Mt. Dora Middle School

2023-24
Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Mt. Dora Middle School

1405 LINCOLN AVE, Mount Dora, FL 32757

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

Provide the school's vision statement.

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

School Leadership Team, 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
Farnsworth, Jennifer	Principal	
Williams, Charlotte	Assistant Principal	
Locuson, Gary	Assistant Principal	
Porter, Phillip	Other	
Marrero, Saul	Dean	
Rigby, Gina	Instructional Coach	
Mitchell, Sherie	School Counselor	
Summers, Heather	School Counselor	
Randolph, Shena	Other	
McCulloch, Heidi	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.

As a Professional Learning Community our School Advisory Council (SAC), Parent Teacher Organization (PTO), and Student Government Association (SGA) collected feedback, reviewed data, and work collaboratively with all stakeholders in the development of our School Improvement Plan. We specifically identified and addressed the following subgroups as needing additional support through ESSA: Students With Disabilities (SWD), African American, and English Language Learners (ELL).

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))

Through Progress Monitoring, Common Formative Assessments, implementation of a systematic intervention and acceleration time, Classroom Learning Walks, and weekly meetings as Professional Learning Teams we will review data regularly and alter out instruction as needed to meet the needs of all learners.

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	57%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	100%
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: C 2018-19: C 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	107	113	131	351
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	28	32	29	89
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	88	103	135	326
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	50	63	71	184
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	88	103	135	326
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level 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	150	136	152	438

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	2	0	4

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	91	88	105	284
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	32	33	76
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	57	66	101	224
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	68	66	72	206
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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	128	135	178	441

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	4	1	1	6
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	91	88	105	284
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	32	33	76
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	57	66	101	224
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	68	66	72	206
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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	128	135	178	441

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	4	1	1	6
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*	43	43	49	44	45	50	45		
ELA Learning Gains				41			45		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				38			36		
Math Achievement*	53	52	56	49	33	36	45		

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
Math Learning Gains				49			35		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				49			36		
Science Achievement*	47	42	49	47	50	53	33		
Social Studies Achievement*	53	64	68	64	54	58	71		
Middle School Acceleration	72	70	73	58	45	49	58		
Graduation Rate					47	49			
College and Career Acceleration					67	70			
ELP Progress	59	44	40	26	71	76	41		

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	55
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	4
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	327
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	47
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	465
Total Components for the Federal Index	10

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
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	24	Yes	4	1
ELL	28	Yes	4	1
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	40	Yes	4	
HSP	47			
MUL	40	Yes	1	
PAC				
WHT	66			
FRL	46			

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	3	
ELL	36	Yes	3	
AMI				
ASN	62			
BLK	40	Yes	3	
HSP	41			
MUL	52			
PAC				
WHT	54			
FRL	42			

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	43			53			47	53	72			59
SWD	20			30			20	26			4	
ELL	14			34			11	23			5	59
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	28			38			35	29	72		5	
HSP	33			45			37	39	68		6	58
MUL	36			49			40	33			4	
PAC												
WHT	57			65			62	72	75		5	
FRL	32			42			38	36	66		6	62

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	44	41	38	49	49	49	47	64	58			26
SWD	24	37	34	27	44	42	24	28				
ELL	25	36	37	33	45	60	15	44				26
AMI												
ASN	80			55	50							
BLK	30	42	47	32	45	44	24	47	50			
HSP	33	39	37	43	50	50	38	54	43			25
MUL	38	42	55	53	44	33	62	80	60			
PAC												
WHT	57	41	27	59	49	57	55	78	63			
FRL	34	41	43	37	43	48	33	48	47			

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	45	45	36	45	35	36	33	71	58			41
SWD	17	32	24	20	32	32	6	58				
ELL	30	44	34	27	40	50	7	63				41
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	33	40	29	30	32	26	27	54	43			
HSP	39	44	34	37	31	30	19	71	43			44
MUL	40	41		50	50		36	63				
PAC												
WHT	52	46	44	54	37	49	43	75	63			
FRL	32	38	34	30	28	32	13	67	39			

Grade Level Data Review– State Assessments (pre-populated)
The data are raw data and include ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data. The percentages shown here represent ALL students who received a score of 3 or higher on the statewide assessments.

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

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
07	2023 - Spring	33%	43%	-10%	47%	-14%
08	2023 - Spring	41%	46%	-5%	47%	-6%
06	2023 - Spring	43%	46%	-3%	47%	-4%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	56%	55%	1%	54%	2%
07	2023 - Spring	32%	47%	-15%	48%	-16%
08	2023 - Spring	45%	56%	-11%	55%	-10%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	44%	44%	0%	44%	0%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	86%	51%	35%	50%	36%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	100%	49%	51%	48%	52%

CIVICS						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	50%	67%	-17%	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.

