

Seminole County Public Schools

GREENWOOD LAKES MIDDLE SCHOOL



2025-26 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

- SIP Authority 1
- I. School Information 2
 - A. School Mission and Vision 2
 - B. School Leadership Team, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring 2
 - C. Demographic Data..... 6
 - D. Early Warning Systems 7
- II. Needs Assessment/Data Review 10
 - A. ESSA School, District, State Comparison 11
 - B. ESSA School-Level Data Review 12
 - C. ESSA Subgroup Data Review 13
 - D. Accountability Components by Subgroup..... 14
 - E. Grade Level Data Review 17
- III. Planning for Improvement..... 18
- IV. Positive Learning Environment 25
- V. Title I Requirements (optional)..... 27
- VI. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review 31
- VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus 32

School Board Approval

A "Record School Board Approval Date" tracking event has not been added this plan. Add this tracking event with the board approval date in the notes field to update this section.

SIP Authority

Section (s.) 1001.42(18)(a), 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, F.S., by one or more student subgroups, as defined in the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), 20 U.S. Code (U.S.C.) § 6311(c)(2); 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, F.S., and as calculated under s. 1008.34(3)(b), F.S., 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, F.S.; or has significantly lower graduation rates for a subgroup when compared to the state's graduation rate.

SIP Template in Florida Continuous Improvement Management System Version 2 (CIMS2)

The Department's SIP template meets:

1. All state and rule requirements for public district and charter schools.
2. ESEA components for targeted or comprehensive support and improvement plans required for public district and charter schools identified as Additional Targeted Support and Improvement (ATSI), Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI), and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI).
3. Application requirements for eligible schools applying for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) funds.

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.

I. School Information

A. School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement

The mission of Greenwood Lakes Middle School is to ensure that all students acquire 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 relationships, instructional relevance and rigor, and instructional technology for the 21st century learner.

B. School Leadership Team, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring

1. School Leadership Membership

School Leadership Team

For each member of the school leadership team, enter the employee name, and identify the position title and job duties/responsibilities as they relate to SIP implementation for each member of the school leadership team.

Leadership Team Member #1

Employee's Name

Yaschika Mims

yaschika_mims@scps.k12.fl.us

Position Title

Principal

Job Duties and Responsibilities

Structures and Monitors School Learning Environment

Leadership Team Member #2

Employee's Name

Dr. Rendon Fletcher

rendon_fletcher@scps.k12.fl.us

Position Title

Assistant Principal

Job Duties and Responsibilities

Collaboratively develops and implements instructional framework

Leadership Team Member #3

Employee's Name

Mayra Santiago

santiama@scps.k12.fl.us

Position Title

Assistant Principal

Job Duties and Responsibilities

Collaboratively develops and implements instructional framework

Leadership Team Member #4

Employee's Name

Evan Sokolowsky

evan_sokolowsky@scps.k12.fl.us

Position Title

School Administration Manager

Job Duties and Responsibilities

Operations: Title I Compliance, Facilities, and Testing Coordinator

Leadership Team Member #5

Employee's Name

Latasha Smith

smithlz1@scps.k12.fl.us

Position Title

Dean of Students

Job Duties and Responsibilities

Supports teachers in managing classroom behaviors and other related district initiatives

Leadership Team Member #6

Employee's Name

Wesley Powell

powellwc@scps.k12.fl.us

Position Title

Dean of Students

Job Duties and Responsibilities

Supports teachers in managing classroom behaviors and other related district initiatives

2. Stakeholder Involvement

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 (20 U.S.C. § 6314(b)(2), ESEA Section 1114(b)(2)).

Note: If a School Advisory Council is used to fulfill these requirements, it must include all required stakeholders.

Stakeholders play an important role in Greenwood Lakes' SIP development. Active participation in school programs and committees such as SAC, PTSA, the SCPS Dividends program, PBS, and SGA help GLMS succeed and achieve on an annual basis. Effective communication, shared vision, and collegiality are extremely important and our stakeholders are tasked with helping us address the diverse needs of our students.

The SIP is reviewed by both SAC and PTSA and their input is documented. Amendments to the SIP are made on an annual basis and stakeholders are told that school wide plans are “fluid” and can be amended at any time. GLMS follows the SIP template provided by the district and uses appropriate and understandable terminology when describing our School Improvement initiatives and practices. The SIP is posted on the GLMS website upon final approval and advertised through social media, Skyward message center, and the marquee. It is composed in English but can be translated to any other language upon request.

3. 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 academic standards, particularly for those students with the greatest achievement gap. Describe how the school will revise the plan with stakeholder feedback, as necessary, to ensure continuous improvement (20 U.S.C. § 6314(b)(3), ESEA Section 1114(b)(3)).

