39	44	34	37	31	30	19	71	43		
MUL	40	41		50	50		36	63			
WHT	52	46	44	54	37	49	43	75	63		
FRL	32	38	34	30	28	32	13	67	39		
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	17	36	33	27	41	38	24	33			
ELL	23	38	30	33	48	43	17	52			
ASN	60	40		90	80						
BLK	42	30	19	41	38	33	39	55	58		
HSP	46	50	34	49	45	36	35	56	69		
MUL	41	62	58	62	54		54	40	58		
WHT	62	57	49	74	52	46	56	72	75		
FRL	43	47	36	49	47	40	36	49	64		

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	47
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	26
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	465
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	99%

Subgroup Data

Students With Disabilities

Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	33
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	36
---	----

English Language Learners	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	62
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	40
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	41
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	54
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	42
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?

In ELA we saw a slight drop in the percent proficient in 6th and 7th grade. The subgroups of ELL, BLK, HSP, MUL all saw a decline in proficiency in ELA. In math there was not a drop in proficiency in any grade. 6th and 8th grade saw a gain and 7th grade remained the same. All subgroups saw an increase in math proficiency except for WHT students which showed a decline. Our Lowest quartile percentile in math and ELA had gains from the previous year. Science Achievement saw gains and Civics has a decline in achievement.

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

Our greatest need for improvement is in Civics and ELA proficiency and learning gains on FSA and EOC. Civics achievement dropped from 71% in 2021 to 64% in 2022. ELA proficiency dropped from 45% in 2021 to 44% in 2022. ELA Learning Gains dropped from 45% in 2021 to 41% in 2022. In all other areas there was growth last school year.

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

Last year the ELA department transitioned to a new curriculum. We also had turnover during the school year within the department. Our new actions for this year is an emphasis on ELA professional learning teams meeting weekly with a specific focus on clarifying what each student must learn (essential standards), monitoring students' learning (Common formative assessments) and providing systematic intervention and acceleration for each student during our Eagle Time.

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

Math and Science FSA scores showed the most improvement. For math, there was a 14% increase from previous year in learning gains to 49%. and a 13% increase from previous year in Lowest quartile making learning gains 49%. The science achievement increase by 14% from the previous year with achievement going up to 47%.

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

In math and science the teachers worked collaboratively as a professional learning team meeting weekly with a specific focus on clarifying what each student must learn (essential standards), monitoring students' learning (Common formative assessments) and providing systematic intervention and

acceleration for each student during our Eagle Time. We also utilized the ALEKS math program for remediation and acceleration opportunities.

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

We will be offering tutoring before and after school for students. All PLC teams across the school will focus on essential standards, common formative assessments and utilizing data to develop targeted interventions during our Eagle Time block (4x per week for 32 min, each block).

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.

Administration and teachers conducting learning walks to visit classrooms on campus. The first Tuesday of the month PD focused on the instructional framework and best practices. District PLC program specialist will offer PD on collaborative planning to focus on clarifying what each student must learn (essential standards), monitoring students' learning (Common formative assessments) and providing systematic intervention and acceleration for each student during our Eagle Time.

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

Administration will continue to do classroom walkthroughs and give feedback. Mentor teachers and literacy coach will be assigned to assist newer teachers to ensure they are supported and growing professionally in their craft.

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.

Based upon FSA data Needs Assessment/Analysis section instructional practice specifically related to standards-aligned instruction is one of our most critical areas of focus. With high expectations, teachers will understand, plan, deliver, and differentiate standards-based instruction in all content areas for all students while intentionally incorporating setting the purpose, modeling thinking, guided instruction, collaborative learning, and independent learning; students will be able to state what they are learning, why they are learning it, how they know they have learned it.

