

Lake County Schools

Gray 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	23
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	23
VI. Title I Requirements	25
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	27

Gray Middle School

205 E MAGNOLIA ST, Groveland, FL 34736

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

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Lake County School Board on 10/23/2023.

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 Gray Middle School is to provide a secure, welcoming environment for all students and staff to thrive. We will ensure that student learning is paramount and a place where all students become leaders of tomorrow.

La misión de la Escuela Secundaria Gray es proporcionar un ambiente seguro y acogedor para que todos los estudiantes y el personal prosperen. Nos aseguraremos de que el aprendizaje de los estudiantes sea primordial y un lugar donde todos los estudiantes se conviertan en líderes del mañana.

La mission de Gray Middle School est de fournir un environnement sûr et accueillant pour que tous les élèves et le personnel puissent s'épanouir. Nous veillerons à ce que l'apprentissage des élèves soit primordial et un lieu où tous les élèves deviennent les leaders de demain.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Gators are...
 Goal Oriented
 Academically Focused
 Trustworthy
 Organized
 Respectful
 Striving for Greatness!

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
Frana, Melissa	Principal	
Smallridge, Greg	Assistant Principal	
Sorrells, Michelle	Assistant Principal	
Stuart, Edward	Assistant Principal	
Miller, Matthew	Instructional Coach	
Strickland, Natalie	Instructional Technology	
Wentzell, Jennifer	School Counselor	
Hacker, Megan	Teacher, K-12	
Grady, Amy	Teacher, K-12	
Fiske, Sara	Teacher, ESE	
Brosious, Adrianna	Teacher, ESE	
Grable, Vicky	Other	
Merkle, Deborah	Other	

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.

Gray Middle's School Improvement team comprises representatives from each stakeholder group. This team facilitates the planning process and ensures that all voices are heard. We involve stakeholders by conducting a thorough needs assessment, which may involve surveys and data analysis. This step aims to identify the school's strengths, areas for improvement, and specific needs as perceived by stakeholders.

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))

Gray Middle School's leadership team utilizes its School Improvement Plan (SIP) as a roadmap to regularly monitor and evaluate the effectiveness of its initiatives in improving student achievement, particularly for those students facing the greatest achievement gap. The SIP outlines specific goals, strategies, and action steps to address the school's unique challenges and growth opportunities. Regular assessments are conducted by teachers using common formative assessments. We utilize Florida's FAST (Florida Assessment of Student Thinking) in ELA and Math, along with Lake County School's quarterly assessments, as a means of data collection and analysis. The data collected on student performance, growth, and achievement aligns with the State's academic standards. Through ongoing data analysis and stakeholder input, our school identifies strengths and areas for improvement, including the progress of students with the greatest achievement gaps. In response to this feedback, our school revises the plan and actions as necessary and ensures continuous improvement. Revisions may involve refining strategies, reallocating resources, providing targeted professional development, or implementing new interventions to support students better.

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	63%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	98%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	ATSI
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No

<p>2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)</p>	<p>Students With Disabilities (SWD)* English Language Learners (ELL)* Native American Students (AMI)* Asian Students (ASN) Black/African American Students (BLK)* Hispanic Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)*</p>
<p>School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.</p>	<p>2021-22: C 2019-20: B 2018-19: B 2017-18: B</p>
<p>School Improvement Rating History</p>	
<p>DJJ Accountability Rating History</p>	

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	138	163	199	500	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	43	60	62	165	
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	2	7	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	3	8	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	145	140	131	416	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	92	80	116	288	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	145	140	131	416	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Behavior Incidents 4 or more	0	0	0	0	0	0	23	19	15	57	

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	199	225	255	679	

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	2	3	5	10

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	142	190	220	552
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	46	66	62	174
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	3	6
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	3	8
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	109	155	153	417
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	126	127	144	397
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	109	155	153	417
	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	208	226	257	691

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	1	3	2	6
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	3	6

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	142	190	220	552
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	46	66	62	174
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	3	6
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	3	8
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	109	155	153	417
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	126	127	144	397
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	109	155	153	417
	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	208	226	257	691

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	1	3	2	6
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	3	6

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*	36	43	49	40	45	50	46		
ELA Learning Gains				38			44		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				31			33		
Math Achievement*	45	52	56	41	33	36	46		
Math Learning Gains				44			36		