2025 Baseline Data will be reviewed with all staff during Pre-Plan. Curriculum Leaders will work with departments to develop PLC Action Plans that will focus on each subject's missing skill(s) and incorporate instructional strategies into lesson plans. PLCs will continue to monitor their data throughout the year utilizing PM, QBA, formative, and summative assessments. Data will be discussed weekly in PLCs and PLC Data Chats will occur with the Principal. Both teachers and SOAR Time will focus on ensuring students know and understand their own data while developing Learning Goals and action plans. This can be seen in each student planner. Instructional Coaches, Curriculum Leaders, and Administration will support both new teachers and teachers struggling with closing the gap through PLC support, individual planning support, coaching cycle, and providing both verbal and written feedback as aligned with the Seminole County Instructional Model.

C. Demographic Data

2025-26 STATUS (PER MSID FILE)	ACTIVE
SCHOOL TYPE AND GRADES SERVED (PER MSID FILE)	MIDDLE/JR. HIGH 6-8
PRIMARY SERVICE TYPE (PER MSID FILE)	K-12 GENERAL EDUCATION
2024-25 TITLE I SCHOOL STATUS	YES
2024-25 ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED (FRL) RATE	62.0%
CHARTER SCHOOL	NO
RAISE SCHOOL	NO
2024-25 ESSA IDENTIFICATION *UPDATED AS OF 1	N/A
ELIGIBLE FOR UNIFIED SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT GRANT (UNISIG)	
2024-25 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 <i>*2022-23 SCHOOL GRADES WILL SERVE AS AN INFORMATIONAL BASELINE.</i>	2024-25: A 2023-24: B 2022-23: C 2021-22: B 2020-21:

D. Early Warning Systems

1. Grades K-8

Current Year 2025-26

Using 2024-25 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	
School Enrollment							308	264	268	840
Absent 10% or more school days							52	41	54	147
One or more suspensions							21	39	28	88
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)							13	23	17	53
Course failure in Math							21	21	10	52
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment							41	36	57	134
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment							63	34	33	130
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.053, F.A.C. (only applies to grades K-3)							12	7	3	22
Number of students with a substantial mathematics defined by Rule 6A-6.0533, F.A.C. (only applies to grades K-4)							7	0	0	7

Current Year 2025-26

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							57	48	50	155

Current Year 2025-26

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

INDICATOR	GRADE LEVEL									TOTAL
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained students: current year							0	0	0	0
Students retained two or more times							0	1	1	2

Prior Year (2024-25) As Last 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 school days							53	51	72	176
One or more suspensions							14	33	47	94
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)							1	9	11	21
Course failure in Math							10	6	2	18
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment							41	58	75	174
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment							52	68	49	169
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.053, F.A.C. (only applies to grades K-3)										0
Number of students with a substantial mathematics defined by Rule 6A-6.0533, F.A.C. (only applies to grades K-4)										0

Prior Year (2024-25) As Last Reported (pre-populated)

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							121	71	65	257

Prior Year (2024-25) As Last Reported (pre-populated)

The number of students retained:

INDICATOR	GRADE LEVEL									TOTAL
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained students: current year										0
Students retained two or more times										0

2. Grades 9-12 (optional)

This section intentionally left blank because it addresses grades not taught at this school or the school opted not to include data for these grades.

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review (ESEA Section 1114(b)(6))

A. ESSA School, District, State Comparison

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.

Data for 2024-25 had not been fully loaded to CIMIS at time of printing.

ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENT	2025			2024			2023**		
	SCHOOL	DISTRICT†	STATE†	SCHOOL	DISTRICT†	STATE†	SCHOOL	DISTRICT†	STATE†
ELA Achievement*	61	64	58	51	57	53	47	54	49
Grade 3 ELA Achievement	27			21					
ELA Learning Gains	60	62	59	59	56	56			
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	60	54	52	60	50	50			
Math Achievement*	66	69	63	56	65	60	44	61	56
Math Learning Gains	68	64	62	63	65	62			
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	67	57	57	66	60	60			
Science Achievement	57	62	54	54	56	51	53	56	49
Social Studies Achievement*	81	78	73	80	73	70	63	72	68
Graduation Rate									
Middle School Acceleration	73	82	77	69	77	74	51	76	73
College and Career Acceleration									
Progress of ELLs in Achieving English Language Proficiency (ELP)	73	66	53	67	65	49	37	50	40

*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.

**Grade 3 ELA Achievement was added beginning with the 2023 calculation.

† District and State data presented here are for schools of the same type: elementary, middle, high school, or combination.

B. ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2024-25 ESSA FPPI	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL FPPI – All Students	67%
OVERALL FPPI Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the FPPI	666
Total Components for the FPPI	10
Percent Tested	98%
Graduation Rate	

ESSA OVERALL FPPI HISTORY						
2024-25	2023-24	2022-23	2021-22	2020-21**	2019-20*	2018-19
67%	63%	51%	55%	51%		60%

* Any school that was identified for Comprehensive or Targeted Support and Improvement in the previous school year maintained that identification status and continued to receive support and interventions in the 2020-21 school year. In April 2020, the U.S. Department of Education provided all states a waiver to keep the same school identifications for 2019-20 as determined in 2018-19 due to the COVID-19 pandemic.

** Data provided for informational purposes only. Any school that was identified for Comprehensive or Targeted Support and Improvement in the 2019-20 school year maintained that identification status and continued to receive support and interventions in the 2021-22 school year. In April 2021, the U.S. Department of Education approved Florida's amended waiver request to keep the same school identifications for 2020-21 as determined in 2018-19 due to the COVID-19 pandemic.

C. ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

2024-25 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%
Students With Disabilities	49%	No		
English Language Learners	56%	No		
Asian Students	77%	No		
Black/African American Students	54%	No		
Hispanic Students	62%	No		
Multiracial Students	69%	No		
White Students	74%	No		
Economically Disadvantaged Students	61%	No		

D. 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.

2024-25 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS													
	ELA ACH.	GRADE 3 ELA ACH.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	MATH ACH.	MATH LG	MATH LG L25%	SCI ACH.	SS ACH.	MS ACCEL.	GRAD RATE 2023-24	C&C ACCEL 2023-24	ELP PROGRESS
All Students	61%		60%	60%	66%	68%	67%	57%	81%	73%			73%
Students With Disabilities	34%		53%	52%	41%	62%	66%	28%	56%	47%			
English Language Learners	38%		58%	62%	53%	65%	61%	32%	62%	59%			73%
Asian Students	73%		73%		77%	83%		80%		75%			
Black/African American Students	42%		53%	59%	44%	63%	64%	45%	71%	41%			
Hispanic Students	55%		56%	54%	60%	64%	60%	49%	75%	74%			73%
Multiracial Students	58%		50%		75%	68%		60%	100%	73%			
White Students	72%		66%	72%	77%	72%	76%	68%	88%	78%			
Economically Disadvantaged Students	51%		54%	52%	57%	65%	68%	50%	72%	66%			72%
09/2025													

2023-24 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS													
	ELA ACH.	GRADE 3 ELA ACH.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	MATH ACH.	MATH LG	MATH LG L25%	SCI ACH.	SS ACH.	MS ACCEL.	GRAD RATE 2022-23	C&C ACCEL 2022-23	ELP PROGRESS
All Students	51%		59%	60%	56%	63%	66%	54%	80%	69%			67%
Students With Disabilities	18%		43%	49%	25%	48%	52%	25%	59%	35%			75%
English Language Learners	28%		50%	50%	43%	64%	74%	31%	59%	53%			67%
Asian Students	70%		57%		78%	73%							
Black/African American Students	33%		52%	60%	33%	53%	53%	36%	70%	56%			
Hispanic Students	44%		54%	57%	48%	65%	75%	46%	71%	59%			71%
Multiracial Students	41%		62%	82%	57%	73%	58%	50%	92%	60%			
White Students	64%		67%	66%	72%	63%	66%	68%	89%	77%			
Economically Disadvantaged Students	44%		56%	61%	47%	60%	66%	48%	75%	59%			67%

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS													
	ELA ACH.	GRADE 3 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%			37%
Students With Disabilities	18%				24%			17%	37%	33%			54%
English Language Learners	26%				31%			36%	34%	50%			47%
Asian Students	90%				80%								
Black/African American Students	24%				19%			35%	48%	35%			
Hispanic Students	43%				40%			50%	54%	43%			45%
Multiracial Students	39%				26%			29%	50%	36%			
White Students	59%				59%			66%	76%	58%			
Economically Disadvantaged Students	39%				34%			45%	56%	40%			48%

E. 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.

2024-25 SPRING						
SUBJECT	GRADE	SCHOOL	DISTRICT	SCHOOL - DISTRICT	STATE	SCHOOL - STATE
ELA	6	62%	66%	-4%	60%	2%
ELA	7	54%	63%	-9%	57%	-3%
ELA	8	57%	62%	-5%	55%	2%
Math	6	50%	71%	-21%	60%	-10%
Math	7	70%	72%	-2%	50%	20%
Math	8	37%	33%	4%	57%	-20%
Science	8	54%	61%	-7%	49%	5%
Civics		76%	76%	0%	71%	5%
Algebra		79%	61%	18%	54%	25%
Geometry		94%	60%	34%	54%	40%

III. Planning for Improvement

A. Data Analysis/Reflection (ESEA Section 1114(b)(6))

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources.

