Lake Nona Middle School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Lake Nona Middle

13700 NARCOOSSEE RD, Orlando, FL 32832

https://lakenonams.ocps.net/

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.

With the support of families and the community, we create enriching and diverse pathways that lead our students to success.

Provide the school's vision statement.

To ensure every student has a promising and successful future.

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
Fugate, Jennifer	Principal	The principal serves as the instructional leader and chief administrator of the school which involves developing, implementing, and supporting policies, programs, curriculum activities, and budgets in a manner that promotes the educational development of each student as well as the professional development of each staff member.
Huerta-Kirkland, Teresa	Assistant Principal	The assistant principals' position is to assist the building principal in organizing and fostering a positive, safe environment that is conducive to best meeting the needs of all students, staff and parents. This includes responsibilities such as: leading, directing, counseling and supervising a variety of personnel and programs. Assistant principals are key in creating effective parent, teacher, and student communications. The also support, encourage, mentor and evaluate staff. They foster teamwork between teachers, staff and parents.
Berson, Steven	Assistant Principal	The assistant principals' position is to assist the building principal in organizing and fostering a positive, safe environment that is conducive to best meeting the needs of all students, staff and parents. This includes responsibilities such as: leading, directing, counseling and supervising a variety of personnel and programs. Assistant principals are key in creating effective parent, teacher, and student communications. The also support, encourage, mentor and evaluate staff. They foster teamwork between teachers, staff and parents.
Wright, Amy	Assistant Principal	The assistant principals' position is to assist the building principal in organizing and fostering a positive, safe environment that is conducive to best meeting the needs of all students, staff and parents. This includes responsibilities such as: leading, directing, counseling and supervising a variety of personnel and programs. Assistant principals are key in creating effective parent, teacher, and student communications. The also support, encourage, mentor and evaluate staff. They foster teamwork between teachers, staff and parents.
Powers, Sharon	Instructional Media	Support personnel like instructional coaches provide job embedded and ongoing professional development for teachers, staff, and administration. The coaches interface with the principal to work towards the vision of high quality of teaching and learning.
Berkes, Nithya	Math Coach	The instructional coach leads and supports PLC meetings weekly. The instructional coach also assists with testing and analyzing data.
Gill, Roxanne	Reading Coach	The instructional coach leads and supports PLC meetings weekly. The instructional coach also assists with testing and analyzing data.
Harrelson, Allyson	Curriculum Resource Teacher	The instructional coach leads and supports PLC meetings weekly. The instructional coach also assists with testing and analyzing data.

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Haigler, Jarelis	Other	The instructional coach leads and supports PLC meetings weekly. The instructional coach also assists with testing and analyzing data. The 504 coordinator works closely with the staffing specialist and ESE department to ensure that our students with health concerns and/or disabilities are cared for.
Holman, Shelby	Staffing Specialist	The Staffing Specialist assists in the coordination of eligibility and placement of Students with Disabilities (SWD) as well as Gifted students. They provide leadership for improving instruction for all students with Exceptional Student Education (ESE) designations.
Lozano Rodriguez, Ricardo	Dean	The academic deans of students have a responsibility of protecting the health and welfare of our students. They assist students in establishing high standards of conduct and address the improvement of student attendance and discipline.
Munich, Lynette	Dean	The academic deans of students have a responsibility of protecting the health and welfare of our students. They assist students in establishing high standards of conduct and address the improvement of student attendance and discipline.
Powers, Steven	Dean	The academic deans of students have a responsibility of protecting the health and welfare of our students. They assist students in establishing high standards of conduct and address the improvement of student attendance and discipline.
Espino, Karen	ELL Compliance Specialist	The ESOL Compliance Specialist assists in the coordination of eligibility and placement of ESOL students. They provide leadership for improving instruction for ESOL students.
Sella, Rebeca	Other	The SAFE coordinator works closely with the deans, counselors, and social worker to support our students. The SAFE coordinator also runs the threat assessment meetings.
Baez, Anne	Administrative Support	

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.

After reviewing school data, we discussed with the resource team to identify our learning gaps. We then discussed this with teachers to show them the gaps and asked for their areas of need to better support them. We reviewed the data, the identified area of needs, and our goals with our SAC team committee

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))

The goals of the SIP will be evaluated and assessed at the conclusion of each statewide assessment of the FAST ELA and FAST Math tests, as well as after the district-wide assessments.

