

Alachua County Public Schools

A. L. Mebane Middle School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

| | |
|--|-----------|
| SIP Authority and Purpose | 3 |
| I. School Information | 6 |
| II. Needs Assessment/Data Review | 11 |
| III. Planning for Improvement | 16 |
| IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review | 24 |
| V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence | 0 |
| VI. Title I Requirements | 0 |
| VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus | 25 |

A. L. Mebane Middle School

16401 NW 140TH ST, Alachua, FL 32615

<https://www.sbac.edu/mebane>

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Alachua County School Board on 10/17/2023.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes (F.S.), requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a new, amended, or continuation SIP for each school in the district which has a school grade of D or F; has a significant gap in achievement on statewide, standardized assessments administered pursuant to s. 1008.22 by one or more student subgroups, as defined in the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), 20 U.S.C. s. 6311(b)(2)(C)(v)(II); has not significantly increased the percentage of students passing statewide, standardized assessments; has not significantly increased the percentage of students demonstrating Learning Gains, as defined in s. 1008.34, and as calculated under s. 1008.34(3)(b), who passed statewide, standardized assessments; has been identified as requiring instructional supports under the Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE) program established in s. 1008.365; or has significantly lower graduation rates for a subgroup when compared to the state's graduation rate. Rule 6A-1.098813, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.), requires district school boards to approve a SIP for each Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) school in the district rated as Unsatisfactory.

Below are the criteria for identification of traditional public and public charter schools pursuant to the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) State plan:

Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)

A school not identified for CSI or TSI, but has one or more subgroups with a Federal Index below 41%.

Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)

A school not identified as CSI that has at least one consistently underperforming subgroup with a Federal Index below 32% for three consecutive years.

Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)

A school can be identified as CSI in any of the following four ways:

1. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%;
2. Have a graduation rate at or below 67%;
3. Have a school grade of D or F; or
4. Have a Federal Index below 41% in the same subgroup(s) for 6 consecutive years.

ESEA sections 1111(d) requires that each school identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI develop a support and improvement plan created in partnership with stakeholders (including principals and other school leaders, teachers and parent), is informed by all indicators in the State's accountability system, includes evidence-based interventions, is based on a school-level needs assessment, and identifies resource inequities to be

addressed through implementation of the plan. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as TSI, ATSI and non-Title I CSI must be approved and monitored by the school district. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as Title I, CSI must be approved by the school district and Department. The Department must monitor and periodically review implementation of each CSI plan after approval.

The Department's SIP template in the Florida Continuous Improvement Management System (CIMS), <https://www.floridacims.org>, meets all state and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all ESSA components for a support and improvement plan required for traditional public and public charter schools identified as CSI, TSI and ATSI, and eligible schools applying for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) funds.

Districts may allow schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions to develop a SIP using the template in CIMS.

The responses to the corresponding sections in the Department's SIP template may address the requirements for: 1) Title I schools operating a schoolwide program (SWD), pursuant to ESSA, as amended, Section 1114(b); and 2) charter schools that receive a school grade of D or F or three consecutive grades below C, pursuant to Rule 6A-1.099827, F.A.C. The chart below lists the applicable requirements.

| SIP Sections | Title I Schoolwide Program | Charter Schools |
|--|---|------------------------|
| I-A: School Mission/Vision | | 6A-1.099827(4)(a)(1) |
| I-B-C: School Leadership, Stakeholder Involvement & SIP Monitoring | ESSA 1114(b)(2-3) | |
| I-E: Early Warning System | ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III) | 6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2) |
| II-A-C: Data Review | | 6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2) |
| II-F: Progress Monitoring | ESSA 1114(b)(3) | |
| III-A: Data Analysis/Reflection | ESSA 1114(b)(6) | 6A-1.099827(4)(a)(4) |
| III-B: Area(s) of Focus | ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(i-iii) | |
| III-C: Other SI Priorities | | 6A-1.099827(4)(a)(5-9) |
| VI: Title I Requirements | ESSA 1114(b)(2, 4-5), (7)(A)(iii)(I-V)-(B) ESSA 1116(b-g) | |

Note: Charter schools that are also Title I must comply with the requirements in both columns.

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 Department 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.