Most Improvement

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

Greenwood Lakes Middle school experienced significant academic growth with the 2025 FAST ELA data component, specifically with 6th grade ELA. In 6th grade ELA, GLMS saw an 18-point increase in proficiency, from 38% to 56%, on the 2025 FAST ELA PM3 assessment. This growth is a testament to the focused efforts of the Professional Learning Community (PLC), which prioritized high-impact professional development centered around research-based instructional resources. The team also benefited from consistent instructional coaching provided by both school-based and district-level staff. Throughout the year, the PLC committed to closely monitoring student progress using formative and summative assessments, strategically implementing reteaching cycles each nine weeks based on student data. A key component of their approach was empowering students to understand and take ownership of their progress monitoring data, creating a culture of academic accountability and growth.

Similarly, GLMS achieved a 15-point increase in Geometry data component, rising from 79% to 94% on the 2025 Geometry state assessment. The Geometry team engaged deeply with the state benchmarks, leveraging professional development to unpack standards and align instruction accordingly. Working in collaboration with the school's instructional coach and supportive leadership, the team integrated cooperative learning strategies, embedded routine checks for understanding, and emphasized the production of high-quality student work. Ongoing analysis of student performance allowed the team to identify learning gaps promptly and deliver targeted reteaching.

These outcomes reflect the school's commitment to data-driven instruction, collaborative professional learning, and student-centered practices.

Lowest Performance

Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year's low performance and discuss any trends.

Greenwood Lakes Middle School had the lowest performance within the 8th grade Science

Achievement data component with only 26% of students scoring a Level 3 or higher. This outcome was influenced in part by mid-year staffing changes that impacted instructional consistency and student learning. Despite this challenge, the school recognizes the need for a renewed focus on instructional continuity, targeted science intervention, and benchmark-aligned instruction moving forward.

The 6th Grade FAST Math results and 7th Grade FAST ELA results were GLMS's second lowest, with 27% of students reaching proficiency in both areas. The 6th grade Math PLC is composed primarily of early-career educators, many of whom are in their first or second year of teaching and new to the school. In 7th Grade ELA, instructional effectiveness was impacted by frequent teacher absences, which disrupted instructional continuity and student learning.

Despite these challenges, both PLCs demonstrated meaningful professional growth throughout the year. Teams made notable progress in unpacking the B.E.S.T. Benchmarks, implementing high-yield instructional strategies, analyzing assessment data to drive instruction, and addressing student learning needs with increasing precision. This foundation of professional learning and collaboration positions these teams for stronger outcomes in the 2025–2026 school year, especially with continued support, targeted coaching, and intentional planning.

Greatest Decline

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

GLMS demonstrated growth in all assessed areas except 8th grade Science, which saw a 10% decline. This drop was influenced in part by mid-year staffing changes that disrupted instructional consistency and impacted student learning. Despite this setback, the school acknowledges the urgent need to strengthen instructional continuity, implement targeted science interventions, and reinforce benchmark-aligned instruction to support future success.

Greatest Gap

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.

Greenwood Lakes Middle School showed the largest performance gaps compared to the state average in 8th grade Math (-20%) and 6th grade Math (-10%). The Math PLC is composed primarily of teachers who are either new to GLMS or in their first or second year of teaching. Despite these challenges, the team demonstrated significant growth over the school year in their understanding of the Florida B.E.S.T. Benchmarks, effective instructional strategies, data analysis, and the academic needs of their students. As the year progressed, the PLC strengthened both behavioral and

instructional routines, which contributed to improved student learning gains, as reflected in the data.

EWS Areas of Concern

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

An analysis of the Early Warning System (EWS) indicators at Greenwood Lakes highlights two emerging areas of concern in Math. First, there was an 11% increase in the number of 6th grade students scoring at Level 1 on Math assessments compared to the previous year. Second, the percentage of 8th grade students failing their Math courses rose to 13%, reflecting an upward trend in course failures. These patterns suggest the need for deeper examination and targeted intervention to address foundational gaps and course performance.

Highest Priorities

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

Priority #1: 8th grade Science

Priority #2: 8th grade ELA Learning Gains

Priority #3: Attendance

Priority #4: Middle School Acceleration

B. Area(s) of Focus (Instructional Practices)

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

Area of Focus #1

Address the school's highest priorities based on any/all relevant data sources.