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	76%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	37%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	N/A
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: A 2019-20: A 2018-19: A 2017-18: A
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems	

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	54	105	115	274
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	30	56	97
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	3
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	7	11
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	74	125	103	302
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	71	75	49	195
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	

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	55	87	76	218

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	79	89	118	286
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	1	0	6
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	3	1	11
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	90	72	280
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	87	44	230
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	

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	1	65	50	213

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Prior Year (2022-23) 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	79	89	118	286
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	1	0	6
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	3	1	11
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	90	72	163
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	87	44	132
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	

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	1	65	50	116

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review

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

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

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	65	48	49	69	49	50	67		
ELA Learning Gains				63			59		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				51			51		
Math Achievement*	77	57	56	79	36	36	74		
Math Learning Gains				80			61		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				69			55		
Science Achievement*	72	53	49	74	55	53	66		
Social Studies Achievement*	86	64	68	88	61	58	86		
Middle School Acceleration	85	77	73	89	52	49	83		
Graduation Rate					51	49			
College and Career Acceleration					69	70			
ELP Progress	54	43	40	50	79	76	60		

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)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	73
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	439
Total Components for the Federal Index	6

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	71
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	712
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	33	Yes	1	
ELL	61			
AMI				
ASN	90			
BLK	73			
HSP	69			
MUL	81			
PAC				
WHT	78			
FRL	65			

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	41			
ELL	62			
AMI				
ASN	80			
BLK	62			
HSP	69			
MUL	87			
PAC				
WHT	81			
FRL	63			

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	65			77			72	86	85			54
SWD	21			36			21	53			4	
ELL	43			63			49	72	83		6	54
AMI												
ASN	86			91			80	100	92		5	
BLK	65			67			62	92	79		5	
HSP	58			72			67	80	83		6	55
MUL	74			85			77	87	82		5	
PAC												
WHT	71			84			81	93	86		6	54
FRL	51			66			59	77	79		6	56

| 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	69	63	51	79	80	69	74	88	89			50
SWD	29	36	24	35	61	60	28	52				
ELL	48	58	55	65	71	61	54	75	87			50
AMI												
ASN	84	73	20	93	96	100	78	82	95			
BLK	55	54	32	59	73	56	56	81	91			
HSP	63	60	53	76	77	69	70	86	87			52
MUL	76	70		87	90		92	100	93			
PAC												
WHT	82	68	70	88	82	72	84	92	91			
FRL	50	53	46	68	76	67	59	78	84			46

| 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	67	59	51	74	61	55	66	86	83			60
SWD	23	40	34	29	48	38	23	57	38			
ELL	46	59	54	61	61	60	44	74	79			60
AMI												
ASN	77	66	50	88	73		85	91	93			
BLK	63	57	22	56	55	39	68	77	85			
HSP	61	58	53	70	60	57	58	82	76			61
MUL	70	62		83	57			91	100			
PAC												
WHT	79	60	55	84	64	58	81	94	88			
FRL	53	51	49	62	57	53	57	75	68			59

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	61%	45%	16%	47%	14%
08	2023 - Spring	54%	46%	8%	47%	7%
06	2023 - Spring	59%	44%	15%	47%	12%

MATH

Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	72%	53%	19%	54%	18%
07	2023 - Spring	48%	38%	10%	48%	0%
08	2023 - Spring	70%	58%	12%	55%	15%

SCIENCE

Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	64%	50%	14%	44%	20%

ALGEBRA

Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	97%	47%	50%	50%	47%

GEOMETRY

Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	97%	45%	52%	48%	49%

BIOLOGY

Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	*	63%	*	63%	*

CIVICS

Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	81%	61%	20%	66%	15%

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 Students With Disabilities (SWD) subgroup has lagged behind in proficiency during the transition from FSA to FAST BEST Assessments. In addition, the performance of our SWD students dropped on the Spring 2023 assessments from the Spring 2022 data in all areas.

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

Our Students With Disabilities (SWD) subpopulation has also lagged behind in growth during the transition from FSA to FAST BEST Assessments.

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.

State data is not yet available; however, we can compare our data to the District's data from the Spring of 2022. The largest gaps is with our SWD group, ranging from 11% behind in Science proficiency to 28% behind in English Language Arts (ELA) proficiency.

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

Our Middle School Acceleration rates increased among all subgroups, including our SWD students. The school took into account the student performance data, which ensured that all students enrolled in acceleration courses had the skills to successfully complete the coursework.

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

Our SWD students are not progressing at the same rate as the rest of our population.

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

Increase the percentage of students who feel the positive school culture and climate from 35% to 50%. Narrow the gap between the general school population and the Students With Disabilities population by 5% in English Language Arts (ELA) and Math.

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 Other

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.

Positive Culture and Environment - a supportive and fulfilling environment with learning conditions that meet the needs of all students.

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

The student response on our Spring 2023 Accreditation Stakeholder survey indicated that 35% of the students have a positive overall perception of the social and learning climate of the school. By implementing a strong social and emotional school wide support system, Lake Nona Middle School will decrease the number of students with attendance below 90 percent, decrease the number of major disciplinary infractions that lead to internal or external suspensions, and increase Accreditation Stakeholder Student Survey. Student data will show that over 80% of students agree/strongly agree that their social and emotional needs are supported by their school. Our student data will show an increase of 15 percentage points for the topic of "School Climate" from 35% in the 2022-2023 school year to 50% in 2023-2024.

