

Collier County Public Schools

Marco Island Charter 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 | 10 |
| III. Planning for Improvement | 15 |
| IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review | 0 |
| V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence | 0 |
| VI. Title I Requirements | 0 |
| VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus | 0 |

Marco Island Charter Middle

1401 TRINIDAD AVE, Marco Island, FL 34145

www.micms.org

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Collier County School Board on 8/23/2023.

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.

The mission of Marco Island Charter Middle School is high academic achievement and responsible moral character for its students, achieved through relentless attention to innovation to core discipline, teachings, and extracurricular activities.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The vision of Marco Island Charter Middle School is to create a community-centered, state of the art facility that promotes student participation in a stimulating learning environment that is positive, hopeful, and exciting.

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 |
|--------------------|----------------|---|
| Heidenreich, Margo | Principal | Ensure the ongoing communication between all stakeholders; parents, teachers, instructional coach, ESE teacher, and dean of discipline as it relates to the success and academic gains of our students with specific learning disabilities. |

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 order to improve academic outcomes and overall educational experience for students with disabilities, grade level teams will meet daily to review data and collaborate with peers. Teachers will provide accommodations based on the student IEPs and see support from the ESE Teacher. Data points to be discussed weekly will include Beable for Lexile growth, ALEKS for math growth, WriteScore for writing progress, and FAST assessments to name a few. One day a week, grade level teams will meet with the Instructional Coach, Guidance Counselor, and Dean of Discipline to discuss any needs they may have as they work with our students with learning disabilities.

Our ESE teacher is available to meet with the grade level teams daily as needed and she also works with our students during a Learning Strats class every day. She will effectively communicate with families and students as to the progress being monitored.

The Principal will meet with grade level teams every week to ensure everyone is following IEP

accommodations and will provide support where needed.

During Professional Development in the 23-24SY, all teachers required to obtain 40 hours of reading instruction prior to teaching certificate renewal will participate in Professional development meeting 20 hours of the requirement in the 2023-24SY. The professional development course titled, Reading Difficulties, Disabilities and Dyslexia will provide training for teachers of students who face challenges with the mastery of reading skills. Through this course, teachers will gain a better understanding of appropriate interventions to meet the student needs.

To provide reading opportunities throughout the school, all subjects will incorporate reading instruction into their curriculum. Students will be exposed to multiple opportunities to read informational text as it applies to their subjects of instruction. Through their professional learning community, teachers will be provided strategies for using small group instruction to help learners of all levels either through remediation or for extension activities for our gifted students.

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))

Grade level teams will meet one day a week with our Instructional Coach, Guidance Counselor, and Dean of Discipline to discuss any needs they may have as they work with our students with learning disabilities. During this time, they will review the data to determine if students are showing growth. They will meet another day of the week with the Principal to review progress and share any areas of concern. The Principal and the Instructional Coach will review data monthly to determine if more interventions are required. We will rely heavily on the FAST progress monitoring tool to determine if strategies in place are effective.

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 | 49% |
| 2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate | 46% |
| Charter School | Yes |
| 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) Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP) White Students (WHT) |

| | |
|---|---|
| | Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL) |
| School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline. | 2021-22: A |
| | 2019-20: A |
| | 2018-19: A |
| | 2017-18: A |
| 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 | 2 | 5 | 11 | 18 | |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 13 | 13 | 31 | |
| Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 15 | 15 | |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 15 | 21 | |
| Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 15 | 20 | 44 | |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 4 | 10 | |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C. | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 15 | 20 | 44 | |

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 | 1 | 5 | 11 | 17 |

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 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 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 |
|---|-------------|-------|
| Absent 10% or more school days | | |
| One or more suspensions | | |
| Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA) | | |
| Course failure in Math | | |
| Level 1 on statewide FSA ELA assessment | | |
| Level 1 on statewide FSA Math assessment | | |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C. | | |

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

| Indicator | Grade Level | Total |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|-------|
| Students with two or more indicators | | |

The number of students identified retained:

| Indicator | Grade Level | Total |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|-------|
| Retained Students: Current Year | | |
| Students retained two or more times | | |

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 school days | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Level 1 on statewide FSA ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Level 1 on statewide FSA Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 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 | 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 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |

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 | 0 | 0 | |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |

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* | 70 | 54 | 49 | 67 | 55 | 50 | 66 | | |
| ELA Learning Gains | | | | 57 | | | 55 | | |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | 41 | | | 37 | | |
| Math Achievement* | 85 | 72 | 56 | 85 | 34 | 36 | 77 | | |
| Math Learning Gains | | | | 75 | | | 59 | | |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | 70 | | | 56 | | |
| Science Achievement* | 66 | 48 | 49 | 67 | 67 | 53 | 50 | | |
| Social Studies Achievement* | 83 | 70 | 68 | 71 | 64 | 58 | 95 | | |
| Middle School Acceleration | 78 | 80 | 73 | 72 | 57 | 49 | 82 | | |
| Graduation Rate | | | | | 52 | 49 | | | |
| College and Career Acceleration | | | | | 71 | 70 | | | |
| ELP Progress | 45 | 41 | 40 | 83 | 86 | 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 | 71 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students | No |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 1 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 427 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 6 |
| Percent Tested | 99 |
| Graduation Rate | |

| 2021-22 ESSA Federal Index | |
|--|------|
| ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI) | ATSI |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students | 69 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students | No |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 1 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 688 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 10 |
| 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 | 26 | Yes | 2 | 1 |
| ELL | 56 | | | |
| AMI | | | | |
| ASN | | | | |
| BLK | | | | |
| HSP | 66 | | | |
| MUL | 65 | | | |
| PAC | | | | |
| WHT | 78 | | | |

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% |
|----------------------|--|---------------------------|--|--|
| FRL | 68 | | | |

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 | 33 | Yes | 1 | |
| ELL | 52 | | | |
| AMI | | | | |
| ASN | | | | |
| BLK | 69 | | | |
| HSP | 64 | | | |
| MUL | | | | |
| PAC | | | | |
| WHT | 70 | | | |
| FRL | 62 | | | |

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 | 70 | | | 85 | | | 66 | 83 | 78 | | | 45 |
| SWD | 26 | | | 42 | | | 9 | | | | 3 | |
| ELL | 52 | | | 64 | | | | 61 | | | 4 | 45 |
| AMI | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ASN | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| BLK | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| HSP | 66 | | | 80 | | | 63 | 73 | 74 | | 6 | 40 |
| MUL | 50 | | | 80 | | | | | | | 2 | |

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 |
|-----------|----------|--------|-------------|-----------|---------|--------------|----------|---------|-----------|-------------------|---------------------|--------------|
| PAC | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 73 | | | 88 | | | 65 | 89 | 76 | | 5 | |
| FRL | 67 | | | 78 | | | 60 | 78 | 78 | | 6 | 45 |

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 | 67 | 57 | 41 | 85 | 75 | 70 | 67 | 71 | 72 | | | 83 |
| SWD | 17 | 34 | 26 | 44 | 52 | 55 | 21 | 15 | | | | |
| ELL | 44 | 49 | 43 | 72 | 57 | 57 | 28 | 50 | 36 | | | 83 |
| AMI | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ASN | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| BLK | 73 | 45 | | 73 | 83 | | | | | | | |
| HSP | 59 | 59 | 45 | 84 | 70 | 66 | 57 | 60 | 58 | | | 82 |
| MUL | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| PAC | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 70 | 54 | 36 | 86 | 77 | 73 | 76 | 75 | 80 | | | |
| FRL | 61 | 52 | 48 | 82 | 73 | 65 | 52 | 63 | 60 | | | |

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 | 66 | 55 | 37 | 77 | 59 | 56 | 50 | 95 | 82 | | | |
| SWD | 28 | 37 | 22 | 49 | 65 | 62 | 27 | | | | | |
| ELL | 42 | 49 | 32 | 60 | 52 | 46 | | 82 | | | | |
| AMI | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ASN | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| BLK | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| HSP | 57 | 47 | 28 | 75 | 61 | 60 | 44 | 92 | 83 | | | |
| MUL | 50 | | | 70 | | | | | | | | |
| PAC | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 73 | 59 | 44 | 80 | 60 | 52 | 57 | 97 | 82 | | | |
| FRL | 55 | 48 | 30 | 70 | 63 | 60 | 33 | 92 | 74 | | | |

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 | 70% | 52% | 18% | 47% | 23% |
| 08 | 2023 - Spring | 62% | 47% | 15% | 47% | 15% |
| 06 | 2023 - Spring | 70% | 51% | 19% | 47% | 23% |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|-------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 06 | 2023 - Spring | 89% | 70% | 19% | 54% | 35% |
| 07 | 2023 - Spring | 82% | 75% | 7% | 48% | 34% |
| 08 | 2023 - Spring | 75% | 52% | 23% | 55% | 20% |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
|---------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 08 | 2023 - Spring | 63% | 45% | 18% | 44% | 19% |

| ALGEBRA | | | | | | |
|---------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| N/A | 2023 - Spring | 100% | 59% | 41% | 50% | 50% |

| GEOMETRY | | | | | | |
|----------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| N/A | 2023 - Spring | * | 61% | * | 48% | * |

| CIVICS | | | | | | |
|--------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| N/A | 2023 - Spring | 82% | 68% | 14% | 66% | 16% |

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.

