Leon County Schools

William J Montford III Middle School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

William J Montford III Middle School

5789 PIMLICO DR, Tallahassee, FL 32309

https://www.leonschools.net/montford

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 William J. Montford, III Middle School is to establish a culture of respect and responsibility; engage students in an active, emotionally, and physically safe learning environment; model enthusiasm for and love of learning; and prepare students to contribute and care for the community and the environment by providing opportunities to explore interests and creatively solve problems.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The school's vision is to be recognized as the highest performing middle school where students, staff, and families enjoy learning, take pride in contributing to the community, and enjoy the highest levels of success in all we do.

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
McQuade, Anthony	Principal	Mr. McQuade is responsible for overseeing the process to ensure the laws and policies are followed in the best interest of the students and staff. He works to intentionally shape our school vision for academic success for all students.
Sims, Kimberly	Assistant Principal	Mrs. Sims is responsible for assisting the principal in the implementation of the process of laws and policies are followed in the best interest of the students and staff. She works also to intentionally shape our school vision for academic success for all students.
Stallworth, Stacy	Assistant Principal	Mrs. Stallworth is responsible for assisting the principal in the implementation of the process of laws and policies are followed in the best interest of the students and staff. She works also to intentionally shape our school vision for academic success for all students.
Allen, Clyde	Dean	Mr. Allen generally assists the principal and assistant principals in fulfilling his/her chief responsibility of promoting the educational success and safety of each student in the school. He also assists the administration with discipline matters (e.g., in-school detention, OFI).
Ward, Tiffany	Curriculum Resource Teacher	Mrs. Ward is responsible for assisting the principal in the implementation of the process of laws and policies are followed in the best interest of the students and staff. She works also to intentionally shape our school vision for academic success for all students through testing coordination and 504 coordination.
Wilson, Camillia	Reading Coach	Ms. Wilson our reading coach participates in student data collection and evaluation of data, collaborates with district personnel to identify appropriate, evidence-based intervention strategies, and assists with design and delivery of professional development relative to implementation of effective reading strategies.
Gaskin, Christi	Teacher, K-12	Mrs. Gaskin is the Language Arts Department Chair- she provides leadership for all members of the team/grade. She helps to monitor and report trends occurring within the team in regards to discipline, safety, curriculum, and student achievement.
Hanna, Christy	Teacher, K-12	Mrs. Hanna is the Science Department Chair- she provides leadership for all members of the team/grade. She helps to monitor and report trends occurring within the team in regards to discipline, safety, curriculum, and student achievement.
Scott, Monica	Teacher, K-12	Ms. Scott is our athletic director who generally assists the administrative team and oversees all aspects of the athletic program and club organizations,

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		including hiring coaches and sponsors, scheduling, budget preparation, promotion, compliance, and facility management. She also works with coaches, sponsors, athletes, and students to help teams and clubs reach their potential goals.
Wood, Robin	Teacher, K-12	She is the 7th Grade Team Leader- she provides leadership for all members of the team/grade. She helps to monitor and report trends occurring within the team in regards to discipline, safety, curriculum, and student achievement.
Fowler, Susan	School Counselor	Ms. Fowler is our 6th /7th grades counselor. She is also responsible for providing a comprehensive school counseling program that is preventative in design, developmental in implementation, and supports students in the areas of academic achievement, career and college planning, and personal and social development
Long, Alexandra	School Counselor	Guidance Counselor, Referral Coordinator. She is responsible for providing a comprehensive school counseling program that is preventative in design, developmental in implementation, and supports students in the areas of academic achievement, career and college planning, and personal and social development.
Allen, Katie	Teacher, ESE	Mrs. Allen-Blair is the ESE Department Chair- she provides leadership for all members of the team/grade. She helps to monitor and report trends occurring within the team in regards to discipline, safety, curriculum, and student achievement.
Drew, Jodi	Teacher, K-12	Mrs. Drew is the Fine Arts Department Chair- she provides leadership for all members of the team/grade. She helps to monitor and report trends occurring within the team in regards to discipline, safety, curriculum, and student achievement.
Lowery, Darlene	Teacher, K-12	Social Studies Department Chair- she provides leadership for all members of the team/grade. She helps to monitor and report trends occurring within the team in regards to discipline, safety, curriculum, and student achievement.
Thompson, Fred	Teacher, K-12	Mr. Thompson is the Physical Education Department Chair- he provides leadership for all members of the team/grade. He helps to monitor and report trends occurring within the team in regards to discipline, safety, curriculum, and student achievement.
Taylor, Wendy	Teacher, K-12	Mrs. Taylor is the 6th Grade Team Leader - she provides leadership for all members of the team/grade. She helps to monitor and report trends occurring within the team in regards to discipline, safety, curriculum, and student achievement.