I. School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

Mebane Middle School is committed to the teaching, training, and preparation of ALL students to be successful in school and as contributing members of the community. The responsibility for learning should be inspired by teachers, encouraged by parents, and ultimately accepted by each student. We believe that with faculty efforts, parent support, and student commitment with self-discipline, a child will have the best opportunity to realize his or her fullest potential.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Mebane Middle School is committed to providing all of our students with skills and experiences that will enable them to reach their fullest potential while building on their strengths to prepare students for successful careers, higher education opportunities, and to be lifelong learners.

School Leadership Team, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring

School Leadership Team

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 as it relates to SIP implementation for each member of the school leadership team.:

| Name | Position Title | Job Duties and Responsibilities |
|------------------|---------------------|--|
| Gamble, Mike | Principal | |
| Geiger, Gina | Assistant Principal | Assistant Principal over curriculum. Provide a shared vision and language for the continued use of data-based decision making. Provide needed resources and materials to ensure optimum levels of program success. Provide and/or coordinate professional development. Conduct classroom walkthroughs to monitor fidelity of interventions in use. Provide outreach to parents, community and other stakeholders to benefit all students. In charge of the master schedule as well as schoolwide testing coordinator. |
| Felix, Sarah | Teacher, K-12 | 6th Grade Math teacher and school Magnet Coordinator. She is also the grade level and math chairperson. |
| Weeks, Lillian | School Counselor | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Monitor student behavior log and checking in with students that are appearing on a regular basis. 2. Working with small groups of students during lunch on behavior and academic success. 3. Support student mental health concerns through individual and group counseling as well as provide Mental Health Curriculum to all students based upon the Mental Health Assessment Data collected by teachers. 4. Meet monthly to discuss students of concern, review interventions for students, and make adjustments as needed. 5. Act as a liaison between teachers, students, and parents in creating student success plans. |
| | Dean | PBIS School Coordinator Threat Assessment Team Member Title IV Investigator Responsibilities: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Will monitor student behavior using a behavior intervention log checking in with students that are appearing on the log on a regular basis. 2. Will hold monthly PBIS meetings to review discipline procedures and make suggestions for implementation. 3. Planning monthly reward activities for students that exemplify the Mustang Expectations. 4. Will meet to discuss monthly students of concern, review interventions for students, and make adjustments as needed including writing behavior plans for students in need of interventions. |
| Reynolds, Hannah | Teacher, K-12 | 7th gr Civics Teacher, Team Leader and Social Studies Dept. Chair Literacy Team Member Social Studies Department Chairperson CORE Team Member PBIS Committee Member Responsibilities: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Support the implementation of reading and writing in all Social Studies |

| Name | Position Title | Job Duties and Responsibilities |
|------|----------------|--|
| | | <p>classes through the use of TEAL (Topic, Evidence, Analysis, and Link) when generating Costa's Higher Order questions and student response expectations.</p> <p>2. Promoting the use of Cornell Notes and summarization within the ELA department to ensure implementation across all subject areas.</p> |

Diley, Teacher, 8th gr Team Leader
Jennifer K-12

Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Development

Describe the process for involving stakeholders (including the school leadership team, teachers and school staff, parents, students (mandatory for secondary schools) and families, and business or community leaders) and how their input was used in the SIP development process. (ESSA 1114(b)(2))

Note: If a School Advisory Council is used to fulfill these requirements, it must include all required stakeholders.

In a small community such as Alachua, the schools play an outsized role, since nearly all of the middle-school aged children attend Mebane. Since being appointed principal in July, Mr. Gamble contacted the Alachua mayor, city commissioners and city manager. He has already met with some of these individuals who told him that education was the #1 priority in the City's Strategic Plan. All of the faculty & staff of Mebane, its students and their families are stakeholders. Of course, it is up to the classroom teachers to provide the instruction for student academic success. It is then up to the school leadership team, and primarily the administration, to monitor the academic progress of our students and provide feedback to teachers. Progress is mostly monitored through assessments such as the District's AIMS assessments, iReady for Reading, iXL for Math, and the State's FAST tests, which are administered three times per year. FAST test results are also shared with the School Advisory Council.