Our greatest need for improvement is in Civics and ELA. EOC Civics achievement droppped 14 percentage points from 64% in 2022 to 50% in 2023. ELA FAST proficiency dropped 5 percentage points from 44% in 2022 to 39% in 2023. Contributing factor in EOC civics was inconsistency in staffing on the civics team. Contributing factors for ELA FAST were teachers staffing inconsistencies with 7th grade, teachers adjusting to new curriculum and new testing format.

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

The greatest data component decline from the prior year is a 14 percentage point drop in EOC Civics. The factors that contributed to this decline was inconsistency in staffing on the Civics team.

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.

EOC Civics data showed the greatest gap when compared to the state average. The factor that contributed to this decline was inconsistency in staffing on the civics team.

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

The area showing the most improvement was in FAST Math. The professional learning teams met weekly reviewing the data and common formative assessments. Teachers implemented the newly adopted curriculum Math Nation with Fidelity. Tutoring offered four days a week for math. Intervention block used to address student deficiencies. IXL and Aleks supported student growth and the Math Nation Textbook.

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

The number of students missing 10% or more of school increased by 24% from the prior year. Another area of concern is the number of students who performed at a Level 1 on the FAST Reading Progress Monitoring assessment compared to years past data increased by 46%.

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

1. Improving ELA proficiency in FAST PM #3
2. Improving Civics proficiency on the EOC
3. Reduce excessive absenteeism
4. Recruiting and retaining high quality educators

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

#1. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Teacher Retention and Recruitment

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

Based upon the overall decline in student proficiency in Civics and ELA due to teacher turn over, staffing inconsistencies, and teacher shortages nation-wide teacher retention and recruitment is one of our most critical areas of focus. Through the Professional Learning Community (PLC) process, Teacher Induction Support Team meetings, implementation of mentorship program for new teachers to Mount Dora Middle, and continuing our work in supporting and creating high quality instructional teams we will recruit and retain high quality educator with a common belief that all students can achieve at high levels.

This area of focus supports our goal of increasing overall proficiency and learning gains in all areas, as well as specifically targeting the following four ESSA identified subgroups that are performing below the 41%: English Language Learners, Students with Disabilities, Hispanic, and African American.

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

By focusing on improving our culture and environment we expect to see an increase in teacher retention by retaining 90% or more instructional staff for the 23-24 school year.

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

Our Administrative team will participate weekly in collaborative planning meetings, Conduct monthly support team meetings with our new teachers to MDMS, Literacy Coach will provide weekly check-ins for instructional staff, and monthly meetings with our guiding coalition to identify and discuss areas of strengths and areas in need of support.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jennifer Farnsworth (farnsworthj1@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.)

Mount Dora Middle School will continue our work in strengthening our capacity as a Professional Learning Community by focusing on our instructional practices and providing appropriate interventions to target student who are not reaching the desired learning outcomes. Therefore, we will increase student achievement over all, as well as specifically targeting the following four ESSA identified subgroups that are performing below the 41%: English Language Learners, Students with Disabilities, Hispanic, and African American.

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

If we implement, monitor, and support common planning and provide comprehensive support for new instructional staff we will retain high quality educators and see an increase in overall student achievement.

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

<table>
<tr><td>**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.</td></tr>
</table>

Monthly TIST Meetings

Person Responsible: Gary Locuson (locusong1@lake.k12.fl.us)

By When: Meetings will be monthly beginning in September and ending in May

Implement a Guiding Coalition to meet regularly to support the PLC process and new teacher retention.

Person Responsible: Charlotte Williams (williamsc1@lake.k12.fl.us)

By When: Meetings will be continuous throughout the 2023-2024 school year.

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Benchmark-aligned Instruction

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 core content data from the Needs Assessment/Analysis section of School Data Review, the percentage of students overall performing at proficiency or above declined by five percent in Reading and fourteen percentage points in Civics, which makes focusing our instructional practice specifically related to standards-aligned instruction one of our most critical areas of focus. With high expectations, teachers will understand, plan, deliver, and differentiate standards-based instruction in all content areas for all students while intentionally incorporating setting the purpose, modeling thinking, guided instruction, collaborative learning, and independent learning; students will be able to state what they are learning, why they are learning it, how they know they have learned it.

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

By focusing on these areas, we expect to see an increase in the following state level data:
EOC Civics Achievement 50% to 65%
FAST Math proficiency from 54% to 57%
FAST ELA proficiency from 39% to 44%
All ESSA components to at least 41%

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

FAST progress monitoring, Lake Standards Assessments (LSA), Common Formative Assessment data, Classroom learning walks will be analyzed to determine progress towards the goals listed above.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Gary Locuson (locusong1@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 data collected from the district learning walk tool will be reviewed by leadership team and used to identify the need for professional development and instructional coaching regarding the effective implementations of standards based instruction and implementation of the Instructional Framework.
Rosetta Data and Achieve 3000 data will also be used for ELL progress monitoring. Our ESE support facilitators and ELL Support will provide additional support during our Eagle Time (Intervention) to focus on specific needs based on essential standards.
This area of focus supports our goal of increasing overall proficiency and learning gains in all areas, as well as targeting the following four ESSA components that are below 41%: English Language Learners, Students with
Disabilities, African American and Hispanic.