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				34			29		
Science Achievement*	34	42	49	44	50	53	44		
Social Studies Achievement*	56	64	68	64	54	58	62		
Middle School Acceleration	64	70	73	59	45	49	57		
Graduation Rate					47	49			
College and Career Acceleration					67	70			
ELP Progress	32	44	40	59	71	76	59		

* 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	45
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	4
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	267
Total Components for the Federal Index	6
Percent Tested	97
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	45
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	5
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	454
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	98

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	23	Yes	4	2
ELL	26	Yes	2	1
AMI	55			
ASN	44			
BLK	38	Yes	2	
HSP	42			
MUL	55			
PAC				
WHT	52			
FRL	38	Yes	2	

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	27	Yes	3	1
ELL	37	Yes	1	
AMI	26	Yes	1	1
ASN	58			
BLK	38	Yes	1	
HSP	42			
MUL	49			
PAC				
WHT	48			
FRL	40	Yes	1	

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	36			45			34	56	64			32
SWD	20			22			18	31			4	
ELL	20			27			14	36			5	32
AMI	55			55							2	
ASN	39			57			36				3	
BLK	32			33			16	47	64		5	
HSP	31			38			30	54	66		6	30
MUL	50			48				67			3	
PAC												
WHT	42			57			43	60	59		5	
FRL	30			39			29	50	58		6	23

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	40	38	31	41	44	34	44	64	59			59
SWD	14	28	26	21	35	27	12	36	40			
ELL	20	34	37	22	35	34	20	44	69			59
AMI	14	38		21	31							
ASN	57	48		54	56		58	77				
BLK	31	31	36	34	39	30	42	51	52			
HSP	39	40	32	35	41	32	39	56	59			50
MUL	51	42		50	42		60					
PAC												
WHT	45	37	25	51	49	40	50	73	58			
FRL	30	33	32	32	38	30	34	55	51			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	46	44	33	46	36	29	44	62	57			59
SWD	22	36	24	29	39	27	29	36	35			
ELL	30	40	36	26	30	36	8	44				59
AMI												
ASN	61	52		68	30							
BLK	47	50	36	37	36	24	27	71	36			
HSP	41	41	33	41	36	31	40	54	61			58
MUL	45	45		39	27		40	82				
PAC												
WHT	49	46	37	53	38	31	54	62	55			
FRL	39	42	32	38	37	28	38	55	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	31%	43%	-12%	47%	-16%
08	2023 - Spring	37%	46%	-9%	47%	-10%
06	2023 - Spring	33%	46%	-13%	47%	-14%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	39%	55%	-16%	54%	-15%
07	2023 - Spring	26%	47%	-21%	48%	-22%
08	2023 - Spring	53%	56%	-3%	55%	-2%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	32%	44%	-12%	44%	-12%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	83%	51%	32%	50%	33%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	*	49%	*	48%	*

CIVICS						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	55%	67%	-12%	66%	-11%

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 lowest performance observed at Gray Middle School last year was a concerning decline of 22 points in 7th-grade math scores compared to the previous year. Three contributing factors were identified as key elements in this setback. Firstly, a significant number of students were found to be behind grade level in math skills, which posed a challenge for teachers in addressing diverse learning needs effectively. Moreover, the implementation of a new math curriculum introduced a period of adjustment for the teaching staff, impacting instructional consistency. Additionally, the lack of targeted intervention during regular class time and the built-in Flextime further hindered the support provided to struggling students.

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

The most significant decline in academic performance at Gray Middle School was observed in 7th-grade math scores during the transition from the 2021-2022 school year to the 2022-2023 school year. One significant contributor was the implementation of a new math curriculum during the 2022-2023 school year. Adjusting to a new curriculum can pose challenges for both teachers and students, as educators

become familiar with the instructional materials and teaching methods, while students adapt to different learning approaches.

Additionally, there was a lack of targeted intervention to support students who were struggling with math concepts. Finally, insufficient progress monitoring of student performance on the math standard might have hindered the early identification of struggling students.

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.