SIP Monitoring

Describe how the SIP will be regularly monitored for effective implementation and impact on increasing the achievement of students in meeting the State's academic standards, particularly for those students with the greatest achievement gap. Describe how the school will revise the plan, as necessary, to ensure continuous improvement. (ESSA 1114(b)(3))

Mr. Gamble places a premium on giving teachers written feedback via Snapshots in ACIIS (the District's evaluation program) and informal walkthroughs to check on student engagement and teacher planning. Both he & Mrs. Geiger will complete more than the District's suggested four Snapshots per teacher per year. Mr. Gamble places special emphasis on new and beginning teachers. Administration will also review assessment data with individual teachers and their teams. Special emphasis will be placed on the assessment results and progress of our Black, ELL and ESE students. All children can learn and should be making progress throughout the year.

Results of FAST tests will be shared with the SAC.

Demographic Data

Only ESSA identification and school grade history updated 3/11/2024

| | |
|--|--------|
| 2023-24 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 |
| 2022-23 Title I School Status | No |
| 2022-23 Minority Rate | 56% |
| 2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate | 100% |
| Charter School | No |
| RAISE School | No |
| ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024 | TSI |
| Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) | No |
| 2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Students With Disabilities (SWD)* English Language Learners (ELL)* Black/African American Students (BLK)* Hispanic Students (HSP)* Multiracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL) |
| School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline. | 2021-22: C 2019-20: C 2018-19: C 2017-18: C |
| School Improvement Rating History | |
| DJJ Accountability Rating History | |

Early Warning Systems

Using 2022-23 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 | | |
| Absent 10% or more days | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 33 | 24 | 27 | 84 | |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14 | 21 | 21 | 56 | |
| Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 21 | 38 | 69 | |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 7 | 15 | 31 | |
| Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 42 | 35 | 44 | 121 | |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 25 | 36 | 19 | 80 | |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C. | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 42 | 35 | 44 | 121 | |

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

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | Total |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | |
| Students with two or more indicators | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 33 | 41 | 47 | 121 |

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students identified retained:

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

Prior Year (2022-23) As Initially Reported (pre-populated)

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

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|---|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-----|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | | |
| Absent 10% or more days | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 31 | 26 | 21 | 78 | |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 16 | 15 | 43 | |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 8 | 9 | 30 | |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 18 | 24 | 13 | 55 | |
| Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 40 | 35 | 27 | 102 | |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 54 | 44 | 26 | 124 | |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C. | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 40 | 35 | 102 | |
| | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | |

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | Total |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | |
| Students with two or more indicators | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 51 | 48 | 38 | 137 |

The number of students identified retained:

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

Prior Year (2022-23) Updated (pre-populated)

Section 3 includes data tables that are pre-populated based off information submitted in prior year's SIP.

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

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|---|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-----|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | | |
| Absent 10% or more days | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 31 | 26 | 21 | 78 | |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 16 | 15 | 43 | |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 8 | 9 | 30 | |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 18 | 24 | 13 | 55 | |
| Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 40 | 35 | 27 | 102 | |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 54 | 44 | 26 | 124 | |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C. | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 40 | 35 | 75 | |
| | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | |

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-----|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | | |
| Students with two or more indicators | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 51 | 48 | 38 | 137 | |

The number of students identified retained:

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

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review

ESSA School, District and State Comparison (pre-populated)

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school or combination schools). Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school.

On April 9, 2021, FDOE Emergency Order No. 2021-EO-02 made 2020-21 school grades optional. They have been removed from this publication.

| Accountability Component | 2023 | | | 2022 | | | 2021 | | |
|----------------------------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|
| | School | District | State | School | District | State | School | District | State |
| ELA Achievement* | 40 | 49 | 49 | 37 | 51 | 50 | 40 | | |
| ELA Learning Gains | | | | 45 | | | 45 | | |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | 41 | | | 26 | | |
| Math Achievement* | 47 | 51 | 56 | 41 | 34 | 36 | 37 | | |
| Math Learning Gains | | | | 50 | | | 36 | | |

| Accountability Component | 2023 | | | 2022 | | | 2021 | | |
|---------------------------------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|
| | School | District | State | School | District | State | School | District | State |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | 38 | | | 25 | | |
| Science Achievement* | 31 | 46 | 49 | 27 | 51 | 53 | 36 | | |
| Social Studies Achievement* | 49 | 58 | 68 | 58 | 54 | 58 | 39 | | |
| Middle School Acceleration | 56 | 75 | 73 | 74 | 40 | 49 | 58 | | |
| Graduation Rate | | | | | 45 | 49 | | | |
| College and Career Acceleration | | | | | 61 | 70 | | | |
| ELP Progress | 18 | 48 | 40 | | 80 | 76 | | | |

* In cases where a school does not test 95% of students in a subject, the achievement component will be different in the Federal Percent of Points Index (FPPI) than in school grades calculation.