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

If we implement, monitor, and support common planning and the District Instructional Framework there will be an increase in achievement in Math, ELA, and Civics. Using the frame work as a guide for teachers to utilize in their planning will ensure that there is an emphasis on focused instruction that leads to effective instructional practices and student achievement.
The additional support offered by our ESE and ELL support staff focusing on essential standards and language support there will be an increase in student achievement.

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.

Create a professional development series that focuses on the district instructional framework and PLC.

Person Responsible: Gary Locuson (locusong1@lake.k12.fl.us)

By When: First Tuesday of each month Evidence: Sign in Sheets, presentations

Weekly learning walks conducted by administration to monitor implementation of engaging standards based instruction focused on high levels of learning for all students.

Person Responsible: Charlotte Williams (williamsc1@lake.k12.fl.us)

By When: Weekly

Attend professional development focused on building high impact teams

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

By When: Monthly District PD Summer PD opportunities

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Intervention

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 order to better support the needs of our Students with Disabilities, our English Language Learners, and our students needing remediation we have built an intervention block (Eagle Time) into our master schedule. Eagle Time is an opportunity for teachers to provide just in time support by implementing targeting interventions based on the needs of the learners. By implementing Eagle Time daily school-wide we will meet the needs of our lowest quartile students which will help to increase lowest quartile learning gains. The intervention time will also address our identified sub-groups performing below the required 41% by ESSA. To monitor this strategy school/state/district level data, EWS data, and classroom learning walk data will be analyzed quarterly by the teacher support team.

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

Students will attend targeted intervention based on data from common formative assessments. This will be evidenced by interventions in Flex-time and student rosters. Increase student achievement in Civics Achievement 50% to 65%, Math proficiency from 54% to 57%, ELA proficiency from 39% to 44%, Increase all ESSA components to at least 41%.

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

To monitor intervention groups, the administrative team will be involved in Professional Learning Communities and conduct classroom learning walks of intervention time (Eagle Time), conduct department quarterly data chats of LSA's and FAST PM data.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Charlotte Williams (williamsc1@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 data collected from the district learning walk tool will be reviewed by leadership team and used to identify the need for professional development and instructional coaching regarding the effective implementations of standards based instruction, implementation of the Instructional Framework, and Intervention.
Rosetta Data, Achieve 3000 (Intensive Reading), ALEKS (Math), and IXL (ELA and Math) data will also be used for ELL progress monitoring. Our ESE support facilitators and ELL Support will provide additional support during our Eagle Time (Intervention) to focus on specific needs based on essential standards.
This area of focus supports our goal of increasing overall proficiency and learning gains in all areas, as well as targeting the following four ESSA components that are below 41%: English Language Learners, Students with
Disabilities, African American and Hispanic.

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

If we implement, monitor, and support common planning, Intervention, and the District Instructional Framework there will be an increase in achievement in Math, ELA, Science, and Civics. Using the framework as a guide for teachers to utilize in their planning will ensure that there is an emphasis on focused instruction that leads to effective instructional practices and student achievement.

The additional support offered by our ESE and ELL support staff focusing on essential standards and language support there will be an increase in student achievement.

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.

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

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

By When: Who: Administration and literacy coach When: 10/1/23, End 5/1/24 Frequency: Available Monday thru Thursday Evidence: School/state/district level data

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

Person Responsible: Charlotte Williams (williamsc1@lake.k12.fl.us)

By When: Who: Administration and Guidance When: 01/10/24, End 5/26/24 Frequency: Available Monday thru Sunday

Create a structured intervention plan for ELA Level 1 and 2 students utilizing IXL as a diagnostic to track student growth.

Person Responsible: Gary Locuson (locusong1@lake.k12.fl.us)

By When: Who: Administration and literacy coach When: 9/12/23, End 5/26/24 Frequency: Reevaluate quarterly Evidence: School/state/district level data

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).

School Improvement Funding will be based on the need to continue to support and grow teacher and school leadership quality through continued learning and collaboration. Funds will be utilized to continue the work at MDMS to move us to a model PLC school supporting the needs of all ESSA groups to reach a minimum of 41% proficiency.

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: Positive Culture and Environment: Teacher Retention and Recruitment	$0.00
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Benchmark-aligned Instruction	$0.00
3	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Intervention	$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