The data component that exhibited the most significant gap when compared to the state average at Gray Middle School was the 7th-grade math scores, which were notably 22 points below the state average. The significant decline in 7th-grade math scores at Gray Middle School can be attributed to the introduction of a new math curriculum which might have led to adjustments and challenges for both teachers and students. A notable number of students were identified as being behind grade level in math skills as well. This pre-existing gap in foundational knowledge might have made it difficult for some students to keep up with the new curriculum's demands. Furthermore, the lack of targeted intervention to address individual learning needs could have further exacerbated the performance gap.

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

The data component that showed the most improvement at our school was 8th-grade math scores in pre-algebra. The percentage of students proficient in pre-algebra increased significantly from 18% in the 2021-2022 school year to an impressive 53% proficiency in the 2022-2023 school year. This remarkable progress reflects the success of the new actions implemented in this area. Three dedicated math teachers remained at the school throughout the year, providing continuity and stability in instruction. Additionally, the 8th-grade math team continually implemented the Professional Learning Communities (PLC) process, fostering collaboration and data-driven decision-making among educators. This collaborative approach allowed teachers to analyze student performance data, identify areas of improvement, and implement targeted instruction and interventions.

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

Based on the EWS (Early Warning System) data from Part I, two potential areas of concern have been identified. The first area is the school-wide below proficiency rating in both math and ELA when compared to the state average. The second area of concern is the significant decline in 7th-grade math scores from the previous year. A 22-point drop in math scores indicates a notable setback in this grade level, warranting a thorough examination of potential factors contributing to the decline.

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

1. Improving Math and ELA Proficiency: Addressing the school-wide below proficiency rating in math and ELA will be our highest priority. We will do this by implementing targeted instructional strategies, personalizing interventions, and providing professional development for teachers who can support student growth and achievement in these core subjects.
2. Reversing Decline in 7th-Grade Math Scores: The significant decline in 7th-grade math scores requires urgent attention. Identifying the root causes, providing targeted interventions, and closely monitoring student progress will improve performance and ensure a positive trajectory in math proficiency.
3. Data-Driven Decision-Making and Progress Monitoring: Establishing a robust data-driven decision-making process and progress monitoring system is essential. Regularly analyzing student data, identifying areas for improvement, and adjusting instructional practices based on evidence will help us lead to informed and effective interventions.

4. Decreasing and Implementing Interventions for Unwarranted Behaviors: Addressing unwarranted behaviors is crucial for maintaining a positive and conducive learning environment. Implementing targeted interventions and support systems for students displaying unwarranted behaviors will help improve the overall classroom climate and student engagement.

5. Team Creation and Implementation of Common Formative Assessments: Collaborative teams will create and implement common formative assessments, enabling consistent and aligned assessment practices across grade levels and subject areas. This will provide valuable data to inform instruction, identify learning gaps, and support differentiated approaches to meet student needs effectively.

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 Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups**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 identified crucial need for targeted intervention and support for ESSA subgroups of students with disabilities (SWD) and African American students is based on a thorough analysis of their ELA, Math, and Science achievement levels. The data reviewed reveals that both SWD and African American students are significantly underperforming in these subjects compared to other subgroups.

For SWD, the achievement percentages of 22% in ELA, 7% in Math, and 3% in Science are notably lower than those of other subgroups. Similarly, for African American students, the achievement percentages of 34% in ELA, 14% in Math, and 13% in Science indicate a substantial achievement gap compared to their peers from different backgrounds.

Measurable Outcome:

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

The specific measurable outcome that the school plans to achieve is to increase the proficiency rates of students with disabilities (SWD) in ELA, Math, and Science by at least 15% over the academic year. Additionally, the school aims to raise the proficiency rates of African-American students in these subjects by a minimum of 10% during the same period.

Monitoring:

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

The Area of Focus, aimed at improving the proficiency rates of students with disabilities (SWD) and African American students in ELA, Math, and Science, will be monitored to ensure the desired outcome is achieved. The monitoring process will involve gathering baseline data collection, progress monitoring, and formative assessment data analysis.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Melissa Frana (franam@lake.k12.fl.us)

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.)

Baseline Data Collection: The school will collect baseline data on the current proficiency rates of SWD and African American students in ELA, Math, and Science. This data will serve as a starting point to measure progress.

Progress Monitoring: The school will establish regular intervals for progress monitoring throughout the academic year. This will include quarterly assessments to track the incremental progress of SWD and African-American students in ELA, Math, and Science.