See [Florida School Grades, School Improvement Ratings and DJJ Accountability Ratings](#).

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

| 2021-22 ESSA Federal Index | |
|--|-----|
| ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI) | TSI |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students | 40 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students | Yes |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 4 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 241 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 6 |
| Percent Tested | 99 |
| Graduation Rate | |

| 2021-22 ESSA Federal Index | |
|--|-----|
| ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI) | TSI |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students | 46 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students | No |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 4 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 411 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 9 |
| Percent Tested | 97 |

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index

Graduation Rate

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)**2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY**

| ESSA Subgroup | Federal Percent of Points Index | Subgroup Below 41% | Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41% | Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32% |
|----------------------|--|---------------------------|--|--|
| SWD | 12 | Yes | 4 | 4 |
| ELL | 24 | Yes | 3 | 1 |
| AMI | | | | |
| ASN | | | | |
| BLK | 29 | Yes | 4 | 2 |
| HSP | 41 | | | |
| MUL | 46 | | | |
| PAC | | | | |
| WHT | 57 | | | |
| FRL | 34 | Yes | 1 | |

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY

| ESSA Subgroup | Federal Percent of Points Index | Subgroup Below 41% | Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41% | Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32% |
|----------------------|--|---------------------------|--|--|
| SWD | 22 | Yes | 3 | 3 |
| ELL | 32 | Yes | 2 | |
| AMI | | | | |
| ASN | | | | |
| BLK | 31 | Yes | 3 | 1 |
| HSP | 34 | Yes | 1 | |
| MUL | 55 | | | |
| PAC | | | | |
| WHT | 57 | | | |
| FRL | 41 | | | |

Accountability Components by Subgroup

Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school. (pre-populated)

| 2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY 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 2021-22 | C & C Accel 2021-22 | ELP Progress |
| All Students | 40 | | | 47 | | | 31 | 49 | 56 | | | 18 |
| SWD | 15 | | | 15 | | | 0 | 16 | | | 4 | |
| ELL | 12 | | | 41 | | | | | | | 3 | 18 |
| AMI | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ASN | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| BLK | 26 | | | 27 | | | 18 | 31 | 45 | | 5 | |
| HSP | 39 | | | 61 | | | 23 | | | | 3 | |
| MUL | 48 | | | 44 | | | | | | | 2 | |
| PAC | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 51 | | | 59 | | | 41 | 70 | 63 | | 5 | |
| FRL | 31 | | | 40 | | | 18 | 39 | 43 | | 5 | |

| 2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY 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 | ELP Progress |
| All Students | 37 | 45 | 41 | 41 | 50 | 38 | 27 | 58 | 74 | | | |
| SWD | 15 | 31 | 30 | 13 | 30 | 29 | 4 | 21 | | | | |
| ELL | 14 | 43 | | 29 | 43 | | | | | | | |
| AMI | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ASN | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| BLK | 22 | 39 | 37 | 21 | 40 | 37 | 6 | 44 | | | | |
| HSP | 28 | 42 | 40 | 28 | 42 | | 25 | | | | | |
| MUL | 53 | 64 | | 44 | 60 | | | | | | | |
| PAC | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 50 | 49 | 50 | 60 | 58 | | 48 | 67 | 73 | | | |
| FRL | 29 | 44 | 39 | 30 | 46 | 37 | 20 | 53 | 67 | | | |

| 2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY 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 | ELP Progress |
| All Students | 40 | 45 | 26 | 37 | 36 | 25 | 36 | 39 | 58 | | | |
| SWD | 7 | 12 | 9 | 7 | 15 | 13 | | 0 | | | | |
| ELL | 23 | 42 | | 31 | 33 | | | | | | | |
| AMI | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ASN | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| BLK | 25 | 35 | 24 | 15 | 28 | 29 | 21 | 23 | 27 | | | |
| HSP | 35 | 47 | 40 | 31 | 36 | | | 39 | | | | |
| MUL | 43 | 50 | | 35 | 37 | | | | | | | |
| PAC | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 53 | 52 | 25 | 56 | 42 | 25 | 49 | 50 | 66 | | | |
| FRL | 32 | 40 | 23 | 27 | 30 | 21 | 33 | 34 | 39 | | | |

Grade Level Data Review– State Assessments (pre-populated)

The data are raw data and include ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data. The percentages shown here represent ALL students who received a score of 3 or higher on the statewide assessments.