The data component that showed the lowest performance was our Students with Disabilities. It is well documented that students with disabilities suffered more learning loss during Covid than their non-SWD peers. After Covid, MICMS used a block schedule to help mitigate the spread of Covid which was not an effective strategy for at risk learners.

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

Students with Disabilities in the subject of English Language Arts showed the greatest decline from the prior year. Factors that contributed to this include absenteeism due to discipline related suspensions, lack of small group instruction, and the block scheduling from the prior year.

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.

When comparing 2021-2022 data with the state, 84.7% of our students with disabilities scored below grade level in Social Studies which is higher than the state average of 59.3%. Block scheduling the prior year, along with a lack of small group instruction because of Covid, contributed to students not getting the individualization they needed. Plus, there were many students still experiencing high absenteeism due to the pandemic.

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

In comparing 2021-2022 data with the state, our highest category involving our students with disabilities was in the subject of Mathematics. Math has traditionally been an area of strength for our school and our teachers were able to mitigate some of the learning losses during the previous year.

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

One area of concern is our low ELA scores across the board. While we outperformed the state in the 2021-2022 school year, our performance has room for improvement. An improvement in English Language Arts will have a positive affect on results in Social Studies, Science, and Mathematics across all subgroups.

Another area of concern were the days missed due to discipline related suspensions. Creating a more positive and engaging school culture will help reduce this number.

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

Our top priorities this year are to improve our MTSS process by providing time for grade level teams to meet daily, increase our reading instruction across all subject areas providing opportunities for students to connect with readings on multiple topics, focusing on small group instruction in order to provide support and extensions to meet the needs of our diverse learners, and creating a more positive and engaging school culture to help reduce student suspensions.

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 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.

Effectively using small group instruction will allow for better teacher-student relationships in the classroom. This allows students to feel more comfortable to take academic risks and to be "seen" by their teacher. The positive relationships forged through the small groups will improve the learning environment and overall school culture. By working in small groups, teachers will be better able to consistently provide students with opportunities to ask and answer questions identify areas of need and provide strategies to improve student successes.

Measurable Outcome:

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

By engaging in small group instruction, all students will improve their ELA scale score during PM3 of the FAST test. This includes our students with disabilities.

Monitoring:

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

By collaborating daily within grade level teams and discussing student data, teachers and leadership team will be able to identify what is and is not working on a weekly basis.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Margo Heidenreich (heidenma@collierschools.com)

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.)

Small group instruction will help build students' world and word knowledge so they can make sense of the text and provide students with opportunities to monitor their comprehension as they read. The use of Beable to monitor their Lexile growth on a monthly basis will also help provide data to determine student growth.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Students that struggle in school often withdraw from large group discussions and tune out direct instruction unless they are actively engaged. Small group instruction will all teachers to engage students in a smaller setting and providing a safe place for students to take academic risks and step out of their comfort zone.

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.

-Implement a multi-tiered system of support (MTSS) to address academic, behavioral, and social-emotional needs of our students with disabilities

- Provide targeted interventions and enrichment activities to address individual student needs.
- Monitor student progress through data collection and adjust support strategies accordingly.

Person Responsible: Margo Heidenreich (heidenma@collierschools.com)

By When: Ongoing throughout the year.

- Collect and analyze data on the academic performance and well-being of students with disabilities.
- Use data insights to make informed decisions and refine strategies for improvement.
- Regularly review the effectiveness of the improvement plan and make necessary adjustments.

Person Responsible: Margo Heidenreich (heidenma@collierschools.com)

By When: Ongoing throughout the year.

#2. 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.

Building a positive school culture will allow students and teachers to feel a sense of belonging and understand that their presence at school matters. By implementing the Leader in Me program by the Franklin Covey Foundation, we can empower students to lead their own learning and create the positive school culture we envision.

Measurable Outcome:

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

By implementing the Leader in Me program, we will increase our attendance to 96% by the end of the 2023-2024 school year.

Monitoring:

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

Leadership is a choice, and for Leader in Me students, leadership choices are demonstrated most clearly through self-discipline. Negative interactions with peers and incidents of poor self-control in the classroom often arise from a lack of self-discipline. Students throughout Leader in Me Schools learn the skills of personal and interpersonal leadership and, consequently, their self-discipline increases while schoolwide discipline referrals inevitably decline.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Margo Heidenreich (heidenma@collierschools.com)

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.)

Leader in Me is associated with 42% fewer discipline incidence than expected in a statewide sample of Leader in Me schools based on pre-Leader in Me trajectory and showed 28% improvement in teen's mental wellness. By successfully implementing the Leader in Me program we can cut down on students absenteeism.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

As a middle school, our students come to us already possessing the knowledge of the 7 habits of highly effective teens. By reinforcing the habits, empowering students to lead, and partnering with families, we can help students maintain self-discipline and use their genius to improve our school.

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