Formative Assessment Data: Teachers will use ongoing formative assessment data to adjust instructional strategies and interventions. This data-driven approach ensures that teaching methods are responsive to individual student needs and contribute to overall improvement.

Intervention Effectiveness: The impact of targeted interventions and support strategies will be assessed through the progress of SWD and African-American students. Certain interventions may be expanded or modified to enhance outcomes if they prove particularly effective.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The rationale for selecting the specific strategy of improving proficiency rates in Math and Science for students with disabilities (SWD) and African American subgroups is strongly supported by the historical

performance data. Over the last three years, both SWD and African American subgroups have consistently demonstrated the lowest levels of academic achievement. This persistent trend highlights a significant achievement gap that needs to be urgently addressed.

Furthermore, the data specifically indicates that the achievement levels in Math and Science for these subgroups are considerably lower when compared to other student groups. This underperformance suggests that there may be specific challenges or barriers that are impacting the learning outcomes of SWD and African American students in these subjects.

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 system of regular progress monitoring to track the academic growth of SWD and African American students in Math and Science. Adjust instructional plans based on ongoing data analysis.

Person Responsible: Greg Smallridge (smallridgeg@lake.k12.fl.us)

By When: Start: 8/22/223 End: 5/24/24

Facilitate regular collaboration sessions among Math and Science teachers to share successful strategies, discuss challenges, and collectively identify effective instructional approaches.

Person Responsible: Michelle Sorrells (sorrellsm@lake.k12.fl.us)

By When: Start: 8/22/223 End: 5/24/24

Train Math and Science teachers on implementing differentiated instruction techniques to cater to diverse learning needs within SWD and African American subgroups.

Person Responsible: Deborah Merkle (merkled@lake.k12.fl.us)

By When: Start: 8/22/223 End: 5/24/24

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Collaborative Planning

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 area of focus for Gray Middle School will be identifying essential standards and creating common formative assessments. This decision was driven by the data analysis, which revealed that almost 70% of students are scoring below proficiency in both ELA and Math, as indicated by the FAST assessment results. This data highlights the need for targeted interventions to address learning gaps and improve student performance in these core subjects. By identifying essential standards, teachers can prioritize the most critical content students must master to succeed academically. This focus ensures that instructional time is dedicated to the most relevant and impactful concepts, enhancing students' depth of understanding and skill development. Implementing common formative assessments will further support this area of focus by providing consistent and standardized measures of student progress. These assessments will allow teachers to gauge student learning regularly and identify areas of weakness. The data obtained from common formative assessments will inform instructional decisions, enabling educators to effectively tailor interventions and support to meet individual student needs.

Measurable Outcome:

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

We plan to achieve this measurable outcome by increasing the percentage of students scoring at or above proficiency in both ELA and Math on the FAST assessment by at least 15% by the end of the upcoming school year in all three grade levels.

Monitoring:

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

The Area of Focus, which involves identifying essential standards and creating common formative assessments to improve student proficiency in ELA and Math, will be closely monitored to ensure the desired outcome. Monitoring will be a continuous and collaborative process that involves various stakeholders. Teachers will engage in collaborative planning sessions with the presence and guidance of an administrator, coach, and other support personnel. During these sessions, teachers will identify essential standards, aligning their instructional practices to focus on the most crucial content that drives student success. Teachers will collaboratively develop common formative assessments to assess student learning consistently and objectively. The school will measure the specific outcome by using the FAST assessment data for Progress Monitoring 1 (PM1) and Progress Monitoring 2 (PM2). By comparing the proficiency percentages from baseline data, the school can track progress and evaluate the effectiveness of instructional interventions and support strategies.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Melissa Frana (franam@lake.k12.fl.us)

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.)

The evidence-based intervention being implemented for the Area of Focus of improving student proficiency in Math and ELA involves a "Small Group Intervention Cycle." This intervention is designed to provide targeted support and instruction for the lowest-performing students in both subjects and those who have performed poorly on the same common formative assessment twice. Students who demonstrate below proficiency scores in Math and ELA on common formative assessments will be identified as candidates for the small group intervention cycle. This identification ensures that students with specific academic needs receive additional support. Students identified for the intervention will be pulled for small group instruction four times a week during our Flextime intervention period, allowing for more personalized

and focused instruction. Students well below grade level will receive intervention in foundational skills in Math and ELA, focusing on essential concepts and building a strong academic base for students.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Our small group intervention cycle in Math and ELA is rooted in the data-driven need to address the academic challenges of the lowest-performing students. The data analysis evidence indicates that almost 70% of students are scoring below proficiency in both subjects, highlighting the urgency to provide targeted and intensive support for these students. The small group intervention instruction will be based on student performance on essential standards deemed necessary for their grade level. Teachers will deliver lessons to students in groups of 10-15 on essential standards with the intent of repeated practice with the skills necessary to master those standards. Students will be assessed at the end of each cycle (3 weeks) to see if they have achieved proficiency on those standards.