An asterisk (*) in any cell indicates the data has been suppressed due to fewer than 10 students tested, or all tested students scoring the same.

| ELA | | | | | | |
|-------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 07 | 2023 - Spring | 33% | 46% | -13% | 47% | -14% |
| 08 | 2023 - Spring | 35% | 47% | -12% | 47% | -12% |
| 06 | 2023 - Spring | 43% | 47% | -4% | 47% | -4% |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|-------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 06 | 2023 - Spring | 60% | 47% | 13% | 54% | 6% |
| 07 | 2023 - Spring | 14% | 24% | -10% | 48% | -34% |
| 08 | 2023 - Spring | 41% | 57% | -16% | 55% | -14% |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
|---------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 08 | 2023 - Spring | 31% | 44% | -13% | 44% | -13% |

| ALGEBRA | | | | | | |
|---------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| N/A | 2023 - Spring | 73% | 52% | 21% | 50% | 23% |

| GEOMETRY | | | | | | |
|----------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| N/A | 2023 - Spring | * | 57% | * | 48% | * |

| CIVICS | | | | | | |
|--------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| N/A | 2023 - Spring | 51% | 58% | -7% | 66% | -15% |

III. Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis/Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources.

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

7th Grade Math showed the lowest achievement level. Mebane only had 14% of the students score a level 3 or higher on the FAST 7th Grade Math assessment. There were some contributing factors which include the math teacher having to miss a lot of days due to personal reasons. In addition, any student who was a level 3 or higher based on their 6th grade score was placed in 7th Grade Advanced Math. All of those students took the 8th Grade FAST Math assessment therefore their scores are not reflected in that 14%. The students that were part of the 14% were all students who were a level 1 or 2 student to begin with in Math so only 14% of that group made a level 3 or higher.

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

The percentage of students achieving a level 3 or higher in the area of ELA has continued to decline since the 2018-2019 school year. At the end of the 2018-2019 school year the ELA achievement level was at 51%. Upon returning to school in 2020-2021 after COVID, the achievement level dropped to 40%. In the 2021-2022 school year the ELA achievement was at 37% and it remained at 37% again during this past 2022-2023 school year. Contributing factors include: The 7th grade ELA teacher quit by email on 8/

24/22. There was a substitute for a short period of time and then those classes were collapsed and teachers picked up an extra section. Then the 8th grade ELA teacher resigned in December of 2022. Therefore, there were substitutes in that classroom until another teacher was hired on January 31st. Since we are a small school and only have three ELA teachers, this caused a major disruption to the learning environment for two out of three ELA classes/grade levels.

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

Overall the biggest gap between the school and the state average would be the proficiency scores on the ELA FAST PM3. The contributing factors were listed above and related to having teachers available to teach the students instead of subs and lots of turnover.

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

Our 6th grade Math and Algebra 1 state assessment scores showed tremendous growth. Our 6th grade Math achievement on the FAST PM3 was 60% which was higher than the district (47%) and the state (55%) average. Our Algebra 1 EOC results indicate that 73% of those students scored a level 3 or higher which was also above the district (52%) and the state (50%) average. We attribute this growth to the two outstanding teachers who taught 6th- & 8th-grade Math. These teachers established classroom environments that allowed them to teach the Standards to their students. Unfortunately, the 8th-grade teacher transferred to another school at the end of the year, but the 6th-grade teacher is still here at Mebane MS.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I, identify one or two potential areas of concern.

According to the EWS, a major area of concern is the number of students who failed ELA as well as 121 students who scored a Level 1 on the ELA assessment which indicates a substantial reading deficiency.

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

ELA/Reading Achievement Levels and Learning Gains - ELA student achievement and learning gains must increase in grades 6, 7, and 8. Included in this category which is also an area of concern is our SWD, African American, Hispanic and ELL students. By addressing the needs in ELA/Reading, we will also simultaneously be addressing the needs of the subgroups listed above that are below the Federal Index of 41%.

