Lecanto Middle School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Lecanto Middle School

3800 W EDUCATIONAL PATH, Lecanto, FL 34461

https://lms.citrusschools.org/

School Board Approval

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

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.

We believe at LMS that together we will achieve excellence through culture, innovation, and rigor. We can, we care, we connect, we are LMS

Provide the school's vision statement.

Excellence for everyone every day.

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
Frederick, Inge	Principal	Lead the creation of and collaboration and facilitation of the SIP with all stakeholders.
Davis, Benjamin	Assistant Principal	Assist the principal with the creation of and collaboration and facilitation of the SIP with all stakeholders.
Stukes, Tony	Assistant Principal	Assist the principal with the creation of and collaboration and facilitation of the SIP with all stakeholders.
Filipic, Kelly	Instructional Coach	Assist the principal with the creation of and collaboration and facilitation of the SIP with all stakeholders.
James, Ingrid	Other	Assist the principal with the creation of and collaboration and facilitation of the SIP with all stakeholders.

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.

The school leadership team, teachers, and school staff met to review data and create strategies for meeting our student achievement goals for 2023-2024. We met during Faculty meetings, Team meetings, Innovators meetings and at our summer School Improvement Planning Session on July 19th, 2023 .

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))

1. Monthly review of SIP and progress towards goals with staff at faculty meetings, Grade Level Team Meetings, Department Meetings, and Innovators Leadership Team Meetings through an interactive Nearpod presentation..
2. Review of SIP and progress towards goals with parents and community members at our five (5) scheduled SAC meetings.
3. Quarterly review of SIP and progress towards goals with students in NJHS and Student Government.
4. Bi-monthly review of data from IXL, iReady, FAST, and Achieve through our Tuesday Planning and Learning Community Meetings during Planning Periods.

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	Yes
2022-23 Minority Rate	22%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	89%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	ATSI
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)* Asian Students (ASN) 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: B 2018-19: B 2017-18: B
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	73	80	91	244
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	25	51	50	126
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	31	57	99
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	24	16	57	97
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	56	65	52	173
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	71	39	35	145
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	55	56	40	151

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	51	69	100	220

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	30	30	26	86
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	2

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	47	63	77	187
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	25	51	50	126
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	31	57	99
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	24	16	57	97
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	46	60	64	170
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	54	56	59	169
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	46	64	56	166

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	69	100	220

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	30	30	26	86
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	2

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	47	63	77	187
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	25	51	50	126
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	31	57	99
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	24	16	57	97
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	46	60	64	170
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	54	56	59	169
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	46	64	56	166

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	69	100	220

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	30	30	26	86
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	2

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*	55	48	49	48	46	50	49		
ELA Learning Gains				44			50		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				36			40		
Math Achievement*	63	53	56	54	30	36	50		
Math Learning Gains				57			43		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				53			36		
Science Achievement*	49	43	49	45	48	53	46		
Social Studies Achievement*	70	63	68	72	47	58	73		
Middle School Acceleration	67	63	73	62	44	49	60		
Graduation Rate					42	49			
College and Career Acceleration					66	70			
ELP Progress		40	40		57	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)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	61
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	304
Total Components for the Federal Index	5

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
Percent Tested	97
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	52
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	471
Total Components for the Federal Index	9
Percent Tested	99
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	27	Yes	3	2
ELL	50			
AMI				
ASN	89			
BLK	50			
HSP	67			
MUL	45			
PAC				
WHT	61			
FRL	53			

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	26	Yes	2	1
ELL	32	Yes	1	
AMI				
ASN	73			
BLK	49			
HSP	47			
MUL	50			
PAC				
WHT	53			
FRL	47			

