Greenwood Lakes Middle School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Greenwood Lakes Middle School

601 LAKE PARK DR, Lake Mary, FL 32746

http://www.scps.k12.fl.us/schools/schoolinfopage.cfm?schoolnumber=0671

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Seminole County School Board on 10/24/2023.

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 Greenwood Lakes Middle School is to ensure that all students require the knowledge, skills, and attitudes to be productive citizens.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The vision of Greenwood Lakes Middle School is to engage students through academic learning time, academic and behavioral interventions, introduce levels of cognitive complexity, provide literacy across all content areas, decrease the achievement gap through relationship, instructional relevance and rigor, and instructional technology for the 21st century learner.

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
Erickson, Breezi	Principal	Structures and Monitors School Learning Environment
Fletcher, Rendon	Assistant Principal	Collaboratively develops and implements instructional framework
Hall, Jacqueline	Assistant Principal	Collaboratively develops and implements instructional framework
Sokolowsky, Evan	Administrative Support	Operations: Title I Compliance, Facilities, and Testing Coordinator
Smith, Latasha	Dean	Supports teachers in managing classroom behaviors and other related district initiatives
Fletcher, Gary	Dean	Supports teachers in managing classroom behaviors and other related district initiatives

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.

The SIP is reviewed by both the SAC and PTSA committees and their input is documented. Amendments to the SIP are made on a yearly basis and the SIP is posted on the GLMS website for review once it is finalized. GLMS follows the district's template and uses appropriate and understandable

terminology when describing our School Improvement initiatives and practices. The SIP is currently composed in English but can be translated into other languages upon request.

The Principal and/or SAM sends an email to parents through Skyward Family Access as soon as the SIP is finalized and posted. School Improvement information is also sent home in The Eagle Express and a copy is available in the Title I binder inside the front office.

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))

SIP will be regularly monitored in weekly administrative meetings, MTSS meetings, and with Academic Intervention Teacher. The Principal, Assistant Principals, and Instructional Coaches will monitor and support weekly PLCs to ensure student data and instructional strategies are the focus as lesson plans are being designed. Monthly Curriculum Leaders will monitor data and instruction best practices. PLCs will meet with Principal to review data, dig deep into achievement gaps and what this means for individual students and where to go from here.

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	Yes
2022-23 Minority Rate	62%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	66%
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: B 2019-20: B 2018-19: B

	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	58	59	78	195
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	19	34	48	101
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	9	7	28
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	8	1	20
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	86	84	111	281
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	106	73	80	259
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	

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	86	78	91	255

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

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	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	9	11	27
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	12	4	23
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	5	6	24
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	83	58	63	204
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	126	89	61	276
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	

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	20	16	10	46

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	27	18	31	76
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	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	9	11	27
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	12	4	23
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	5	6	24
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	83	58	63	204
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	126	89	61	276
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	

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	20	16	10	46

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Total
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	27	18	31	76
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*	47	54	49	55	59	50	55		
ELA Learning Gains				52			51		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				40			36		
Math Achievement*	44	61	56	50	37	36	50		
Math Learning Gains				59			40		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				58			36		
Science Achievement*	53	56	49	53	62	53	44		
Social Studies Achievement*	63	72	68	76	62	58	70		
Middle School Acceleration	51	76	73	73	51	49	72		
Graduation Rate					59	49			
College and Career Acceleration					76	70			
ELP Progress	47	50	40	38	80	76	53		

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	51
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	4
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	305
Total Components for the Federal Index	6
Percent Tested	98
Graduation Rate	

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	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	554
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	98
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	31	Yes	4	1
ELL	37	Yes	1	
AMI				
ASN	85			
BLK	32	Yes	1	
HSP	46			
MUL	36	Yes	1	
PAC				
WHT	64			

2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
FRL	44			

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	41			
AMI				
ASN	68			
BLK	45			
HSP	53			
MUL	48			
PAC				
WHT	65			
FRL	50			

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	47			44			53	63	51			47
SWD	18			24			17	37	33		6	54
ELL	26			31			36	34	50		6	47
AMI												
ASN	90			80							2	
BLK	24			19			35	48	35		5	
HSP	43			40			50	54	43		6	45
MUL	39			26			29	50	36		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
PAC												
WHT	59			59			66	76	58		5	
FRL	39			34			45	56	40		6	48