Area of Focus

(Identified key Area of Focus that addresses the school's highest priority based on any/all relevant data sources)

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Black/African-American**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Black student subgroup. Two years ago the percentage of Mebane's Black students who earned a Level 3+ was 22% for ELA and 21% for Math. Classroom teachers need to pay closer attention to the achievement of our Black students and not just look at overall numbers.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Bring up Black student achievement so that 45% or more of our Black students show proficiency on the FAST Math & ELA tests.

Monitoring:

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

Administration will meet with teachers to review iXL, iReady, and FAST 1 & 2 results to track progress.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Mike Gamble (gamblemp@gm.sbac.edu)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Monitor the progress of Black students with FAST, iReady and iXL.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Black students have been below 45% proficient for 3 years.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

Meet with teachers to review their students' data from iReady, iXL and FAST.

Person Responsible: Mike Gamble (gamblemp@gm.sbac.edu)

By When: Each 9 weeks: October 13th, January 11th, & March 27th

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to English Language Learners**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Mebane's English Language Learners (ELL) students have not met proficiency in Math or ELA on state assessments. ESSA data indicates that our ELL students have a federal index of 32 which is below the required 41.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Increase ELL student achievement so that 41% or more of our ELL students show proficiency on the FAST Math & ELA tests.

Monitoring:

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

ELL student data will be monitored through FAST PM for ELA and Math, iReady for Reading, and IXL for Math.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Lillian Weeks (weekslt@gm.sbac.edu)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

iReady is evidenced-based and approved on the ESSA.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

English learners who receive the recommended levels of i-Ready personalized instruction experience greater learning gains in Reading.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 2 - Moderate Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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. Spanish/English dictionaries
2. Peer assistance
3. Digital tools for translation assistance
4. Parent Night for ELL students

Person Responsible: Lillian Weeks (weekslt@gm.sbac.edu)

By When: May 2024

#3. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Based on current and historical data on statewide assessments, SWD have been below the federal index of 41% for three year consecutive years. Mebane is currently at 22%.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Mebane will increase the federal index to 25% for the 2023-2024 school year with the goal of increasing that target each year until we reach the minimum of 41%.

Monitoring:

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

SWD will be closely monitored through FAST PM subgroup data for both ELA and Math. iReady subgroup data will also be analyzed to identify specific reading deficiencies that need to be addressed. Problem solving teams will need to determine the critical skills and concepts that students are missing and provide scaffolds that will bridge those gaps while teaching missing skills with precision and efficiency.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Gina Geiger (geiger@gm.sbac.edu)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Scaffold instruction is the intentional support provided by a teacher for learners to carry out learning tasks with support. The intent (and the part that is often missed) of scaffold instruction is to provide supports to allow students to achieve academic success, followed by a gradual decrease in the level of support until learners are empowered to achieve academic success independently. Examples of scaffolded instruction in the classroom might include the use of formative assessments, written or verbal prompts, engagement of students in meaningful dialogue, along with a gradual decrease in support as responsibility for learning is transferred to student.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The rational for focusing on scaffolding as a high leverage, evidence-based instructional strategy is to address the learning needs of SWDs: According to the Practice Profiles for grades PK-12 Literacy Instruction (provided by FLDOE), scaffold instruction is considered a best instructional practice assisting in closing the achievement gap for Florida's most vulnerable students.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

SWD that participate in the general ed setting for inclusion for ELA and Math will be provided with support facilitation to provide additional supports that include scaffolding.

Person Responsible: Gina Geiger (geigergl@gm.sbac.edu)

By When: May 2024

#4. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Hispanic

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Mebane's Hispanic students have not met proficiency in Math or ELA on state assessments. ESSA data indicates that our Hispanic population have a federal index of 34 which is below the required 41.

Measurable Outcome:

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

The outcome goal would be to increase our federal index from 34 to 41.

Monitoring:

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

Student data will be monitored through FAST PM for ELA and Math, iReady for Reading, and IXL for Math.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

[no one identified]

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

iReady for Reading and IXL for Math.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

iReady is an approved intervention on the ESSA.

