

Leon County Schools

Deerlake Middle School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	10
III. Planning for Improvement	14
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	0
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	0
VI. Title I Requirements	0
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

Deerlake Middle School

9902 DEER LK W, Tallahassee, FL 32312

<https://www.leonschools.net/deerlake>

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.

Together with community stakeholders, parents/ guardians and the PTO, we at Deerlake Middle School are focused on preparing students for college and careers. We aim to Inspire and empower students to excel both academically and socially, while preparing them to be productive citizens and future leaders. Deerlake strives to provide a nurturing and safe environment that fosters rigorous academics and S.T.E.A.M infused curriculum to prepare students to become lifelong learners.

Provide the school's vision statement.

We the Deerlake faculty and community, believe in academic excellence and that all students can be successful. In order to achieve our mission, we will:

- Provide all students an academically challenging environment appropriate for their individual needs, including offering a wide variety of curricular choices to allow students to explore their skills and interests.
- Provide an environment with high expectations including fair and consistent discipline.
- Prepare students for a world of changing technologies and teach them to incorporate those technologies in their everyday lives.
- Provide a secure and supportive environment where respect for individual differences and for the rights of others both at school and in our community.
- Support our faculty in their professional development to ensure that curriculum and teaching methodologies meet the changing demands of today's students.
- Ensure that faculty, staff, parents, students and community members are all stakeholders who work together to meet the students' needs through open and timely communication.
- Value diversity as a strength of our school.

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
Mills, Steve	Principal	
Oliveri, Robin	Assistant Principal	Ms. Oliveri is responsible for supporting the principal in the execution of his duties. She is specifically assigned to be the administrator in charge of ESE, curriculum, 7th grade, ESOL, FTE, and testing.
Scott, Taita	Assistant Principal	Mrs. Scott is responsible for supporting the principal in the execution of his duties. She is specifically assigned as the 8th Grade Administrator, School Improvement Plan Administrator (including School Advisory Council and Lowest 25% Assistant Principal for Administration (Attendance, Critical Incident/Safety, Due Process, and Transportation).
Faison, Sherrhonda	Assistant Principal	Ms. Faison is responsible for supporting the principal with the execution of his duties. She is specifically assigned to discipline, bullying/harassment, health/clinic operations, facilities management, and is the 6th grade administrator.
Burkey, Chris	Administrative Support	Mr. Burkey is the school technology coordinator and the academic dean. He is responsible for providing support for technology education, administrative activities, and school communication.
Thomas, Rachel	School Counselor	Ms. Thomas is the guidance counselor and is responsible for the social/emotional learning programs, mental health support, referral coordinator, and intervention for students in need of support.
Smithson, Jessica	Administrative Support	Ms. SMithson is the school testing coordinator and ESOL/ELL Coordinator.
Solz, Katherine	Reading Coach	Ms. Solz serves as the school reading coach, reading interventionist, and Language Arts Department Chair.
Watkins, Lanandra	Teacher, K-12	Ms. Watkins is a coach and serves as the department chair for Allied Arts.
Dilmore, Robyn	Teacher, K-12	Mrs. Dilmore serves as department head for Social Studies.
Schwartz, Jennifer	Teacher, K-12	Mrs. Schwartz is department head for Mathematics.

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 2023-2024 School Improvement Plan was shared with community partners, students, families, staff, and stakeholders during a public review night coinciding with the school's fall Open House event. Invitation to view and comment on the plan was shared with the community through electronic communication systems and social media. A copy of the plan is made available on the school website for public access.

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))

School leadership members will use state FAST progress monitoring data, quarterly grade reports, attendance, and discipline data to monitor student academic trends overall and for specific subgroups. Ongoing academic monitoring is provided for targeted student groups through monthly MTSS meetings with the school counselor, assistant principals, social workers, and ESE staff.

Demographic Data

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	32%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	18%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
2021-22 ESSA Identification	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)	
School Grades History	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	39	47	64	150	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	3	0	7	
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	0	10	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	3	9	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	30	36	30	96	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	38	19	16	73	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5	3	18	

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	15	21	12	48

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	2	1	0	3
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	23	34	45	102	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	4	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	4	4	12	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	5	12	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	30	37	87	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	41	33	32	106	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	22	29	68	

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	11	8	8	27

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	2	6
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	23	34	45	102
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	4
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	4	4	12
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	5	12
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	30	37	87
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	41	33	32	106
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	22	29	68

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	11	8	8	27

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	2	6
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.

District and State data will be uploaded when available.

Accountability Component	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	74			74			77		
ELA Learning Gains	55			58			59		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	38			37			43		
Math Achievement*	83			81			84		
Math Learning Gains	79			72			75		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	61			46			62		
Science Achievement*	74			71			74		
Social Studies Achievement*	95			94			98		
Middle School Acceleration	83			77			85		
Graduation Rate									
College and Career Acceleration									
ELP Progress				90					

* 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	71
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	642
Total Components for the Federal Index	9
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

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	44			
ELL	59			
AMI				
ASN	92			
BLK	56			
HSP	69			
MUL	72			
PAC				
WHT	71			
FRL	55			

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)

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	74	55	38	83	79	61	74	95	83			
SWD	37	32	18	43	55	42	28	68	73			
ELL	54	57	30	78	78							
AMI												
ASN	90	84		97	94	83	93	94	98			
BLK	49	42	40	51	61	54	56	92	60			
HSP	71	45	37	84	81	65	64	92	86			
MUL	76	56	46	82	80		69	94	72			
PAC												
WHT	76	53	36	86	78	59	73	95	82			
FRL	53	41	30	62	66	53	47	82	57			