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	55			63			49	70	67			
SWD	20			27			23	38			4	
ELL	53			47							2	
AMI												
ASN	86			92							2	
BLK	42			65			43				3	
HSP	67			66			52	76	76		5	
MUL	42			48				45			3	
PAC												
WHT	54			63			49	71	66		5	
FRL	47			57			44	62	54		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	48	44	36	54	57	53	45	72	62			
SWD	15	26	17	13	43	40	14	37				
ELL	13	19		31	63							
AMI												
ASN	75	60		75	80							
BLK	33	50		36	52			73				
HSP	45	43	41	52	58	48	27	68	40			
MUL	48	46		40	55			62				
PAC												
WHT	48	43	34	55	56	55	49	72	63			
FRL	39	38	34	47	53	50	41	66	55			

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	49	50	40	50	43	36	46	73	60			
SWD	15	33	34	15	26	27	17	29				
ELL	8	46	50	8	46							
AMI												
ASN	95	89		95	58				92			
BLK	39	67		31	38	50						
HSP	43	53	47	42	53	56	33	75				
MUL	52	57		41	33							
PAC												
WHT	48	48	36	50	42	32	46	73	58			
FRL	42	45	38	41	38	37	39	67	52			

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	54%	45%	9%	47%	7%
08	2023 - Spring	50%	44%	6%	47%	3%
06	2023 - Spring	54%	45%	9%	47%	7%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	54%	44%	10%	54%	0%
07	2023 - Spring	70%	57%	13%	48%	22%
08	2023 - Spring	60%	47%	13%	55%	5%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	49%	41%	8%	44%	5%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	96%	37%	59%	50%	46%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	100%	38%	62%	48%	52%

CIVICS						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	70%	62%	8%	66%	4%

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.

Lecanto Middle School demonstrated gains in ELA, Math, Algebra I Honors, Geometry Honors and Science scores on our Spring State Assessments. Our Civics EOC score decreased by 2 percent (raw data) but was still above the District and State averages. Although we made gains in each grade level on the ELA FAST Assessment (PM3) and were above the District and State averages, our students did not grow as much in proficiency in ELA as our students did in Mathematics.

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

Our raw data indicates that our Civics scores decreased from 72% (3 and above) in 2022 to 70% (3 and above) in 2023. Our Civics score was still above the State and District averages. In all other tested areas our student scores increased, except for in Algebra I Honors and Geometry Honors where our student achievement remained consistent at 96% proficient and 100% proficient, respectively.

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.

Lecanto Middle placed above the state average in all but 6th Grade Mathematics, which was equal to the state average. The highest achieving 6th grade students were placed in Accelerated 7th grade math, so they did not take the 6th Grade FAST math assessment. The students who took the 6th Grade FAST Math Assessment had scored a Level 1, 2, or 3, the previous year on their FSA Math Assessment.

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

Overall gains in mathematics this year was 13%, with 7th graders showing the most gains (20%) and 6th graders showing the fewest (4%).
1. Our Math Instructional Coach worked with our math teachers in the implementation of the MTRs.
2. Our Math teaches met weekly in Collaborative Session Learning Communities where data was shared and discussed and best practices shared.
3. Our Math teachers implemented the first 4 Micro PDs in the Learning Focused Curriculum.
4. Our Math teachers used formative data from the IXL and ALEKS math online programs to differentiate instruction to meet student needs.

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

The two areas of concern that Lecanto Middle School identified were:
1. The number of students missing class due to ISS and OSS placement.
2. The number of students who fail an ELA or Math class during the school year.

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

1. Increase Achievement in Reading
2. Increase Achievement in Math
3. Decrease in the percentage of students missing class due to ISS and OSS placement by a strategic implementation of the PBIS program.
4. Increase learning gains for the following subgroups: Students with Disabilities and Enlgish Language Learners.
5. Increased staff morale and school climate

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

#1. 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.

In each grade level, on the FAST Reading (PM3), LMS scored higher than the District and State averages. ELA scores were 5% higher when compared to the previous year's state assessment. Although these are excellent gains, 47% of LMS students are not scoring proficient as measured by FAST Reading (PM3).