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.

Identify Targeted Students: Deliver a universal screener to students in both ELA and Math to identify students with substantial learning gaps and/or in need of foundational support.

Person Responsible: Deborah Merkle (merkled@lake.k12.fl.us)

By When: Start: September 15th, 2023 End: May 24th, 2024

Data-Informed Instruction: Teachers will continually monitor student progress using common formative assessments and progress monitoring tools, adjusting instruction based on data analysis.

Person Responsible: Edward Stuart (stuarte@lake.k12.fl.us)

By When: End of each quarter: 10/12/23, 12/20/23, 3/7/24, and 5/4/24

Develop Intervention Plan: Teachers will create individualized intervention plans for each small group, outlining targeted instructional strategies, resources, and goals.

Person Responsible: Deborah Merkle (merkled@lake.k12.fl.us)

By When: Start: September 15th, 2023 End: May 24th, 2024

Group Formation: Teachers will form small intervention groups based on the identified students' specific learning needs and performance levels in Math and ELA.

Person Responsible: Edward Stuart (stuarte@lake.k12.fl.us)

By When: Re-evaluate every three weeks until 5/5/24.

Differentiated Instruction: Teachers will implement differentiated instruction within each small group, providing personalized support and addressing individual learning preferences.

Person Responsible: Edward Stuart (stuarte@lake.k12.fl.us)

By When: Re-evaluate every three weeks until 5/5/24.

#3. 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.

Gray Middle School aims to enhance attendance, foster positive student behaviors, and cultivate a safe and supportive academic environment for all students by effectively utilizing early warning systems data. By consistently monitoring this data on a quarterly basis and engaging with students and families to establish clear expectations, we will achieve these objectives. To promote positive behaviors, we will implement a school-wide PBIS (Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports) program, where students will be rewarded with Gator Bucks for making good choices, exceeding expectations, and showing academic improvement. This incentive system will contribute to building a positive school culture, with students being held to high expectations for behavior and academic achievement. Through these concerted efforts, Gray Middle School is committed to fostering a school environment that encourages positive behaviors, improved attendance, and academic success for all students.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Gray Middle School plans to increase overall student attendance by at least 5% each quarter over the previous year and reduce the number of disciplinary incidents by 10% quarterly based on the data collected from the early warning systems last year.

Monitoring:

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

Teachers and staff will maintain high expectations for student's behavior and academic performance. The school's administration, including the dean, potential specialist, and literacy coach, will collaborate to establish and maintain a well-structured PBIS (Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports) system, ensuring its effective operation and smooth functioning.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Michelle Sorrells (sorrellsm@lake.k12.fl.us)

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.)

The school will implement a comprehensive, school-wide positive behavior plan that incentivizes students demonstrating desired positive behaviors. Simultaneously, the plan will incorporate proactive monitoring of early warning signs to identify and intervene with students displaying at-risk behaviors.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

By conducting quarterly monitoring of early warning systems data and collaborating with families to establish clear expectations, we aim to achieve several positive outcomes. Implementing these strategies will lead to increased attendance, improved positive student behaviors, and the maintenance of a safe and supportive environment for all students. Additionally, we anticipate reducing unwanted classroom behaviors and disciplinary incidents, contributing to the overall positive school climate.

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.

The school will implement a comprehensive, school-wide positive behavior plan that incentivizes students who exhibit desired positive behaviors. Additionally, the plan will involve proactive monitoring of early warning signs to identify and provide intervention for students displaying at-risk behaviors.