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

To decrease the number of students with attendance below 90%, we will collect student attendance data weekly. We will utilize classified staff members and guidance counselors to monitor the data and connect with students who are showing a pattern of low attendance.
We will monitor student participation in Resiliency activities and events through Google Forms and sign-ins. LNMS celebrates student personal achievement with award programs to recognize All A's each nine-week marking period; Science Fair school and district level placement winners; Sun Games placement winners; Spelling Bee participants; French and Spanish Honor Society inductions; Chess Club district winners; and more. All of these accomplishments are recognized in the weekly newsletter for parents, students, and members of our community to celebrate. LNMS established school norms that build positive values. We will monitor parent participation in family engagement events and collect customer satisfaction data at the end of the sessions.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:
Amy Wright (amy.wright@ocps.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 facilitate PD sessions centered around the continued implementation of the Building Resiliencey Standards in our school. Teachers will then continue to infuse Resiliency as part of their normal standards-based instructions. We will also communicate with the parents of these students. As part of this communication, staff will address the student's reason for absenteeism. We will address factors such as: transportation, illness, family issues, and/or mental health. To decrease the number of disciplinary infractions that lead to internal or external suspensions we will continue to utilize the H.E.R.O. system to implement PBIS. Teachers will utilize the minor infraction form to track behavior and parent communication prior to assigning a disciplinary referral.

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

In order to achieve large-scale and sustainable improvement, it is necessary to invest in the collective capacity of a school building. To create a culture of social and emotional learning with adults and students, it is critical to harness the professional skills and leadership capabilities of everyone in the school. Through a distributive leadership model, our school will strengthen the team dynamics necessary to collectively support positive organizational improvement and change.

By closely monitoring student attendance data from the beginning, we will be able to address the needs of both the students and their families that may be causing the student to miss valuable instruction time. Similarly, by getting the student's family involved early when minor infractions occur, we can prevent the student from missing classes due to escalation of student behavior, resulting in a solid community of support between the student, the family and our school.

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

Tier 2 - Moderate Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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

Facilitate Resiliency PDs and Support to all Staff Members.

Person Responsible: Rebeca Sella (rebeca.sella@ocps.net)

By When: Ongoing

Implement PBIS using the H.E.R.O. system.

Person Responsible: Steven Berson (steven.berson@ocps.net)

By When:

#2. 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.

The area of focus related to the B.E.S.T. standards aligned instruction for LNMS are to focus specifically on our Students with Disability (SWD) subgroup. Our Students With Disabilities (SWD) subgroup has lagged behind in proficiency during the transition from FSA to FAST BEST Assessments. In addition, the performance of our SWD students dropped on the Spring 2023 assessments from the Spring 2022 data in all areas.

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

Narrow the gap between the general school population and the SWD population by 5% in English Language Arts.

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

Our SWD population will participate in all Progress Monitoring Assessments (PMA) from the state, as well as district-wide Standards-Based Unit Assessments (SBUA). Teachers will engage in peer observations and share weekly feedback during Professional Learning Community Meetings (PLC).

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Roxanne Gill (roxanne.gill@ocps.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.)

Teachers will participate in department data chats, one-on-one data chats with admin, and student data chats. Teachers will use the data collected from assessments to drive student learning and the differentiation of instruction, reteach and remediate deficient standards.

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

The loss of skills for our students has caused increased need for our teachers to utilize more rigorous progress monitoring. It is imperative that we use a variety of progress monitoring tools so that we may address student needs in a timely manner. It is also important that all stakeholders are aware of their student data. This allows for stakeholder buy-in and the early addressing of deficient 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 2 - Moderate Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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

Facilitate PDs on strategies for SWD and Support to all Staff Members.

Person Responsible: Shelby Holman (shelby.holman@ocps.net)

By When: Ongoing

#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.

The area of focus related to the B.E.S.T. standards aligned instruction for LNMS are to focus specifically on our Students with Disability (SWD) subgroup. Our Students With Disabilities (SWD) subgroup has lagged behind in proficiency during the transition from FSA to FAST BEST Assessments. In addition, the performance of our SWD students dropped on the Spring 2023 assessments from the Spring 2022 data in all areas.

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

Narrow the gap between the general school population and the SWD population by 5% in Mathematics.

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

Our SWD population will participate in all Progress Monitoring Assessments (PMA) from the state, as well as district-wide Standards-Based Unit Assessments (SBUA).

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Roxanne Gill (roxanne.gill@ocps.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.)

Teachers will participate in department data chats, one-on-one data chats with admin, and student data chats. Teachers will use the data collected from assessments to drive student learning and the differentiation of instruction, reteach and remediate deficient standards.

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

The loss of skills for our students has caused increased need for our teachers to utilize more rigorous progress monitoring. It is imperative that we use a variety of progress monitoring tools so that we may address student needs in a timely manner. It is also important that all stakeholders are aware of their student data. This allows for stakeholder buy-in and the early addressing of deficient 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 2 - Moderate Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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

Facilitate PDs on strategies for SWD and Support to all Staff Members.

Person Responsible: Shelby Holman (shelby.holman@ocps.net)

By When: Ongoing