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Famularo, Hilary	Teacher, K-12	Mathematics Department Chair- she provides leadership for all members of the team/grade. She helps to monitor and report trends occurring within the team in regards to discipline, safety, curriculum, and student achievement.

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.

Meetings were held with stakeholders during the development process to not only discuss the prior year data and successes, but also areas for improvement. Goals were discussed and action steps were laid out in order to move Montford's students forward for the 23-24 school year. The previous year's SIP was shared, and the Areas of Focus were written with the group.

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))

Focusing on our goals for the 23-24 school year, the SIP will be reviewed each time a progress monitoring assessment is taken to see where each grade level is in relation to the overall goals in ELA. Proficiency and growth will also be monitored for the subgroups, SWD and African American. As necessary, the plan will be revised, and action steps can be added in order to meet the goals set for the 23-24 school year.

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	34%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	22%
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)	Students With Disabilities (SWD)* English Language Learners (ELL)

(subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	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: B 2019-20: A 2018-19: A 2017-18: A
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

Using 2022-23 data, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	21	25	37	83
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	5	6
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	1	5
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	54	43	56	153
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	39	44	36	119
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	37	15	12	64
	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	10	9	18	37

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

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

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	80	93	127	300
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	25	27	39	91
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	25	37	50	112
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	45	35	33	113
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	25	37	50	112

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	3

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

Prior Year (2022-23) Updated (pre-populated)
Section 3 includes data tables that are pre-populated based off information submitted in prior year's SIP.

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	80	93	127	300
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	25	27	39	91
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	25	37	50	112
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	45	35	33	113
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	25	37	50	112

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	3

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

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review

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

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

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	67	52	49	66	53	50	69		
ELA Learning Gains				54			57		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				37			39		
Math Achievement*	83	58	56	74	34	36	73		
Math Learning Gains				67			59		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				52			39		
Science Achievement*	67	51	49	57	55	53	68		
Social Studies Achievement*	79	75	68	83	61	58	78		
Middle School Acceleration	49	67	73	56	47	49	38		
Graduation Rate					51	49			
College and Career Acceleration					76	70			
ELP Progress		42	40		73	76			

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

See Florida School Grades, School Improvement Ratings and DJJ Accountability Ratings.

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	69
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	345
Total Components for the Federal Index	5
Percent Tested	98
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	61
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	546
Total Components for the Federal Index	9
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	35	Yes	2	
ELL	68			
AMI				
ASN	87			
BLK	45			
HSP	68			
MUL	60			
PAC				

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%
WHT	73			
FRL	48			

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	31	Yes	1	1
ELL	46			
AMI				
ASN	87			
BLK	40	Yes	1	
HSP	53			
MUL	65			
PAC				
WHT	66			
FRL	44			

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	67			83			67	79	49			
SWD	37			51			40	30	16		5	
ELL	64			71							2	
AMI												
ASN	85			96			85		82		4	
BLK	43			59			41	56	27		5	
HSP	70			84			50	85	49		5	

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
MUL	65			79			50	75	32		5	
PAC												
WHT	71			87			73	85	51		5	
FRL	47			64			46	58	26		5	

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS

Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21	ELP Progress
All Students	66	54	37	74	67	52	57	83	56			
SWD	26	25	15	37	42	30	19	44	43			
ELL	33	47		47	56							
AMI												
ASN	81	85		90	75			92	100			
BLK	35	40	27	40	46	43	27	67	31			
HSP	60	47	29	68	68	43	46	65	50			
MUL	79	56		74	76		53	85	35			
PAC												
WHT	71	56	44	82	71	58	64	87	58			
FRL	44	41	26	48	50	46	39	65	35			