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	55	52	40	50	59	58	53	76	73			38
SWD	20	38	32	23	52	56	25	42	36			8
ELL	35	40	27	34	54	59	16	68				38
AMI												
ASN	60	68		72	73							
BLK	34	50	41	24	52	53	31	50	68			
HSP	53	46	33	47	59	58	49	77	71			40
MUL	39	42	36	55	42	38	55	73				
PAC												
WHT	67	57	47	62	62	67	65	87	74			
FRL	47	50	37	41	55	56	41	68	68			36

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	55	51	36	50	40	36	44	70	72			53
SWD	20	35	31	20	34	33	17	43	38			20
ELL	38	53	43	33	41	26	22	46				53
AMI												
ASN	68	67		58	28							
BLK	31	35	27	28	29	28	22	46	64			
HSP	50	52	37	45	40	39	41	72	72			52
MUL	52	46		46	39			55				
PAC												
WHT	69	57	45	63	45	47	54	81	72			
FRL	46	46	34	40	38	36	33	64	66			52

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

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

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
07	2023 - Spring	42%	53%	-11%	47%	-5%
08	2023 - Spring	46%	50%	-4%	47%	-1%
06	2023 - Spring	44%	52%	-8%	47%	-3%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	42%	66%	-24%	54%	-12%
07	2023 - Spring	53%	67%	-14%	48%	5%
08	2023 - Spring	13%	31%	-18%	55%	-42%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	51%	55%	-4%	44%	7%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	52%	54%	-2%	50%	2%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	97%	53%	44%	48%	49%

CIVICS						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	61%	71%	-10%	66%	-5%

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.

Reading comprehension skills are critical to impact student achievement data in a positive way. By focusing on demonstrating understanding of vocabulary, identifying critical information when reading, inferencing, and other reading comprehension skills we will improve our student achievement data across the board.

GLMS will need to work on bettering teaching instruction through PLC lesson planning and providing professional support in building better pedagogy skills. Teachers, with instructional coaches and administrative support, will implement more opportunities for students and provide better quality work.

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

Students scoring a Level 3 or above on the Algebra I EOC dropped from 72.5% in 2022 to 51.6% in 2023. The factors that contributed to this decline were teacher retention and acceleration of students that could have benefited from being in Pre-Algebra. Our top 8th grade math teacher left the profession at the end of the 2022 school year and one of our new hires left mid-year in December. The transition of an iSeries teacher into her new role in 8th grade Math was slower than expected.

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.

Algebra 1 EOC had the greatest gap when compared to the state average. Contributing factors include an emphasis on reducing access barriers to high school credited math courses by placing ALL on grade level students in Algebra 1 in 8th grade.

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

6th Grade Math (both Standard and RAMP)

The 6th grade PLC worked effectively as a team to identity instructional practices that allowed students opportunities to practice and learn required skills. Teachers retaught needed standards and scaffolded needed benchmarks to make it student friendly. Teacher attendance was also noticed on this team.

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

Student attendance and on-grade level performance in ELA and Math

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

1. Developing strong teacher instructional practices 2. Develop strong PLCs 3. Deeper understanding of BEST Benchmarks 4. Students owning their own learning 5. Teachers monitoring and providing feedback of student work.

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

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

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

Increasing academic achievement of students with disabilities. ESSA Federal Percent of Points Index indicates this is a high priority need and focusing on the success of these students will reduce achievement gaps and prepare these students for future academic success.

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

Increase achievement and learning gains for students with disabilities.

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

This area of focus will be monitored through classroom walk throughs, review of progress monitoring data and through data chats with professional learning communities.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Breezi Erickson (breezi_erickson@scps.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 following evidence-based interventions are available to middle schools to help them support students based upon the area of need of the individual student: CAR-PD, iReady, Lexia, Corrective Reading, and Reading Mastery.
The following evidence-based interventions are available to middle schools to help them support students based upon the area of need of the individual student: iReady, DreamBox, Seminole Numeracy Project.

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

A variety of interventions are available to the schools to allow them to meet the needs of individual students. This allows all the areas of reading to be addressed from foundations to comprehension across the K-12 continuum.
All of the listed interventions have been approved by Just Read, Florida through the vetting process for the K-12 Comprehensive Evidence- Based Reading Plan.

Math- All the listed interventions have research-based evidence for efficacy.
Standards based lessons differentiated to meet the needs of these specific student groups and data driven deliberate action planning will improve achievement and learning gains for our students. This strategy is aligned to having high expectations for all learners and teachers.

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.

Students
What do we want all students to do?
All students will demonstrate grade-level proficient understanding of content area benchmarks.