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

1. 60% of students scoring 3 and above overall.
2. 60% Learning Gains
3. 60% Learning Gains of the Lowest Quartile

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

The LMS Administrative Core Team will monitor school improvement goals by analyzing data regularly in review meetings, adapting strategies based on insights, and maintaining open communication. The team will compare collected data against baselines, identifying trends, successes, and challenges. Flexibility is key, thus the team will—adjust strategies promptly to address setbacks and capitalize on opportunities. The team will be transparent and share progress, milestones, and challenges with stakeholders, fostering engagement and collaboration.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Benjamin Davis (davisb3@citrusschools.org)

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.)

Based on the CERP, LMS uses SAVVAS Realize's My Perspecitves Tier 1, ELA instruction. For Tier 2 students (i.e., those scoring as a level 2 on the FAST PM3), Achieve 3000 is used as an intervention. For Tier 3 students (i.e., those scoring as a level 1 on the FAST PM3), i-Ready and Phonics for Reading is used as an intervention. Furthermore, Tier 3 students are placed with an ESE certified teacher in both their Tier 1 ELA class as well as their Intenisve Reading (Tier 3) class.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

According to ESSA, each evidence-based intervention being implemented has a rating of "Promising" to "Strong".

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.

Facilitate weekly collaborative planning sessions in which Achieve 3000 and i-Ready data are analyzed and used to make instructional decisions.

Person Responsible: Benjamin Davis (davisb3@citrusschools.org)

By When: May 2024

Biweekly walkthroughs by school cadre and i-Ready Coach in ELA & Reading classes with targeted feedback to increase impact of instructional practices on student achievement.

Person Responsible: Benjamin Davis (davisb3@citrusschools.org)

By When: May 2024

Provide professional learning and implementation of Learning-Focused strategies. To be reviewed: Classroom Learning Environment, Learning Goals & Lesson Essential Question, Lesson Assessments, and Graphic Organizers. To be introduced: Assessment Prompts, Lesson Activities, Activitating Strategies, & Vocabulary Instruction.

Person Responsible: Kelly Filipic (filipick@citrusschools.org)

By When: May 2024

Conduct walkthroughs using the district-wide Walkthrough Tool which focuses on the Practice Profile Components: Explicit Instruction, Systematic Instruction, Scaffolded Instruction, Corrective Feedback, and Differentiated Instrution. The goal is to complete 5/week, per admin.

Person Responsible: Inge Frederick (fredericki@citrusschools.org)

By When: May 2024

Weekly sharing of available data (e.g., FAST Progress Monitoring, Achieve 3000, i-Ready), to stakeholders: School Advisory Council, students, parents, teachers, and other community members.

Person Responsible: Inge Frederick (fredericki@citrusschools.org)

By When: May 2024

Students are scheduled into tiered classes based on historical data from multiple sources (e.g., FAST, Achieve 3000, i-Ready, grades). Adjustments will be made throughout the year as additional data points are gathered.

Person Responsible: Inge Frederick (fredericki@citrusschools.org)

By When: May 2024

To provide feedback to students on a bi-weekly basis in the form of Teacher/Student data conferences where goals are determined and progress towards goals are measured. Data used will be from i-Ready and Achieve.

Person Responsible: Benjamin Davis (davisb3@citrusschools.org)

By When:

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

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.

In comparison of State data from Spring 2022 to Spring 2023, LMS students moved from 54% to 67% demonstrating a 13% gain in proficiency as measured by the FAST Math. LMS students scored above the State and District average in all grade levels and on the Algebre and Geometry EOCs. Although scores have shown an upward trend over the past two years, the focus this year will be on increasing learning gains for all students. Learning gains were not reported with this years data due to moving from FSA to FAST.

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

60% of students in grades 6-8 will make learning gains as measured by FAST Math PM3.
60% of students in the bottom quartile will make learning gains as measured by FAST Math PM3.
70% of students will be proficient as measured by FAST Math PM3.