Instructional Practice specifically relating to Benchmark-aligned instruction, Collaborative Planning, Professional Learning Communities, Science

Area of Focus Description and Rationale

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a description of your Area of Focus for each relevant grade level, how it affects student learning and a rationale explaining how it was identified as a crucial need from the prior year data reviewed.

2025 8th grade Science overall achievement was 57% with 8th grade standard Science courses decreasing from 36% to 26% proficiency. Additional focus will be given to ensure 8th grade students are mastering Science standards to prepare for the assessment.

Measurable Outcome

Measurable Outcome: Include prior year data and state the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each relevant grade level. This should be a data-based, objective outcome.

Increase 8th grade Science overall proficiency from 57% to 62% to meet the district average.

Monitoring

Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for implementation and impact to reach the desired outcome.

Students will be monitored throughout the school year utilizing Quarter Benchmark Assessments, teacher formative/summative assessments, and grades.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome

School based administrators, Instructional Coaches

Evidence-based Intervention:

Evidence-based intervention: (May choose more than one evidence-based intervention.) Describe the evidence-based intervention (practices/programs) being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each relevant grade level and describe how the identified interventions will be monitored for this Area of Focus (20 U.S.C. § 7801(21)(A)(i) and (B), ESEA Section 8101(21)(A) and (B)).

Description of Intervention #1:

Science teachers will incorporate standards-aligned formative assessments that are aligned to the 8th grade tested Science benchmarks. These assessments will contain Science Item Specs and district-aligned question stems to build test stamina and familiarity. 8th grade Science PLCs will meet weekly to analyze formative data and plan for targeted reteach and enrichment instruction.

Rationale:

To increase Science proficiency, data-driven instruction paired with ongoing formative assessments ensures that teaching is responsive to student needs. This strategy ensures that instruction is aligned with state-tested benchmarks, misconceptions and gaps in understanding are identified early, interventions can be targeted and timely, and teachers receive support to adjust instructional pacing and rigor based on real-time data

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention:

Tier 1 – Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement:

Action step(s) needed to address this Area of Focus or implement this intervention. Identify 2 to 3 action steps and the person responsible for each step.

Action Step #1

PLC Data review and instructional planning

Person Monitoring:

Assistant Principal/Instructional Coach

By When/Frequency:

Weekly

Describe the Action to Be Taken and how the school will monitor the impact of this action step:

Grade-level Science PLCs will meet weekly to analyze formative and benchmark assessment data aligned to 8th grade Science standards. During these meetings, teachers will: - Identify trends in student performance (e.g., strengths, misconceptions, standards not yet mastered). - Group students based on proficiency levels. - Plan differentiated instruction and targeted interventions for reteaching and enrichment. - Align instructional materials and activities to standards and item specifications. - Share and refine instructional strategies that support conceptual understanding and scientific thinking. The school will monitor the impact of this action step through walkthroughs, PLC documentation, and data trackers.

Action Step #2

Ongoing Formative assessments

Person Monitoring:

Instructional Coach/ Science Team

By When/Frequency:

Ongoing

Describe the Action to Be Taken and how the school will monitor the impact of this action step:

Science teachers will implement ongoing formative assessments that are aligned to 8th grade Science benchmarks and item specifications. These short assessments will focus on 1–2 priority standards and will mirror the rigor and format of the state assessment. The school will monitor the impact of this action step through weekly data review on PLCs, student progress monitoring tools, and mid-quarter benchmark assessments.

Area of Focus #2

Address the school's highest priorities based on any/all relevant data sources.

Instructional Practice specifically relating to Benchmark-aligned instruction, Collaborative Planning, ELA, Professional Learning Communities

Area of Focus Description and Rationale

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a description of your Area of Focus for each relevant grade level, how it affects student learning and a rationale explaining how it was identified as a crucial need from the prior year data reviewed.

In 2025, 8th grade ELA Learning Gains declined from 67% to 58%. In response, targeted instructional efforts will be intensified to support student mastery of ELA standards. Additionally, data analysis will be used to identify and address the specific subgroups requiring the most improvement in this area.

Measurable Outcome

Measurable Outcome: Include prior year data and state the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each relevant grade level. This should be a data-based, objective outcome.

Increase 8th grade ELA Learning Gains from 58% to 68%

Monitoring

Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for implementation and impact to reach the desired outcome.