How will we know if they learn it?
65% of our student population will score a Level 3 or higher by the 2023-2024 FAST PM3, as well as on other state assessments including the Algebra & Geometry EOC, the Civics EOC, and the NGSSS Science Assessment.

How will we respond when some students do not learn?
Students within the ESSA subgroups will be specifically targeted within the classroom setting through small group instruction, differentiated learning opportunities, and planned collaboration between the general education teacher and support facilitator. In addition, students will have multiple opportunities to show mastery of content through scaffolded instruction and frequent monitoring.

What evidence/data will there be to reflect monitoring for this strategy/action?
Common Quarterly Benchmark Assessments, iReady, STAR, and F.A.S.T. assessment data from ELL's, SWD's, lowest quartile, and FRL students will be closely monitored following each testing window. ESSA findings of Black, SWD, and ELL students will be supported and monitored by teachers through daily lesson planning and Skyward communication. Teachers will provide ESSA students appropriate opportunities to learn in order to gage understanding of content. Teachers will develop scaffolded lessons on missed skills as identified by lessons and class assessments including Benchmark Assessments. Teachers will monitor and communicate grades to families and the MTSS team. The MTSS team will provide instructional support to struggling students and communicate these needs and resources to families.

Teachers
What do we want all teachers to do?
Teachers will be able to identify students within their classroom that fall into one or more of the ESSA subgroups and be able to use differentiated instructional strategies to meet the unique learning needs of those students in order to guide them to proficiency.

How will we know if teachers are accomplishing this?
Teacher evidence will include seating charts with student demographics identified, analyzed formative and summative assessment data and the discussion of this data during PLC data chats, the presence of differentiated learning opportunities within their lesson plans according to the content learning goal and scale, purposeful collaboration with their support facilitator (if applicable), benchmark-aligned extensions and interventions planned for within quarterly PLC action plans, and evidence of the implementation of differentiated instructional strategies through instructional walks, iObservation, and coaching cycles. In addition, Indicator #6 (Identifying Critical Information) will be looked for during classroom walkthroughs and will reflect increased teacher ratings in iObservation.

How will school leaders respond when teachers need support?
School leaders will support struggling teachers through active participation within grade-level PLCs, providing feedback on lesson plans and implemented instructional strategies through classroom observations, purposeful pairing of new teachers with mentor teachers, and monitoring the implementation of differentiated instructional strategies through instructional walks, iObservation, coaching cycles, side-by-side coaching, PLC planning, real-time coaching, lesson modeling, and peer observation opportunities.

How will we extend professional learning for teachers?

Teachers will be provided with multiple professional learning opportunities in order to accurately measure student understanding of content area benchmarks, including standards-based grading practices, effective feedback methods, and the Collaborative Teaching & Planning training for support facilitators and core instructional teachers.

Person Responsible: Breezi Erickson (breezi_erickson@scps.k12.fl.us)

By When: Ongoing throughout the school year

#2. 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.

Students succeed when conditions for learning are optimized. A focus on campus safety, development of a culture where student voice and belonging are valued and sharing collective responsibility for the success of all students in the school increase student achievement.

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

Increase 5 Essentials Survey and SCPS Safety Survey results indicating a high degree of trust, collective responsibility and academic personalism.

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

Conditions for Learning monitoring will occur during classroom walk through, PLC meetings, attendance and discipline data reviews.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Breezi Erickson (breezi_erickson@scps.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 Multi-Tiered Support System (MTSS) process is a team-based approach that relies on a strong collaboration between families and professionals from a variety of disciplines regardless of the level implemented. MTSS provides a positive and effective means to support student learning, attendance and behavior.

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

MTSS methods are research-based and proven to positively impact school climate and increase academic performance.

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.

Extend and Advertise Student Support and Counseling Services
Student support and counseling services will be advertised through PBS SOAR Time Lessons, the morning news, and announcements from the counselors during lunches. QR codes will be posted campus wide for easy access of making an appointment with a counselor.

Teachers will share responsibility for student development, school improvement, and professional growth

Teachers will work together to ensure ALL students have the ability to learn despite different backgrounds, academic achievement levels, and prior levels of knowledge. Through weekly PLC's and monthly staff meetings, teachers will work to develop and build their pedagogical skills in order to maximize student achievement. Teachers will create student centered classrooms focused on instruction, Social Emotional learning, and building positive relationships with students.

Person Responsible: Breezi Erickson (breezi_erickson@scps.k12.fl.us)

By When: Ongoing throughout school year

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).