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

1. Weekly PLC meetings where formative data (i.e., IXL and i-Ready) is monitored.
2. Progress Monitoring data from PM1 and PM2 will be used to modify instructional strategies to meet student needs.
3. The web-based program, i-Ready will be used in all level one, intensive classes.
4. The web-based program, IXL will be in in all 6-8 math classes.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Tony Stukes (stukest@citrusschools.org)

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.)

All Level 1 math students will be placed in an additional intensive math class with their same highly qualified regular math teacher. Within this intensive math class, the evidence-based program, i-Ready, will be utilized to formatively assess students to determine skill gaps and then used to provide daily small group instruction tailored to student needs. Additionally, IXL will be implemented in all 6 - 8 math classrooms as remediation and extra practice to support grade level standards mastery.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

i-Ready is found to be statistically significant with positive effects for grades 6-8 under the guidelines set forth by ESSA for a Level 2 (or Moderate) rating for evidence-based research. IXL is a personalized learning platform that utilizes comprehensive K-12 curriculum, Real-Time Diagnostic, personalized guidance, and actionable Analytics to give teachers what they need to differentiate instruction.IXL meets the required rigor of the What Works Clearinghouse and the ESSA Tier 2 standards for evidence-based interventions.

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.

All instructional staff will participate in the face-to-face professional development, The High Performance Learning-Focused Lesson will review the first five MicroPDs (i.e., Classroom Learning Environ. Lesson EQ & Learning Goals, Assignments, and Graphic Oranizers) during pre-planning. This review builds the foundation for the next four MicroPDs: Assessment Prompts, Learning Activites, Activating Strategies, and Vocabulary Strategies.

Person Responsible: Kelly Filipic (filipick@citrusschools.org)

By When: August 2024 (review) - May 2024 (new)

All math teachers will meet during a monthly department meeting to discuss best practices and assist in planning for student learning and instruction aligned to the Florida's B.E.S.T. to prepare students for the FAST Math 6-8, PM3.

Person Responsible: Tony Stukes (stukest@citrusschools.org)

By When: May 2024

To provide feedback to teachers throughout the year using the District-wide MTR Walkthrough Tool. Data will be shared in a weekly staff email, in faculty meetings, and SAC Meetings.

Person Responsible: Inge Frederick (fredericki@citrusschools.org)

By When: May 2024

To provide feedback to students on a bi-weekly basis in the form of Teacher/Student data conferences where goals are determined and progress towards goals are measured. Data used will be from i-Ready and IXL.

Person Responsible: Kelly Filipic (filipick@citrusschools.org)

By When: May 2022

Biweekly walkthroughs by school cadre and i-Ready Coach in Math classes with targeted feedback to increase impact of instructional practices on student achievement.

Person Responsible: Tony Stukes (stukest@citrusschools.org)

By When: May 2024

Provide professional learning and implementation of Learning-Focused strategies. To be reviewed: Classroom Learning Environment, Learning Goals & Lesson Essential Question, Lesson Assessments, and Graphic Organizers. To be introduced: Assessment Prompts, Lesson Activities, Activitating Strategies, & Vocabulary Instruction.

Person Responsible: Kelly Filipic (filipick@citrusschools.org)

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.

As we do not have the 2023 subgroup data yet, we are creating our goal with data from 2022 in which our Students With Disabilities had a Federal Index Score of 26%. This has been an area of TS&I since 2019 when our Students With Disabilities scored a 34%.

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

For the 2023-2024 school year, Lecanto Middle School's Goal is to improve by at least 15% to 41% or above.
1. 43% of students will make Learning Gains in Reading.
2. 52% of students will make Learning Gains in Math.
3. 41% of students will make a 3 or above on the Civics EOC.
4. 41% of students will make a 3 or above on the Science FCAT.