Teachers, instructional coaches, curriculum leaders, and administrators will collaboratively monitor student performance through grades, quarterly benchmark assessments, PLC action plans, and other relevant data sources. This ongoing analysis will inform instructional adjustments and targeted interventions aimed at closing learning gaps and accelerating student achievement.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome

School-based administration, Instructional Coaches, Curriculum Leaders

Evidence-based Intervention:

Evidence-based intervention: (May choose more than one evidence-based intervention.) Describe the evidence-based intervention (practices/programs) being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each relevant grade level and describe how the identified interventions will be monitored

for this Area of Focus (20 U.S.C. § 7801(21)(A)(i) and (B), ESEA Section 8101(21)(A) and (B)).

Description of Intervention #1:

8th grade ELA teachers will implement reciprocal teaching strategies in a gradual release format with emphasis on academic discourse and metacognitive strategies. Small group instruction will be implemented based on standards-aligned formative assessment data.

Rationale:

By combining reciprocal teaching with standards-based small group instruction, where students receive focused support based on specific skill gaps identified through data, provide a dual approach that addresses both comprehension and writing deficiencies. This intervention will promote: - Improved student ownership of reading strategies - Strengthened vocabulary and text-based writing skills - Increased proficiency in responding to rigorous, standards-aligned questions

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention:

Tier 1 – Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement:

Action step(s) needed to address this Area of Focus or implement this intervention. Identify 2 to 3 action steps and the person responsible for each step.

Action Step #1

Benchmark Assessment Reviews

Person Monitoring:

School based administrators, Instructional Coaches, ELA team

By When/Frequency:

Quarterly

Describe the Action to Be Taken and how the school will monitor the impact of this action step:

Following each quarterly benchmark assessment, the school will conduct structured benchmark data reviews to evaluate student progress toward ELA proficiency and learning gains. These reviews will take place during PLC sessions and will involve teachers, instructional coaches, and administrators. During the reviews, teams will: - Analyze student performance by standard, question type, and subgroup - Identify trends, instructional gaps, and misconceptions - Compare results to previous benchmarks and district averages - Prioritize standards needing reteach or targeted intervention - Develop and document next steps in instruction and remediation plans

Action Step #2

PLC analysis of student performance

Person Monitoring:

Instructional Coach, ELA PLC team

By When/Frequency:

weekly

Describe the Action to Be Taken and how the school will monitor the impact of this action step:

PLCs will meet weekly to analyze student performance data from formative assessments, writing tasks, classroom assignments, and benchmark assessments. The focus of these meetings will be to: - Identify standards where students are demonstrating proficiency or struggling - Examine subgroup performance to ensure equity in learning gains - Discuss instructional practices that yielded strong results - Develop reteach plans for students who have not mastered targeted standards - Group students for small-group instruction or intervention based on data - Document action steps for the

following week's instruction

IV. Positive Learning Environment

Area of Focus #1

Student Attendance

Area of Focus Description and Rationale

Include a description of your Area of Focus for each relevant grade level, how it affects student learning and a rationale explaining how it was identified as a crucial need from the prior year data reviewed.

Although the number of students with 10% or more absences has decreased across all grade levels—from 176 last year to 147 this year—it remains a significantly high concern. Chronic absenteeism continues to impact student achievement, as consistent attendance is essential for accessing instruction, engaging in learning, and making academic progress.

Measurable Outcome

Include prior year data and state the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each relevant grade level. This should be a data-based, objective outcome.

For the 2025–26 school year, Greenwood Lakes Middle School will aim to reduce the number of students with 10 or more absences by 10%.

Monitoring

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome. Include a description of how ongoing monitoring will impact student achievement outcomes.

The Greenwood Lakes Social Worker, MTSS Team, and Attendance Secretary will collaboratively monitor student attendance and work to ensure families understand the academic impact of chronic absences. The Attendance Secretary will contact families to obtain documentation for excused absences, while the Social Worker and MTSS Team will engage families of chronically absent students to explain the consequences of truancy, including potential court involvement and the negative effect on student learning. In addition, they will provide individualized support and resources to help families improve their child's attendance on a case-by-case basis.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome

School-based administration, Social Worker, MTSS team

Evidence-based Intervention:

Evidence-based intervention: (May choose more than one evidence-based intervention.) Describe the evidence-based intervention (practices/programs) being implemented to achieve the measurable

outcomes in each relevant grade level and describe how the identified interventions will be monitored for this Area of Focus (20 U.S.C. § 7801(21)(A)(i) and (B), ESEA Section 8101(21)(A) and (B)).

Description of Intervention #1:

School-wide attendance and monitoring.