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	69	57	39	73	59	39	68	78	38			
SWD	32	36	27	38	41	30	22	48	6			
ELL	30	60	67	43	50	54						
AMI												
ASN	86	65		90	73				80			
BLK	40	43	37	38	40	33	41	57	16			
HSP	63	54	45	66	65	45	61	70	37			
MUL	68	65	50	65	51	40	43	93	22			
PAC												
WHT	75	59	37	80	62	41	75	81	41			

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
FRL	49	43	31	50	42	32	47	64	15			

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	62%	49%	13%	47%	15%
08	2023 - Spring	65%	49%	16%	47%	18%
06	2023 - Spring	67%	48%	19%	47%	20%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	85%	55%	30%	54%	31%
07	2023 - Spring	86%	51%	35%	48%	38%
08	2023 - Spring	72%	49%	23%	55%	17%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	63%	38%	25%	44%	19%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	100%	58%	42%	50%	50%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	100%	58%	42%	48%	52%

BIOLOGY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	97%	65%	32%	63%	34%

CIVICS						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	79%	72%	7%	66%	13%

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.

In ELA, we remained at 66% for overall achievement. Our students in Social Studies decreased from 83% proficient in 21-22 to 79% proficient in 22-23.

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

Social Studies showed our biggest decrease, dropping 4% in overall achievement to 79% in 22-23. The factors that contributed to this decline included a lower level of proficient readers in the 7th grade.

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.

There were no negative learning gaps compared to state scores.

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

Our Math content area overall showed the greatest improvement on state assessments and on progress monitoring data. Overall achievement went from 74% in 21-22 school year to 85% to 22-23 school year. On the first state progress monitoring assessment, there was a 30% increase of students earning a proficient score. 85% of our students were proficient in PM3.

These gains can be attributed to the use of implementing an inclusive model last school year with the

math content classes being a focus. Last year, we also shifted around grade levels and subject areas in the math department and hired new faculty.

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

Our area of concern is the number of students not performing on grade level in ELA. Last year 153 students were a level 1 on the FAST progress monitoring 3. While the number of proficient ELA students from the 21-22 school year to the 22-23 remained the same, the number of level 1 students increased. With a lot of change in
curriculum and assessments, as well as a decrease in student performance on
state assessments, ELA is an area of focus school wide.
The other area of concern is the number of African American students performing below grade level and their lack of learning gains.
The decrease in reading levels could relate to the decrease in our Social Studies Scores.

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

The number 1 priority in our school is decreasing the number of ELA level 1's. The second priority is our African American students not showing gains in reading. The last priority is increasing our social studies scores. Social Studies saw a small decline this past year.

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

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Black/African-American

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

African American students had a decrease in overall achievement, students demonstrating learning gains, and students in the lowest 25th percentile in 22-23. This subgroup also has new BEST standards, a newer FAST assessment, and newly adopted materials. With a lot of change in curriculum and assessments, as well as a decrease in student performance on state assessments, African Americans is an area of focus school wide.

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

27% of the bottom 25% of African Americans made learning gains. Overall African American student achievement will increase from 35% to 40% and students in the lowest 25th percentile will increase from 27% to 45% on the PM3 FAST Assessment.

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

We will utilize scores from the 1st and 2nd FAST monitoring assessments, StudySync, and Language Live to use data to drive instructional decision making. We will identify benchmarks and standards for mastery and re-address as needed, as well as identify students who need support from the interventionist.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Anthony McQuade (mcquadea@leonschools.net)

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.)

Language Live is a daily intervention program purchased by the district to be used for level 1 ELA students based on it's evidence based strategies demonstrating consistent improvements in comprehension. Level 1 FSA ELA students will be assigned a small group pull out provided by an interventionist to receive reading intervention twice a week for 30 minutes each session. This intervention is individualized and explicitly taught.