If we monitor and support common planning, then teachers will have the opportunity to plan for and evaluate student formative assessments/work products in order to increase student achievement. If we support the district's instructional framework, then teachers will understand and utilize modeling, guided instruction, collaborative and independent learning with high expectations for all students. This area of focus supports our goal of increasing overall proficiency and learning gains in all areas, as well as targeting the three ESSA components that are below 41%.

We currently have four groups below the 41% and will focus on improving student achievement in these subgroups: English Language Learners, Students with Disabilities, African American and Hispanic .

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

Students will attend targeted intervention based on data from common formative assessments. This will be evidenced by interventions in Flex-time and student rosters. Increase student achievement in Civics Achievement 64% to 71%, Math proficiency from 49% to 52%, Math learning gains from 49% to 52%, Math lowest quartile learning gains from 49% to 52%, ELA proficiency from 44% to 47%, ELA learning gains from 41% to 45%, ELA lowest quartile from 38% to 41%, and Science proficiency from 47% to 50%. Increase all ESSA components to at least 41%.

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

Classroom walk-throughs of intervention (Eagle Time), department quarterly data chats of LSA's and APM data and intervention opportunities,

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jennifer Farnsworth (farnsworthj1@lake.k12.fl.us)

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

Common planning will be used to increase teacher capacity, therefore, leading to increases in student achievement. The new math curriculum will be implemented with fidelity and using technology resources available through the curriculum. To monitor this strategy classroom walk-throughs will be analyzed monthly to ensure transfer into instructional delivery from common planning is occurring.

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

If we implement, monitor, and support common planning, then teachers will have the opportunity to plan for and evaluate student formative assessments/work products in order to increase student achievement.

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 a professional development series that focuses on the district instructional framework and PLC. The specific focus for the 2022-2023 school year will be on purpose and common assessments to organize intervention groups.

Who: Administration and literacy coach

When: Monthly

Evidence: Professional development schedule, presentations, sign-in sheets, and CWT data.

2. Increase access to and enrollment in CTE Certification Classes, Algebra, & Geometry

Who: Scheduling Administrator

When: Each Semester

Evidence: Number of courses available and students enrolled in the courses

Frequency: Re-evaluate quarterly

Evidence: Schedule, Norms, List of protocols, and deliverables

Person Responsible Gina Rigby (rigbyg@lake.k12.fl.us)

2. Increase access to and enrollment in CTE Certification Classes, Algebra, & Geometry

Who: Scheduling Administrator

When: Each Semester

Evidence: Number of courses available and students enrolled in the courses

Frequency: Re-evaluate quarterly

Evidence: Schedule, Norms, List of protocols, and deliverables

Person Responsible Erin Porter (portere@lake.k12.fl.us)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Differentiation

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

Based upon the proficiency and learning gains in ELA and Civics from the Needs Assessment/Analysis section list interventions for ELA and Civics is our most critical areas of focus. This area of focus was identified as a critical area of need because proficiency dropped to 44% and learning gains dropped to 36% in ELA. Achievement in Civics dropped from 71% to 64%. There are also four sub-groups performing under the required 41% in Students with disabilities, African American, and English Language Learners and hispanic students

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

By focusing on these area, we expect to see increase in state level data from 44% to 47% in ELA proficiency and 41% to 44% learning gains. In Civics we expect to see an increase from 64% to 71%. We expect to see all sub-groups performing at or above the required 41% by ESSA.

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

classroom learning walks during advisory block, monthly data chats from progress monitoring tools, actively participating in common planning.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jennifer Farnsworth (farnsworthj1@lake.k12.fl.us)

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

A structured intervention time (Eagle Time) will be used for students to receive remediation in ELA and Civics standards not being mastered on common formative assessments, which will help to increase proficiency and learning gains. Reading teacher will have structured intervention time with lowest quartile students which will help to increase lowest quartile learning gains. AMPLIFY curriculum will be implemented with fidelity and using technology resources available through the curriculum during intervention block. The intervention time will also address our identified sub-groups performing below the required

implemented for this Area of Focus.