IXL met the criteria as a Tier 2 intervention on the ESSA.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 2 - Moderate Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

#5. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Teacher Retention and Recruitment**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

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

One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

The teacher turnover rate has been high for Mebane MS the past few years. At the end of the 2023 school year, 7 of 17 teachers (over 40%) of the teacher left or were non-renewed. As a new principal, Mr. Gamble will focus on building pride for Mebane with the students and faculty/staff. We have already purchased equipment to get the school's TV recording studio up and running. Daily televised announcements delivered via YouTube will be a staple, with student anchors delivering the news along with daily announcements from the principal. Both Mr. Gamble and Mrs. Geiger will be present out & about the school during class changes and during the two lunch periods. They will also be present in classrooms and will give written feedback with Snapshots in ACIIS. There are creative teachers at Mebane and they will be recognized, as will all initiatives that benefit our students.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Teacher turnover will be less than 30% at the end of the 2024 school year.

Monitoring:

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

Feedback from Team Leader Meetings and Faculty Meetings.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Mike Gamble (gamblemp@gm.sbac.edu)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Frequent classroom visits and written feedback to teachers using Snapshots in ACIIS.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Teachers like feedback, and especially when they are being innovative. Feedback will be objective looks at what is going on in the classroom while administrators are in there.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

Entering Snapshots in ACIIS and sharing them with teachers. A Google Doc will be kept for administration to keep track of what classrooms were visited and when (date/period). A distinction will be made between informal walkthroughs and Snapshots entered in ACIIS and shared with teachers.

Person Responsible: Mike Gamble (gamblemp@gm.sbac.edu)

By When: By May 30, 2024.

#6. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Based upon the 2023 FAST PM3 for ELA, only 37% of students who tested across grade levels achieved a level 3 or higher.

Measurable Outcome:

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

The outcome goal for the 2023-2024 for ELA is to increase learning gains and percentage of students achieving a level 3 or higher on the FAST ELA assessment to at least 45%

Monitoring:

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

ELA will be monitored using the FAST PM, iReady, Common Lit, Great Leaps, and student grades in the area of ELA and Reading.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Gina Geiger (geiger@gm.sbac.edu)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

iReady effectively improves reading by providing differentiated instruction.

Great Leaps is also an evidenced based program that improves reading in the area of fluency.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

iReady meets the standards of evidence in the ESSA.

Teachers administer the Diagnostic at the beginning of the school year to chart a course for teacher-led instruction, set an i-Ready Personalized Instruction path individualized for each student, and identify students' differentiated growth goals for the year. A midyear and end-of-year Diagnostic help students and teachers measure growth and have data chats. Teacher-led and personalized instruction continues throughout the year to help students address their learning gaps and access grade-level learning.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 2 - Moderate Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

Students will complete iReady lessons twice weekly during Intensive Reading based on how they do on their iReady Diagnostic. Teachers will track their progress and plan for small group instruction based on individual students needs.

Person Responsible: Gina Geiger (geigergl@gm.sbac.edu)

By When: May 2024

#7. -- Select below -- specifically relating to**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

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:

[no one identified]

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

CSI, TSI and ATSI Resource Review

Describe the process to review school improvement funding allocations and ensure resources are allocated based on needs. This section must be completed if the school is identified as ATSI, TSI or CSI in addition to completing an Area(s) of Focus identifying interventions and activities within the SIP (ESSA 1111(d)(1)(B)(4) and (d)(2)(C).

The principal and district (support Principal or executive director) will review the data to ensure the identified areas of focus and action steps align to school needs as the data indicates. Subgroup data will be identified in addition to overall goals. Ongoing progress will be monitored on regular intervals to ensure alignment of action steps and student needs, including identified subgroups. Subgroups will be monitored in addition to school-wide, overall group data. The Federal Grants and programs department will aid in the budget alignment processes to ensure the student needs are met.

Budget to Support Areas of Focus

Part VII: Budget to Support Areas of Focus

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

| | | | |
|--------|--------|--|--------|
| 1 | III.B. | Area of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Black/African-American | \$0.00 |
| 2 | III.B. | Area of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: English Language Learners | \$0.00 |
| 3 | III.B. | Area of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities | \$0.00 |
| 4 | III.B. | Area of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Hispanic | \$0.00 |
| 5 | III.B. | Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Teacher Retention and Recruitment | \$0.00 |
| 6 | III.B. | Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA | \$0.00 |
| 7 | III.B. | Area of Focus: -- Select below --: | \$0.00 |
| Total: | | | \$0.00 |

Budget Approval

Check if this school is eligible and opting out of UniSIG funds for the 2023-24 school year.

No