In collaboration with the Assistant Superintendent, school leaders identify and align resources to meet the needs of all students and maximize desired student outcomes. Evaluation of student achievement data and related early warning factors such as attendance and discipline referrals are at the core of this work. Principals review data with the school leadership team, staff, and other relevant stakeholders, then develop or modify goals and strategies to align with the school needs presented. These goals and strategies are then operationalized through action items within the annual School Improvement Plan. These specific interventions or activities are noted within the SIP, and funding resources are assigned (i.e., Title I, Part A, UniSIG).

Title I Requirements

Schoolwide Program Plan (SWP) Requirements
This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A SWP and opts to use the SIP to satisfy the requirements of the SWP plan, as outlined in the ESSA, Public Law No. 114-95, § 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

Provide the methods for dissemination of this SIP, UniSIG budget and SWP to stakeholders (e.g., students, families, school staff and leadership and local businesses and organizations). Please articulate a plan or protocol for how this SIP and progress will be shared and disseminated and to the extent practicable, provided in a language a parent can understand. (ESSA 1114(b)(4))
List the school's webpage* where the SIP is made publicly available.

The SIP is reviewed by both the SAC and PTSA committees and their input is documented. Amendments to the SIP are made on a yearly basis and the SIP is posted on the GLMS website for review once it is finalized. GLMS follows the district's template and uses appropriate and understandable terminology when describing our School Improvement initiatives and practices. The SIP is currently composed in English but can be translated into other languages upon request.

The Principal and/or SAM sends an email to parents through Skyward Family Access as soon as the SIP is finalized and posted. School Improvement information is also sent home in The Eagle Express and a copy is available in the Title I binder inside the front office.

https://sim.scps.k12.fl.us/school/info/0671

Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission, support the needs of students and keep parents informed of their child's progress.
List the school's webpage* where the school's Family Engagement Plan is made publicly available. (ESSA 1116(b-g))

GLMS builds a positive school culture by encouraging community involvement and ongoing two-way communication. The GLMS administration team and PTSA send out communications on a weekly basis and communicate in a variety of ways: Skyward Family Access; the GLMS website; the school marquee; paper handouts and fliers sent home with students; the bi-monthly Eagle Express newsletter; and Social Media sites Twitter, Facebook, and Instagram. GLMS hosts a number of before, during, and after-school community activities including: Coffee Connections; Title I Literacy Night; Title I Math Night; Title I ESOL Night; school Spirit Nights with local business partners; Sporting Events; Fine Arts performances, Faculty vs. Student Volleyball and Basketball games, Science Fair, Arts Alive, and PBS Quarterly No-Referral Celebrations for students that exhibit SOAR-ing behavior. Our leadership team works closely with our PTSA to provide support to our teachers and staff and celebrate special events such as featured lunches and stock-the-fridge, holiday treats and gifts, and teacher appreciation week.

https://greenwoodlakes.scps.k12.fl.us/

Describe how the school plans to strengthen the academic program in the school, increase the amount and quality of learning time and help provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum. Include the Area of Focus if addressed in Part III of the SIP. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)ii))

Academics programs across the board will increase by working to better teacher instructional practices. Teachers are required to teach bell to bell and focus on the BEST Benchmarks. All teachers will have an understanding of Writing and MTRs in order to provide cross curriculum support. Scales are used to provide accelerated and enrichment opportunities and monitoring for students. SOAR Time lessons are developed to ensure students know their data and own their learning.

If appropriate and applicable, describe how this plan is developed in coordination and integration with other Federal, State, and local services, resources and programs, such as programs supported under ESSA, violence prevention programs, nutrition programs, housing programs, Head Start programs, adult education programs, career and technical education programs, and schools implementing CSI or TSI activities under section 1111(d). (ESSA 1114(b)(5))

During the planning phase of Title I school-wide plans, which typically begins late February or early March for the upcoming school year, leadership from the Department of Teaching and Learning (Title II, Part A), ESOL World Languages and Student Access (Title III, Part A), Families in Need (Title IX, Part A), Student Support Services (IDEA), Student Assignment and Program Access (magnet programs), Alternative Program (Title I, Part D), and Early Learning (Pre-K/VPK) are invited to participate in collaborative planning sessions. At these collaborative planning sessions, school leadership teams begin developing their Title I, Part A plans for the upcoming school year, with support and guidance from these various district-level grant and/or program managers. For instance, the Director of ESOL/World Languages and Student Access would share with Title I school leadership teams relevant updates to those programs for the upcoming school year, which may lead them to leverage their Title I, Part A funds to supplement such initiatives.