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

1. Weekly PLC meetings where weekly Achieve, IXL, and i-Ready data is analyzed and monitored.
2. Achieve and i-Ready data will be monitored in Tier 2 Reading Intervention Classes.
3. i-Ready Phonics for Reading and the i-Ready Path/Toolkit data will be monitored in Tier 3 Reading Classes.
4. i-Ready Path/Toolkit data will be monitored in Intensive math courses.
5. IXL data will be monitored in on grade-level math courses.
6. Progress Learning Data will be monitored for Civics and 8th Grade Science Courses.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Inge Frederick (fredericki@citrusschools.org)

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.)

1, The Achieve Reading supplemental program meets the criteria for or Tier II evidence-based interventions set by the U.S. Department of Education's Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).
2. The i-Ready Reading and Math Intervention Program is evidence based and meets the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) Level 2 (Moderate) evidence requirements.
3. IXL Math meets the criteria for Tier II evidence-based interventions set by the U.S. Department of Education's Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).
4. Progress Learning meets the ESSA criteria for Moderate and Promising Evidence.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Supplemental programs used to meet the needs of struggling learners are all evidence based and provide formative assessment data that allows teachers to differentiate instruction for each student.

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 with Disabilities in Reading are scheduled into a Tier 3 Reading course and provided instruction by a content expert as well as an ESE teacher. Students with Disabilities in Math are scheduled into an Intensive Math course and provided instruction by a content expert as well as an ESE teacher.

Person Responsible: Ingrid James (jamesi@citrusschools.org)

By When: May 2024

ESE students will be divided among the Lecanto Middle Core Team so that each ESE student will meet at least monthly with his/her Admin Core Team support to review formative data and set goals for class grades, behavior, and state assessments.

Person Responsible: Inge Frederick (fredericki@citrusschools.org)

By When: May 2024

#4. 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.

Lecanto Middle School was identified for Targeted Support & Improvement (TS&I) due to the Subgroup Federal Index score of 32% for our English Language Learners.

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

For the 2023-2024 school, Lecanto Middle School's goal is to improve overall by at least 10 points to be above the 41% threshold.
1. 43% of students will make learning gains in ELA.
2. 52% will make learning gains in Math.
3. 43% will make a 3 or above on the Civics EOC.
4. 43% will make a 3 or above on the Science FCAT

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

1. Weekly PLC Meetings where formative data is analyzed and monitored.
2. Reading - Achieve 3000 & i-Ready will be used in all Level 2
Intensive ELA Courses.
3. Reading - i-Ready Program & i-Ready Phonics for Reading for all Level 1 Intensive Reading classes.
4. i-Ready Data for Intensive Math (Level 1) and IXL Data for on grade level and accelerated math classes.
6. Progress Learning Data for Civics
7. Progress Learning Data for Science

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Benjamin Davis (davisb3@citrusschools.org)

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.)

1, The Achieve Reading supplemental program meets the criteria for or Tier II evidence-based interventions set by the U.S. Department of Education's Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).
2. The i-Ready Reading and Math Intervention Program is evidence based and meets the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) Level 2 (Moderate) evidence requirements.
3. IXL Math meets the criteria for Tier II evidence-based interventions set by the U.S. Department of Education's Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).
4. Progress Learning meets the ESSA criteria for Moderate and Promising Evidence.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Supplemental programs used to meet the needs of struggling learners are all evidence based and provide formative assessment data that allows teachers to differentiate instruction for each student.

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

Students who are English Language Learners are scheduled into a Tier 3 Reading course and provided instruction by a content expert as well as a teacher who is certified in ESOL or working towards that certification.

Person Responsible: Benjamin Davis (davisb3@citrusschools.org)

By When: May 2024

ELL students will be divided among the Lecanto Middle Core Team so that each ESE student will meet at least monthly with his/her Admin Core Team support to review formative data and set goals for class grades, behavior, and state assessments.