Rationale:

Implementing a Multi-Tiered System of Supports (MTSS) for attendance—paired with early identification and consistent family engagement—is a highly effective approach to reducing chronic absenteeism. This strategy focuses on: - Proactive identification of at-risk students through data - Tailored interventions that match student and family needs - Building school-home partnerships to address barriers to attendance - Promoting a culture of consistent school attendance

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention:**Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?**

No

Action Steps to Implement:

Action step(s) needed to address this Area of Focus or implement this intervention. Identify 2 to 3 action steps and the person responsible for each step.

Action Step #1

Review and monitor student attendance

Person Monitoring:**By When/Frequency:**

Social Worker, Attendance Secretary, MTSS team weekly

Describe the Action to Be Taken and how the school will monitor the impact of this action step:

The school will implement a structured process for weekly monitoring of student attendance. The Attendance Secretary will generate weekly attendance reports to identify students who are approaching, or have exceeded, the threshold of 10% absences. These reports will be shared with the MTSS Team and School Social Worker for further review and action. The School Social Worker will maintain case files for chronically absent students and coordinate individualized support plans based on identified barriers, such as transportation issues, health concerns, or family needs.

Action Step #2

Attendance Case Review meetings

Person Monitoring:**By When/Frequency:**

MTSS team

Biweekly

Describe the Action to Be Taken and how the school will monitor the impact of this action step:

Greenwood Lakes Middle School will hold bi-weekly attendance case review meetings led by the MTSS Team and the School Social Worker. These meetings will focus on reviewing students who are approaching or exceeding the threshold of 10% absences. The purpose of these meetings is to ensure early identification, consistent follow-up, and targeted support for students who are at risk of becoming chronically absent.

V. Title I Requirements (optional)

A. Schoolwide Program Plan (SWP)

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 20 U.S.C. § 6314(b) (ESEA Section 1114(b)). This section of the SIP is not required for non-Title I schools.

Dissemination Methods

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 (20 U.S.C. § 6314(b)(4), ESEA Section 1114(b)(4)).

List the school's webpage where the SIP is made publicly available.

The School Improvement Plan (SIP) is reviewed annually with input from both the School Advisory Council (SAC) and the Parent Teacher Student Association (PTSA), with all feedback documented. While amendments to the SIP are formally made each year, stakeholders are informed that the plan is a "living document" and may be adjusted at any time to meet evolving school needs. Greenwood Lakes Middle School follows the district-provided SIP template and uses clear, accessible language to communicate improvement initiatives and strategies. Once approved, the SIP is posted on the GLMS website and promoted through various channels, including social media, the Skyward message center, and the school marquee. Although the SIP is composed in English, translations into other languages are available upon request to ensure accessibility for all families.

The SIP is available on the GLMS website: https://greenwoodlakes.scps.k12.fl.us/our-school/title_i

Positive Relationships With Parents, Families and other Community Stakeholders

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 Parental Family Engagement Plan (PFEP) is made publicly available (20 U.S.C. § 6318(b)-(g), ESEA Section 1116(b)-(g)).

Greenwood Lakes Middle School (GLMS) fosters strong, positive relationships with parents, families,

and community stakeholders by promoting ongoing, two-way communication. The GLMS administrative team and PTSA provide weekly updates through multiple platforms, including Skyward Family Access, the school website, the campus marquee, printed flyers sent home with students, the bi-monthly *Eagle Express* newsletter, and social media channels. In addition to regular communication, GLMS actively engages families through a variety of school and community events held before, during, and after school. These include Coffee Connections, Title I Literacy and Math Nights, Title I ESOL Night, Title I FAST Night, Fine Arts performances, and Spirit Nights in partnership with local businesses. These efforts are designed to strengthen family engagement and build a collaborative school community.

The PFEP is available on the GLMS website: https://greenwoodlakes.scps.k12.fl.us/our-school/title_i

Plans to Strengthen the Academic Program

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 II of the SIP (20 U.S.C. § 6314(b)(7)(A)(ii), ESEA Section 1114(b)(7)(A)(ii)).

All teachers will implement targeted reteaching through small group instruction, with a primary focus on Science and ELA. General education teachers and ESE support facilitators will collaborate through co-teaching models to provide differentiated instruction and focused interventions. As outlined in the Area of Focus, Science and ELA teachers will create supportive, inclusive learning environments where small group instruction is used to monitor student progress, address learning gaps, and plan for timely reteaching. This approach will allow students to receive more immediate, personalized support, increasing their opportunities for academic success.

How Plan is Developed

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 this Act, 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) (20 U.S.C. § 6314(b)(5) and §6318(e)(4), ESEA Sections 1114(b)(5) and 1116(e)(4)).