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

The district purchased Language Live and is a critical component of the district's reading intervention plan. Study Sync is our district's adopted curriculum and has built in differenitated activities and lessons for students. These resources have empirical evidence in showing growth for students deficient in reading comprehension and reading strategies. A dedicated interventionist to the ELA department will allow for continuous data monitoring, support of teachers, and identiifcation of students.

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement
List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

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

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

The number of students being reported to guidance with anxiety, poor coping strategies, needing risk assessments, etc. has increased with pandemic learning. In general, middle school is a complex time for adolescents as their brains have not been developing as rapidly as they are right now since toddler years. Middle school is a time for students to learn how to cope and learn about healthy strategies to deal with regular anxiety, depression, and social situations with peers. Due to the pandemic and students not participating in a "typical" learning environment, there has been an increase in student needs regarding social emotional issues.

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

We will educate students on self-care strategies, healthy coping options, and social emotional health in order to decrease the number of students reported to guidance who are in distress by 1%.

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

We will keep track of students who come to guidance in distress.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Susan Fowler (fowlers@leonschools.net)

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.)

We will utilize district-provided mental health curriculum to engage students in best practices in identifying and understanding social emotional learning and their own wellbeing. We will have a different bell schedule once a month to dedicate a one hour block of time to mental health learning. Guidance counselors will attend professional development conferences regarding social emotional learning, and instructional strategies for the classroom geared towards the anxious brain. Guidance counselors will share out information and strategies with staff at faculty meetings.

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

It is important that mental health is integrated throughout the school year and not just one assembly. Many students are in distress and need to learn how to cope and navigate through their emotions. Before students can learn content, students must feel they are in a safe environment and supported social and emotionally.

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

#3. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

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

SWD decreased in overall achievement, students demonstrating learning
gains, and students in the lowest 25th percentile from 21-22. They also demonstrated a decrease
across multiple subgroups of students. This subgroup also has new BEST standards,
a new FAST assessment, and new adopted materials. With a lot of change in
curriculum and assessments, as well as a decrease in student performance on
state assessments, SWD are an area of focus school wide.

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

Overall student achievement will increase from 26% to 30% and students in the
lowest 25th percentile will increase from 15% to 25% on the PM3 FAST
Assessment.

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

We will utilize scores from the 1st and 2nd FAST monitoring assessments,
StudySync, and Language Live to use data to drive instructional decision
making. We will identify benchmarks and standards for mastery and re-address as
needed, as well as identify students who need support from the interventionist.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Camillia Wilson (wilsonc1201@leonschools.net)

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.)

To ensure all students are performing at the appropriate academic level and being
provided the interventions they need to be successful. Teachers will be provided
quarterly planning time to collaborate and analyze data in order to share instructional
strategies which are showing to increase student understanding based on data.

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

The district purchased Language Live and is a critical component of the district's
reading intervention plan. Study Sync is our district's adopted curriculum and has
built in differenitated activities and lessons for students. These resources have
empirical evidence in showing growth for students deficient in reading
comprehension and reading strategies. A dedicated interventionist to the ELA department will allow for
continuous data monitoring, support of teachers, and
identification of students.

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement
List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

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

Using progress monitoring data, classroom data, and school data, core subject area teachers will meet monthly to discuss curriculum and student growth. A large area of focus will be on the two subgroups of students with disabilities and African American students. Funding allocations will be used for substitute teachers to allow the teachers to attend professional development and design curriculum plans to be best meet student needs.

Budget to Support Areas of Focus

Part VII: Budget to Support Areas of Focus

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

1	III.B.	Area of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Black/African-American				$5,000.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2023-24
	5100	1400	1201 - William J Montford III Middle School	School Improvement Funds		$5,000.00
			Notes: Funds will be used for substitute teachers to provide coverage for teachers to attend professional development.			
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Early Warning System				$0.00
3	III.B.	Area of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities				$5,000.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2023-24
	5100	1400	1201 - William J Montford III Middle School	School Improvement Funds		$5,000.00
			Notes: Funds will be used for substitute teachers to provide coverage for teachers to attend professional development.			
					Total:	$10,000.00

Budget Approval

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

Yes