Person Responsible: Benjamin Davis (davisb3@citrusschools.org)

By When: May 2024

#5. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Early Warning System

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 the perception data collected on the end of year survey (2022-2023), a majority of stakeholders indicated their disagreement with the statement, "students in our school show respect to others." Specifically, 65% students disagreed with this statement. As such, an area of focus is increasing the level of respect that students are showing to others, particulary student to student related respect.

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

By the end of the 2023-2024 academic year, decrease the percentage of students disagreeing with the statement, "students in our school show respect to others," from 65% to 40% as indicated on the end-of-year survey. Decrease the parents disagreeing with the statement from 41% to 16% and teachers from 53% to 28%.

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

Data collected from the PBIS Rewards App will be analyzed at each PBIS Core and General Assembly Team Meeting, twice monthly. Additionally, the Core Team will discuss the implications of the PBIS Team and target, adapt, and/or supplement resources or focus toward achieving the indicated outcomes.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Benjamin Davis (davisb3@citrusschools.org)

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.)

Positive Behavior Intervention and Support (PBIS) is an evidence-based (ESSA "Strong") framework that focuses on teaching and reinforcing positive behaviors to create a positive school culture.
http://www.pbis.org/research

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Following the guidance of PBIS best practices that informed Lecanto Middle School's Positive Behavior Interventions Supports (PBIS) Core Values (Respect, On Task, Attitude, and Responsibility), staff will target respect as they award points in the PBIS Rewards App, designate Positive Referrals through Skyward, and leverage other available rewards.

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.

Establish a PBIS Team that includes a diversity in its stakeholders and views. Assign roles within the team to approach professional learning opportunities to support staff implementation, communicate goals, collect data for analysis, manage resources, and operate logistics.

Person Responsible: Benjamin Davis (davisb3@citrusschools.org)

By When: May 2024

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).

After the creation of the School Improvement Plan each year, the Administrative Core Team creates our School Advisory Council Budget. All cost strips used are connected to one of our five (5) School Improvement Goals and all money spent must be used to increase student achievement in one of these 5 areas. Instructional Staff may write mini grant proposals to present to staff for funding.

Title I Requirements

Schoolwide Program Plan (SWP) Requirements
This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A SWP and opts to use the SIP to satisfy the requirements of the SWP plan, as outlined in the ESSA, Public Law No. 114-95, § 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

Provide the methods for dissemination of this SIP, UniSIG budget and SWP to stakeholders (e.g., students, families, school staff and leadership and local businesses and organizations). Please articulate a plan or protocol for how this SIP and progress will be shared and disseminated and to the extent practicable, provided in a language a parent can understand. (ESSA 1114(b)(4))
List the school's webpage* where the SIP is made publicly available.

1. Monthly review of SIP and progress towards goals with staff at faculty meetings through an interactive Nearpod presentation.
2. Review of SIP and progress towards goals with parents and community members at our five (5) scheduled SAC meetings.
3. Quarterly review of SIP and progress towards goals with students in NJHS and Student Government.
4. Our SIP will be made available on our school's website: www.citrusschools.org/lms

Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission, support the needs of students and keep parents informed of their child's progress.
List the school's webpage* where the school's Family Engagement Plan is made publicly available. (ESSA 1116(b-g))

1. Our Family Engagement Plan will be made available on our school's website: www.citrusschools.org/lms.
2. A Day in the Life of a 6th Grader Parent Night
3. STREAMS Interactive Family Night
4. Spring Elective Showcase Family Night

5. Advanced Science Parent Session
6. Algebra and Geometry Parent Session
7. District Parent Conference Day
8. Open House/Orientation
9. Our Family Engagement Plan will be made available on our school's website: www.citrusschools.org/lms

Describe how the school plans to strengthen the academic program in the school, increase the amount and quality of learning time and help provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum. Include the Area of Focus if addressed in Part III of the SIP. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)ii))

Data from Spring state assessments was analyzed and a plan for improvement was developed to meet the needs of students in all academic areas, making sure to provide extra support to our subgroups that were below the Federal Index on the 2023 state assessments, English Language Learners and Students with Disabilities. Evidence based supplemental materials were purchased that demonstrated Strong, Moderate, or Promising impact, meeting ESSA criteria. Instructions strategies with high effect sizes (https://visible-learning.org/hattie-ranking-influences-effect-sizes-learning-achievement/) are being strategically implemented in all curriculum areas, wit a focus on differentiation and targeted feedback. Learning Focused High Impact staff development (https://learningfocused.com/) is also supporting teachers in assuring that lessons and learning activities are standards-based and provide useful formative data.