No Answer Entered

B. Component(s) of the Schoolwide Program Plan

Components of the Schoolwide Program Plan, as applicable

Include descriptions for any additional, applicable strategies that address the needs of all children in the school, but particularly the needs of those at risk of not meeting the challenging state academic standards which may include the following:

Improving Student's Skills Outside the Academic Subject Areas

Describe how the school ensures counseling, school-based mental health services, specialized support services, mentoring services and other strategies to improve students' skills outside the academic subject areas (20 U.S.C. § 6314(b)(7)(A)(iii)(I), ESEA Section 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(I)).

Greenwood Lakes Middle School is committed to supporting the whole child by providing a comprehensive range of services that address students' social, emotional, and behavioral needs. The school is staffed with two highly qualified counselors who deliver ongoing guidance and support to students, while a dedicated mental health therapist is available on campus three days a week to provide more intensive, individualized care. In addition, the school fosters strong student-teacher relationships through a mentorship program in which teachers "adopt" students for the year, offering consistent encouragement and assistance. To further support student development, Greenwood Lakes implements SOAR time—a structured period dedicated to building essential life skills such as goal-setting, resilience, and self-management. Together, these strategies create a supportive environment that nurtures students' well-being and enhances their ability to thrive both in and out of the classroom.

Preparing for Postsecondary Opportunities and the Workforce

Describe the preparation for and awareness of postsecondary opportunities and the workforce, which may include career and technical education programs and broadening secondary school students' access to coursework to earn postsecondary credit while still in high school (20 U.S.C. § 6314(b)(7)(A)(iii)(II), ESEA Section 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(II)).

Not applicable

Addressing Problem Behavior and Early Intervening Services

Describe the implementation of a schoolwide tiered model to prevent and address problem behavior and early intervening services coordinated with similar activities and services carried out under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (20 U.S.C. § 6314(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III), ESEA Section 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III)).

Greenwood Lakes Middle School implements a comprehensive, schoolwide tiered model of support to proactively prevent and address problem behaviors while ensuring early intervention services are effectively coordinated with activities under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA). The school's Multi-Tiered System of Supports (MTSS) team meets weekly to review student data, identify

varying levels of academic, behavioral, and social-emotional needs, and determine appropriate interventions. Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports (PBIS) are embedded into the school culture, with staff consistently documenting and reinforcing positive behaviors to encourage student success. Additionally, a weekly Student Support Team (SST) meeting is held with full participation from the Exceptional Student Education (ESE) department to address the individualized needs of students with disabilities, ensuring alignment with IDEA requirements. This collaborative and data-driven approach ensures that all students receive the appropriate level of support needed for their growth and success.

Professional Learning and Other Activities

Describe the professional learning and other activities for teachers, paraprofessionals and other school personnel to improve instruction and use of data from academic assessments, and to recruit and retain effective teachers, particularly in high-need subjects (20 U.S.C. § 6314(b)(7)(A)(iii)(IV), ESEA Section 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(IV)).

Greenwood Lakes Middle School is dedicated to continuous professional growth and the effective use of academic data to enhance instruction and student outcomes. Weekly Professional Learning Communities (PLCs) are held within grade levels and content areas to analyze student assessment data, plan targeted instruction, and share best practices. In addition, the school hosts cross-grade level and cross-curricular PLCs to foster collaboration among departments, promote interdisciplinary connections, and address broader instructional needs. To support new educators, Greenwood Lakes holds NEST (New Educators Support Team) meetings that provides mentorship, resources, and a safe space for questions, helping teachers acclimate to both the school and district. These collaborative structures not only strengthen instructional practices but also contribute to teacher retention and recruitment, particularly in high-need subject areas, by cultivating a supportive and data-informed professional environment.

Strategies to Assist Preschool Children

Describe the strategies the school employs to assist preschool children in the transition from early childhood education programs to local elementary school programs (20 U.S.C. § 6314(b)(7)(A)(iii)(V), ESEA Section 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(V)).

Not applicable

VI. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review

This section must be completed if the school is identified as ATSI or CSI (ESEA Sections 1111(d)(1)(B)(4) and (2)(C) and 1114(b)(6)).

Process to Review the Use of Resources

Describe the process you engage in with your district to review the use of resources to meet the identified needs of students.

No Answer Entered

Specifics to Address the Need

Identify the specific resource(s) and rationale (i.e., data) you have determined will be used this year to address the need(s) (i.e., timeline).

No Answer Entered

VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus

Check if this school is eligible for 2025-26 UniSIG funds but has chosen NOT to apply.	No
--	----

BUDGET	ACTIVITY	FUNCTION/ OBJECT	FUNDING SOURCE	FTE	AMOUNT
Plan Budget Total					0.00