Person Responsible: Michelle Sorrells (sorrellsm@lake.k12.fl.us)

By When: Start: 8/10/22 End: 5/24/24

As part of an initiative to foster a positive school culture and promote positive student behaviors, teachers will conduct monthly PBIS lessons during flextime. These lessons will be tailored to address early warning systems (EWS) data and incorporate input from stakeholders each month, ensuring targeted interventions and support for students' specific needs.

Person Responsible: Michelle Sorrells (sorrellsm@lake.k12.fl.us)

By When: Start: 8/10/22 End: 5/24/24

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).

At Gray Middle School, students will have the opportunity for Flextime sessions four days a week, during which they can seek assistance in subjects where they require additional support. To participate in Flextime, students are expected to enroll in sessions that align with their identified learning needs. Our educators will cross-reference Flextime rosters to ensure proper enrollment. We are dedicated to catering to the diverse needs of our students, including English Language Learners (ELL), Exceptional Student Education (ESE) individuals, those in the lowest quartile, and participants in the AVID program, who will receive specialized tutoring during their AVID class. Should students receive a failing grade on their quarterly report card, we will offer a Grade Recovery initiative to help them regain credit for essential courses. Throughout tutoring and grade recovery sessions, tutors will engage in hands-on teaching, often employing technology such as computers, displays, and projectors. Necessary supplies, such as individual file folders, scratch paper, and general materials, will be provided to facilitate progress tracking. Students needing extra assistance in mathematics, particularly those who scored at level one on the FSA mathematics section, will benefit from Intensive Math classes. In cases where a failing grade persists by the end of the academic year, attendance in our June Summer School program will be mandatory to ensure a comprehensive opportunity for improvement. The budget allocated to Gray Middle School will be utilized to procure IXL licenses, catering to all Math and ELA students, intending to facilitate both remediation and acceleration of student learning. Additionally, some funds will be allocated to enable teachers to provide essential before and after-school tutoring sessions for students requiring additional support.

Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE)

Area of Focus Description and Rationale

Include a description of your Area of Focus (Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA) for each grade below, how it affects student learning in literacy, and a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed. Data that should be used to determine the critical need should include, at a minimum:

- The percentage of students below Level 3 on the 2022 statewide, standardized ELA assessment. Identification criteria must include each grade that has 50 percent or more students scoring below level 3 in grades 3-5 on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.
- The percentage of students in kindergarten through grade 3, based on 2021-2022 end of year screening and progress monitoring data, who are not on track to score Level 3 or above on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.
- Other forms of data that should be considered: formative, progress monitoring and diagnostic assessment data.

Grades K-2: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA**Grades 3-5: Instructional Practice specifically related to Reading/ELA****Measurable Outcomes**

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each grade below. This should be a data-based, objective outcome. Include prior year data and a measurable outcome for each of the following:

- Each grade K -3, using the coordinated screening and progress monitoring system, where 50 percent or more of the students are not on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment;
- Each grade 3-5 where 50 percent or more of its students scored below a Level 3 on the most recent statewide, standardized ELA assessment; and
- Grade 6 measurable outcomes may be included, as applicable.

Grades K-2 Measurable Outcomes**Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes****Monitoring****Monitoring**

Describe how the school's Area(s) of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcomes. Include a description of how ongoing monitoring will impact student achievement outcomes.

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Evidence-based Practices/Programs

Description:

Describe the evidence-based practices/programs being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each grade and describe how the identified practices/programs will be monitored. The term “evidence-based” means demonstrating a statistically significant effect on improving student outcomes or other relevant outcomes as provided in 20 U.S.C. §7801(21)(A)(i). Florida’s definition limits evidence-based practices/programs to only those with strong, moderate or promising levels of evidence.

- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs meet Florida’s definition of evidence-based (strong, moderate or promising)?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align with the district’s K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align to the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards?

Rationale:

Explain the rationale for selecting practices/programs. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting the practices/programs.

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs address the identified need?
- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken to address the school’s Area(s) of Focus. To address the area of focus, identify 2 to 3 action steps and explain in detail for each of the categories below:

- Literacy Leadership
- Literacy Coaching
- Assessment
- Professional Learning

Action Step	Person Responsible for Monitoring
-------------	-----------------------------------

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.

N/A

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))

N/A

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)

N/A

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))

N/A

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).

N/A

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))

N/A

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))

N/A

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: Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups	\$0.00
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Collaborative Planning	\$0.00
3	III.B.	Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Early Warning System	\$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