If appropriate and applicable, describe how this plan is developed in coordination and integration with other Federal, State, and local services, resources and programs, such as programs supported under ESSA, violence prevention programs, nutrition programs, housing programs, Head Start programs, adult education programs, career and technical education programs, and schools implementing CSI or TSI activities under section 1111(d). (ESSA 1114(b)(5))

N/A

Optional Component(s) of the Schoolwide Program Plan
Include descriptions for any additional strategies that will be incorporated into the plan.

Describe how the school ensures counseling, school-based mental health services, specialized support services, mentoring services, and other strategies to improve students' skills outside the academic subject areas. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(I))

LMS has two Certified School Counselors that are available to students at any time throughout the day. Additionally, we have a School Social Worker who is at the school on Monday - Wednesday and is available on those days for home visits and student check-ins. We have outside agencies that have contracted with the schools and provide individual and group counseling to students during the school day as well as mentors who come in to work with individual students. At all times, LMS follows state statute and maintains the appropriate parental communication and permission when meeting with students regarding mental health concerns.

Describe the preparation for and awareness of postsecondary opportunities and the workforce, which may include career and technical education programs and broadening secondary school students' access to coursework to earn postsecondary credit while still in high school. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(II))

N/A

Describe the implementation of a schoolwide tiered model to prevent and address problem behavior, and early intervening services, coordinated with similar activities and services carried out under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. 20 U.S.C. 1400 et seq. and ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(III).

LMS is Positive Behavior Support school and uses all facets of the program to teach appropriate behavior and provide students with the appropriate support when negative behaviors occur. Students who are in a Tier 2 Behavior Support meet regularly with our Behavior Specialist, with parent permission, and work on appropriate behaviors. We also conduct Child Study Team meetings where a our school team works to develop behavior interventions for students struggling to be successful. At all steps, parents are involved and a partner in working with the school to develop plans. Students in Tier 3 behavior support have more frequent meetings with our Behavior Specialist and have a formalized Behavior Intervention Plan that all staff must follow. This plan generates data each month that determines next steps in meeting students' behavioral needs.

Describe the professional learning and other activities for teachers, paraprofessionals, and other school personnel to improve instruction and use of data from academic assessments, and to recruit and retain effective teachers, particularly in high need subjects. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(IV))

1. We meet weekly in PLCs and analyze data from multiple sources: Achieve, i-Ready, IXL, FAST, and Behavior Data and determine plans of intervention.
2. The PBIS Team meets the first Monday of every month to determine behavior areas of focus, determine rewards, and monitor the success of previous interventions.
3. Teachers participate in Learning Focused Micro-PDs where high impact strategies are learned and then the implementation is monitored.
4. Staff is participating in a book study, What Great Teacher Do Differently, and sharing strategies to move those practices forward at LMS.
5. Our District and LMS participate in job fairs and interact on online sites to recruit teachers. Once employed, new teachers receive a school-based mentor, twice weekly school-based support sessions, and quarterly District support sessions. New teachers are observed three times a year by a school-based administrator and receive formal coaching from their mentors. Additionally, new teaches receive two days a year to visit other classrooms and teachers to grow and learn from highly effective professionals.

Describe the strategies the school employs to assist preschool children in the transition from early childhood education programs to local elementary school programs. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(V))

This is not a focus of LMS, as we are a middle school.