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	74	58	37	81	72	46	71	94	77			90
SWD	36	41	30	41	40	24	37	73	64			
ELL	53	54		75	79							90
AMI												
ASN	90	73	54	96	85		96	100	95			
BLK	40	33	26	48	45	28	39	81	62			
HSP	70	66	43	82	61	47	71	96	79			
MUL	75	56	58	81	66	43	86	83	87			
PAC												
WHT	76	59	38	84	75	51	72	95	74			
FRL	46	41	30	49	38	27	47	86	60			

2018-19 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 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18	ELP Progress
All Students	77	59	43	84	75	62	74	98	85			
SWD	37	41	30	44	54	47	30	86	74			
ELL												
AMI												
ASN	91	68	40	96	91	73	90	98	97			
BLK	55	40	32	65	65	63	27	95	69			
HSP	81	65	36	75	73	59	57	100	88			
MUL	79	61		79	76			100	94			
PAC												
WHT	78	59	47	86	75	62	78	98	84			
FRL	51	38	25	61	65	59	30	96	63			

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.

School, District and State data will be uploaded when available.

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.

Deerlake continues to maintain its status as a high-performing school offering a rigorous curriculum and high school credit opportunities for students.

During the 2023 FAST PM3 testing administration, the lowest performing data component for Deerlake students was in 7th grade ELA with 36% scoring level 1. However, this data component exceeded the state and district levels by 22%. Contributing factors include students using a brand-new district curriculum, brand-new ELA standards, and a brand-new state assessment.

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

The number of students scoring level 1 on the ELA assessment increased by 3 students. Factors contributing to this decline include students using a brand new district curriculum, brand new ELA standards, and a brand new state assessment and assessment schedule.

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.

Deerlake did not demonstrate gaps in achievement scoring higher than both state and district averages by a minimum of 20% in both math and ELA.

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

Math achievement showed the greatest level of improvement with the number of students scoring a Tlevel 1 decreasing from 106 to 31. Changes in teacher assignments and bi-weekly math tutoring opportunities at school contributed to this improvement.

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

One area of focus continues to be improving attendance above 90%. the 2022-2023 data demonstrated 16.8% of students had attendance below 90%. which impacts their academic performance. A second area of concern is to reduce the number of students with two or more early warning signals.

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

Improve ELA learning gains - 1

Improve ELA learning gains for all students in the bottom 25th percentile - 2

Improve math learning gains - 3

Improve math learning gains for students scoring a level 1 - 4

Improve science achievement - 5

Area of Focus

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

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA**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.

An increase in students scoring a level 1 on the FAST PM3 ELA assessment compared to the 2021-2022 school year demonstrates a need for improvement in instructional practice related to alignment with new standards and assessment strategies, differentiation, and strategies for students with disabilities.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Assuming there will be a correlation chart for comparing 2022-2023 FAST Results to 2023-2024 FAST Progress Monitoring: Overall student proficiency in the areas of ELA, Math, Civics, and 8th Grade science will improve by at least 3 percentage points. Students in the Lowest quartile for ELA and Math will show improvement by at least 5 percentage points.

Monitoring:

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

The school reading coach will monitor and review performance data with the administrative team on a weekly basis using classroom data and district assessment data for intervention needs. PM results will be reviewed to identify student learning gaps or deficiencies.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Robin Oliveri (oliverir@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.)

Monthly professional development will be provided to ELA teachers in the area of instructional alignment, data analysis, and targeted differentiation to improve student performance on ELA standards. Content area teachers will be invited to participate in literacy-based professional development led by the district ELA staff and our school reading coach to improve reading and writing skills across subjects and purpose.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Teachers will receive training in:

- *Instructional strategies to improve student reading skills
- *Strategies to analyze data and use results to inform instructional decisions,
- *Strategies to address needs of diverse learners including students with special needs,
- *New technology for newly adopted instructional materials.

Teachers will continue use of technology to supplement classroom lessons (Canvas, Study Sync, Language Live, etc.) via drop in support session offered at the school and district level.

All students will participate in district progress monitoring assessments via Unify at least three times per year. Individual students may participate in supplemental progress monitoring efforts.

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.

Distribute District Progress Monitoring windows to all teachers (September 20223. Ensure teachers administer the required assessments with appropriate accommodations by district deadline.

Person Responsible: Robin Oliveri (oliverir@leonschools.net)

By When: Upon completion of the first state progress monitoring.

Monitor student grade performance to identify students in danger of failing a content area class and provide immediate intervention support; Continue to monitor for students with two or more core course failures for intervention support.

Person Responsible: Robin Oliveri (oliverir@leonschools.net)

By When: Upon completion of the first interim reports.

Identify and counsel students with poor attendance to develop supportive corrective action.

Person Responsible: Taita Scott (scotttt@leonschools.net)

By When: This is a continual action and includes monthly meetings with the school's MTSS team.

Coordinate professional development event for ELA and content area teachers aligned with instructional improvements, reading in the content area, and writing informational text.

Person Responsible: Katherine Solz (solzk1@leonschools.net)

By When: By the end of the first quarter.

Monitor and identify students with reoccurring discipline incidents for intervention services.

Person Responsible: Sherrhonda Faison (faisons2@leonschools.net)

By When: Monthly review to also include the school MTSS team.