41% by ESSA. To monitor this strategy school/state/district level data, EWS data, and classroom walk-through data will be analyzed quarterly by the teacher support team.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

If we implement, monitor, and support a structured intervention time then there will be an increase in our proficiency and learning gains data as evidenced in school/state/district level data.

Describe the resources/ criteria used for selecting this strategy.

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Create a structured intervention plan for ELA and Civics students below proficiency and not meeting learning gains.

Who: Administration and literacy coach

When: 9/12/22, End 5/26/23

Frequency: Reevaluate quarterly

Evidence: School/state/district level data

Person

Responsible Gina Rigby (rigbyg@lake.k12.fl.us)

Implement the usage of the technology remediation tools for Amplify for all students to support quality instruction for Intervention/Acceleration block.

Who: Administration and literacy coach

When: 9/12/21, End 5/26/22

Frequency: Reevaluate quarterly

Evidence: School/state/district level data

Person

Responsible Amanda Laios (laios@lake.k12.fl.us)

Offer before/after-school tutoring for level 1 & level 2 students to provide prescriptive assistance for students in need.

Who: Administration and literacy coach

When: 10/1/21, End 4/1/22

Frequency: Available Monday thru Thursday

Evidence: School/state/district level data

Person

Responsible Jennifer Farnsworth (farnsworthj1@lake.k12.fl.us)

Offer tutoring and course remediation opportunities (before and after school and virtual on weekends) for all students failing courses after first semester to provide prescriptive assistance for students to show mastery for grade recovery.

Who: Administration and Guidance

When: 02/1/21, End 5/26/22

Frequency: Available Monday thru Sunday

Evidence: School/state/district level data

Person Responsible Charlotte Williams (williamsc1@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.

By utilizing early warning systems data, Mount Dora Middle will increase attendance, positive student behaviors, and maintain a safe and supportive environment for all students. If we monitor early warning systems data quarterly and work with families to ensure expectations are clear, then we will increase attendance, positive student behaviors, and maintain a safe and supportive environment for all students.

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

Reduce the number of student referrals and reduce the number of suspensions each quarter. Reduce the amount of students with 10% or more absences by 10%.

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

Quarterly data chats of early warning systems with teachers and administrators.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Charles Feld (feldc@lake.k12.fl.us)

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

Continue implementation of school-wide positive behavior plan to offer incentives for students demonstrating desired positive behaviors and monitor early warning signs to intervene with students displaying at-risk behaviors. Students will work with the Mental Health Liason, school counselors, teachers and administrators.

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

If we monitor early warning systems data quarterly and work with families and students to ensure expectations are clear, then we will increase attendance, positive student behaviors, and maintain a safe and supportive environment for all students.

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.

Implementation of school-wide positive behavior plan to offer incentives for students demonstrating desired positive behaviors and monitor early warning signs to intervene with students displaying at-risk behaviors.

Who: Administration and guidance
 When: 8/22/22, End 5/26/23

Person Responsible Charlotte Williams (williamsc1@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.

MDMS will continue developing a healthy culture and school environment by increasing attendance and positive student behaviors using the PBIS reward system and utilizing restorative practices.

The amount of students missing 10% of school will be decrease by 10%. The amount of students with one or more suspensions will be decreased by 10%.

Restorative Practices PD will be provided to every teacher on the campus.

If teachers are trained and utilize restorative practices then student discipline will decrease.

1. We have an updated behavior tracking/reward system that will allow flexibility for teachers to positively affect behavior.
2. P.A.S.S. class will be utilized to provide students with opportunities for restorative practices.
3. We will educate students on new rules and expectations using clearly defined protocols.

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

Stakeholders are parents, students, teachers, support staff, administrators and community members. Through our SAC and PTO we will collect feedback and work collaboratively with our community members. All Stakeholders play a key role in school performance and addressing equity. Mount Dora Middle School will consult with various stakeholder groups to assist in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies.