

Orange County Public Schools

Carver Middle



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	12
Planning for Improvement	18
Positive Culture & Environment	23
Budget to Support Goals	24

Carver Middle

4500 W COLUMBIA ST, Orlando, FL 32811

<https://carverms.ocps.net/>

Demographics

Principal: Samuel Danner

Start Date for this Principal: 5/22/2018

2019-20 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
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (49%) 2017-18: C (41%) 2016-17: C (47%) 2015-16: F (31%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	LaShawn Russ-Porterfield
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TS&I
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here .	

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Orange County School Board.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F. This plan is also a requirement for Targeted Support and Improvement (TS&I) and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CS&I) schools pursuant to 1008.33 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

To be designated as TS&I, a school must have one or more ESSA subgroup(s) with a Federal Index below 41%. This plan shall be approved by the district. There are three ways a school can be designated as CS&I:

1. have a school grade of D or F
2. have a graduation rate of 67% or lower
3. have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

For these schools, the SIP shall be approved by the district as well as the Bureau of School Improvement.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F, or a graduation rate 67% or less. Districts may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing for schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at www.floridacims.org.

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 Florida Department of Education 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.

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	12
Planning for Improvement	18
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	24

Carver Middle

4500 W COLUMBIA ST, Orlando, FL 32811

<https://carverms.ocps.net/>

School Demographics

<p>School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Middle School 6-8</p>	<p>2019-20 Title I School</p> <p>Yes</p>	<p>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p>100%</p>
<p>Primary Service Type (per MSID File)</p> <p>K-12 General Education</p>	<p>Charter School</p> <p>No</p>	<p>2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p>99%</p>

School Grades History

Year	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17
Grade	C	C	C	C

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Orange County School Board.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a school improvement plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F (see page 4). For schools receiving a grade of A, B, or C, the district may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at <https://www.floridacims.org>.

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 Florida Department of Education 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.

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

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

Provide the school's vision statement.

To ensure every student has a promising and successful future

School Leadership Team

Membership

Identify the name, email address, position title, and job duties/responsibilities for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Ramsey, Jackie	Principal	The principal provides strategic direction, implements standardized curricula, assesses teaching methods, monitors student achievement, encourages parent involvement, revises policies and procedures, administers the budget, hires and evaluates staff, and oversee facilities.
Lewis, Joy	Assistant Principal	The AP assists the principal, provides strategic direction, implements standardized curricula, assesses teaching methods, monitors student achievement, encourages parent involvement, revises policies and procedures, administers the budget, hires and evaluates staff, and oversee facilities.
Lovely, Paul	Assistant Principal	The AP assists the principal, provides strategic direction, implements standardized curricula, assesses teaching methods, monitors student achievement, encourages parent involvement, revises policies and procedures, administers the budget, hires and evaluates staff, and oversee facilities.
Bush, Kenneth	Dean	The dean is responsible for contributing to and communicating a vision and focused plan for improving student achievement and student behavior, fostering a culture of high expectations for all students, building strong partnerships with families and community, and creating a safe and supportive school climate.
McMillion, Dennis	Administrative Support	The SAFE Coordinator promotes a safe, orderly and caring environment by planning and implementing programs designed to reduce school violence and to engage students in appropriate behaviors and activities.
Miller, John	Dean	The dean is responsible for contributing to and communicating a vision and focused plan for improving student achievement and student behavior, fostering a culture of high expectations for all students, building strong partnerships with families and community, and creating a safe and supportive school climate.
Lundi, Ralph	Instructional Coach	The instructional coach builds teacher capacity and teacher understanding of instructional practices; they are responsible for ensuring high-quality instruction in classrooms through modeling, planning, co-teaching, and instructional feedback to teachers.
Skyles, Tonia	Administrative Support	The testing coordinator organizes the administration of local and state testing; as well as manage the testing calendar and ensures all protocols are in place and followed during testing administration.
Jimenez, Jason	Assistant Principal	The AP assists the principal, provides strategic direction, implements standardized curricula, assesses teaching methods, monitors student achievement, encourages parent involvement, revises policies and

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		procedures, administers the budget, hires and evaluates staff, and oversee facilities.
McDonald, Victoria	Instructional Coach	The instructional coach builds teacher capacity and teacher understanding of instructional practices; they are responsible for ensuring high-quality instruction in classrooms through modeling, planning, co-teaching, and instructional feedback to teachers.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Tuesday 5/22/2018, Samuel Danner

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

0

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

2

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

40

Demographic Data

2020-21 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
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Economically Disadvantaged Students

School Grades History	2018-19: C (49%) 2017-18: C (41%) 2016-17: C (47%) 2015-16: F (31%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	LaShawn Russ-Porterfield
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TS&I
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here .	

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	311	300	248	0	0	0	0	859
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	61	145	70	0	0	0	0	276
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	45	10	0	0	0	0	75
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	38	95	72	0	0	0	0	205
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	46	47	51	0	0	0	0	144
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	99	106	82	0	0	0	0	287
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	101	105	85	0	0	0	0	291

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	108	154	107	0	0	0	0	369

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	2
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	13	9	0	0	0	0	29

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 7/8/2020

Prior Year - As Reported

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

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	272	331	243	0	0	0	0	846
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	35	66	62	0	0	0	0	163
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	53	46	55	0	0	0	0	154
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	53	100	104	0	0	0	0	257
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	111	159	140	0	0	0	0	410

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	79	108	110	0	0	0	0	297

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	4	0	0	0	0	7
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	7	17	0	0	0	0	35

Prior Year - Updated

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

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	272	331	243	0	0	0	0	846
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	35	66	62	0	0	0	0	163
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	53	46	55	0	0	0	0	154
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	53	100	104	0	0	0	0	257
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	111	159	140	0	0	0	0	410

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	79	108	110	0	0	0	0	297

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	4	0	0	0	0	7
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	7	17	0	0	0	0	35

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school, or combination schools).

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	31%	52%	54%	26%	52%	52%
ELA Learning Gains	45%	52%	54%	43%	53%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	51%	45%	47%	39%	42%	44%
Math Achievement	38%	55%	58%	35%	53%	56%
Math Learning Gains	58%	55%	57%	62%	55%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	61%	50%	51%	57%	48%	50%
Science Achievement	29%	51%	51%	27%	49%	50%
Social Studies Achievement	50%	67%	72%	51%	67%	70%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey				
Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)			Total
	6	7	8	
	(0)	(0)	(0)	0 (0)

Grade Level Data

NOTE: This data is raw data and includes ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2019	31%	52%	-21%	54%	-23%
	2018	24%	48%	-24%	52%	-28%
Same Grade Comparison		7%				
Cohort Comparison						

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
07	2019	27%	48%	-21%	52%	-25%
	2018	24%	48%	-24%	51%	-27%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison		3%				
08	2019	32%	54%	-22%	56%	-24%
	2018	23%	55%	-32%	58%	-35%
Same Grade Comparison		9%				
Cohort Comparison		8%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2019	32%	43%	-11%	55%	-23%
	2018	23%	35%	-12%	52%	-29%
Same Grade Comparison		9%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	29%	49%	-20%	54%	-25%
	2018	15%	51%	-36%	54%	-39%
Same Grade Comparison		14%				
Cohort Comparison		6%				
08	2019	35%	36%	-1%	46%	-11%
	2018	23%	32%	-9%	45%	-22%
Same Grade Comparison		12%				
Cohort Comparison		20%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2019	26%	49%	-23%	48%	-22%
	2018	24%	49%	-25%	50%	-26%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison						

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					

CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	47%	66%	-19%	71%	-24%

CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2018	44%	66%	-22%	71%	-27%
Compare		3%			
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	100%	63%	37%	61%	39%
2018	57%	61%	-4%	62%	-5%
Compare		43%			
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	94%	53%	41%	57%	37%
2018	60%	65%	-5%	56%	4%
Compare		34%			

Subgroup Data

2019 SCHOOL GRADE 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
SWD	14	36	46	21	58	68	9	27			
ELL	31	50	54	39	56	67	43	49			
BLK	31	45	47	38	57	59	27	50	76		
HSP	27	46	74	36	63	76	39	40			
FRL	30	45	52	38	58	60	29	49	80		

2018 SCHOOL GRADE 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 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	6	32	39	4	43	57	5	6			
ELL	17	45	53	18	43	58	11	67			
BLK	26	39	44	28	40	58	28	46	61		
HSP	24	34	33	20	44	53	23	44			
FRL	25	39	42	29	41	58	27	45	60		

2017 SCHOOL GRADE 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 2015-16	C & C Accel 2015-16
SWD	1	22	26	8	36	31	6	10			
ELL	23	52	44	34	58	55	8	54			
BLK	26	42	38	36	62	57	26	51	81		
HSP	30	57	60	35	62		27	45			
FRL	26	43	39	35	61	56	25	51	80		

ESSA Data

This data has been updated for the 2018-19 school year as of 7/16/2019.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	TS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	49
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	53
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	493
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data

Students With Disabilities

Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	35
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0

English Language Learners

Federal Index - English Language Learners	49
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0

Native American Students

Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	48
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	50
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	50
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Analysis

Data Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources (see guide for examples for relevant data sources).

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

The data component showing the lowest performance on the 2018-2019 state assessment is proficiency of the students with disabilities (SWD) subgroup. This group falls far below the performances of the other subgroups. According to school grade components by subgroups, SWD students performed at 9% proficiency in science, followed by 14% ELA proficiency. We believe this was a direct result of low reading comprehension mastery and the need for our students with disabilities to utilize strategies that will allow them to digest written material, and then be able to analyze, process, and apply information to respond to questions provided. Additionally, we will need to consider how the questions are written, and ensure that assessments administered throughout the year are closely aligned to the end of course assessment administered.

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

All school grade components increased from 2017-18 to 2018-19. Science was the lowest school grade data component at 29% proficiency. Compared to the 2017-2018 school year's data, this is just an 1% increase. Data points show we must consider students' proficiency levels in reading. As ELA (reading) achievement is just 2% above that of Science; it suggests that there is correlation between Science achievement and that of ELA.

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.

ELA has the greatest gap when compared to the state proficiency level. Taking a closer look, ELA 7th grade had the greatest gap at 25% less than the state average. Analyzation of common assessment data shows that the greatest areas that students struggle with are vocabulary and comprehension. Additionally, our students lack the stamina required to read multiple texts within a specified time. This year we will place a strong focus on vocabulary including the use of context clues in order to support student learning and comprehension.

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

Math showed the most improvement, accounting for 47 of the 71 point gain made by the school. All areas of math increased by a minimum of 13 points; including 100% proficiency in Algebra and 94% proficiency in Geometry. Algebra had a 43% increase compared to the 2018 school data, and a 37% increase over the district average for the 2019 school year. Geometry had a 34% increase compared to the 2018 school data and was 41% above the district average for the 2019 school year. Teacher assignment was strategic as well as student placement in appropriate classes. All data points were considered, and continuous monitoring of student progress was a non-negotiable. Math overall proficiency increased by 10%, and math learning gains increased by 17% compared to 2018 school data. Teachers used data to drive their instruction, remediation, and student monitoring. Teachers provided support through small group interventions, student data chats, and tutoring.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern?

There are two areas of concern that need to be addressed regarding the EWS data - the number of students with a percent of attendance below 90, as well as the number of students who have two or more indicators. Both of these groups have an increase in representation over the past three years.

Approximately 33% of our student population have an attendance average less than 90 percent, and 43% of our student population have two or more indicators. This information is quite troubling and merits a closer look. The 7th grade in particular, has the most students in these categories over the past three years, so therefore one could believe there is a trend.

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

1. Increase proficiency in science
2. Increase proficiency in social studies (civics)
3. Increase proficiency in ELA
4. Increase proficiency among students with disabilities
5. Increase attendance among all grade levels above 90%

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	The students with disabilities (SWD) subgroup has the most significant achievement gap among Carver MS students. To increase proficiency and narrow the achievement gap, professional learning around and intentional implementation of best practices for inclusive education will be a focus for the 2020-2021 school year. Focus includes increasing scaffolding measures for inclusion, effective implementation of the gradual release model, and equipping students with the necessary strategies to work independently without prompting.
Measurable Outcome:	With an intense focus on the achievement of students within the SWD subgroup, we expect to increase proficiency for these students in ELA by 10%, Math by 7%, Science by 11%, and Social Studies by 17%. Total points for the SWD subgroup will exceed 41% on the ESSA Federal Percent of Points Index, with a goal of 49% or better.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Jackie Ramsey (jackie.ramsey@ocps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	<p>The gradual release model is a research-based best practice instructional model where teachers strategically transfer the responsibility in the learning process from the teacher to the students. The gradual release model has four phases: "I do," where the teacher models the lesson objective, "we do," guided instruction with both input from the teacher and the students, "you do together," collaborative learning in small groups/partners, and "you do independently," independent practice. In order for this model of instruction to be most effective, all 4 phases need to be present.</p> <p>As the student acquires the new information and skills, the responsibility of learning shifts from teacher-directed instruction to student processing activities, with students relying more on themselves and less on the teacher to complete the learning task. Teachers using various monitoring techniques such as formative assessments, check-ins and student samples, are able to perform "in the moment" adaptations for students who are struggling.</p>
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	<p>Analysis of student achievement data and weekly classroom observation data indicates that teachers are intentional in the modeling phase of instruction, yet are sometimes inconsistent in relating the purpose of the modeling to the other phases of instruction. Analysis showed that the majority of modeling was of process skills or specific products. Teacher modeling sometimes lacks the rigor of work that students are expected to complete independently. This complicated students' efforts to practice what was modeled and often led to the need for one on one support.</p>

Action Steps to Implement

Address the "State of the School" with faculty and staff, sharing annual data results and vision for the upcoming year. Principal Ramsey will share her vision for the year and introduce plans for change.

Person Responsible Jackie Ramsey (jackie.ramsey@ocps.net)

Professional development classes will be created to support teachers in implementing the full extent of the gradual release model. Strategies presented will be used to increase cognitive thinking and independent practice by the student. Professional development will be offered on a monthly basis with opportunity for safe practice.

Person Responsible Paul Lovely (paul.lovely@ocps.net)

Through weekly observations, administration will monitor and provide coaching to support teachers and staff. Safe practice will be employed to allow for teachers to become comfortable with using best practices in the classroom. Immediate written feedback will be provided for teachers as well.

Person Responsible Jason Jimenez (jason.jimenez@ocps.net)

Coaches will be a part of the planning process in PLC meetings, supporting teachers in their pedagogical practices. Instructional coaches will also work with select students to ensure their understanding and mastery of standards

Person Responsible Victoria McDonald (victoria.mcdonald@ocp.net)

Administration will provide monthly communication to stakeholders highlighting the school improvement plan, and inviting stakeholders to discuss and identify ways to support students. Data will be shared with stakeholders to identify trends, areas of growth, and success stories.

Person Responsible Joy Lewis (joy.lewis@ocps.net)

#2. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Social Emotional Learning

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: After careful review, the number of students with a percent of attendance below 90, as well as the number of students who have 2 or more indicators, are quite concerning. Both of these groups have an increase in representation over the past three years. Approximately 33% of our student population have an attendance average less than 90 percent, and 43% of our student population have two or more indicators. This information is quite troubling and merits a closer look. The 7th grade in particular, has the most students in these categories over the past three years, so therefore one could believe there is a trend.

Measurable Outcome: We plan to achieve a reduction in percentage of student attendance below 90 by 10%; consequently less than 25% of the student body will have moderate to high absenteeism. Likewise, due to the increased positivity in climate and culture, we expect for discipline referrals to decrease subsequent to the number of suspensions.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Jackie Ramsey (jackie.ramsey@ocps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Social and emotional learning (SEL) is defined by the Collaborative for Academic, Social, and Emotional Learning (CASEL) as the process through which children and adults acquire and effectively apply the knowledge, attitudes, and skills necessary to understand and manage emotions, set and achieve positive goals, feel, and show empathy for others, establish and maintain positive relationships, and make responsible decisions. Building everyone’s SEL skills creates a positive learning and work environment, thus leading to increased student achievement.

There are direct connections to social and emotional learning and the Instructional Framework embedded in our learning. These connections will provide support for faculty and students working towards accomplishing our leadership and literacy targets. Social and emotional learning supports meeting the needs of the whole child.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Integrating and aligning SEL with academic content is important because it helps educators make connections that support social and emotional development throughout the school day. This integration supports student understanding and sustained learning. Students spend the majority of their time in schools, at home, and in the community. The CASEL Wheel shows all stakeholders must work together to meet the social and emotional needs of our children. When social and emotional skills are taught and mastered using evidence-based approaches, they help students to succeed not just in school, but in all avenues of life. When we commit to using the SEL 3 Signature Practices in an authentic way, we are better able to address the attendance decline, meet our school wide learning goals, and improve student learning outcomes.

Action Steps to Implement

Address the "State of the School" with faculty and staff, sharing annual data results and vision for the upcoming year. Principal Ramsey will share her vision for the year and introduce plans for change.

Person Responsible Jackie Ramsey (jackie.ramsey@ocps.net)

Professional development classes will be created to support teachers in implementing the SEL strategies.

Person Responsible Dennis McMillion (dennis.mcmillion@ocps.net)

Monthly discipline meeting to discuss trends, attendance, and implementation of strategies to promote a positive school environment. Deans will review weekly data to identify students in crisis, and work with the

Parent Engagement Liaison and Safe Coordinator to develop a wrap around approach to support these students.

Person Responsible John Miller (john.miller3@ocps.net)

Use social emotional learning strategies across content levels to build student buy-in and engagement. Additionally, these strategies are directly aligned with our instructional framework to support student learning as well. Teachers will participate in monthly professional development classes that instruct them on how to use social emotional learning strategies in the classroom

Person Responsible Victoria McDonald (victoria.mcdonald@ocp.net)

Through weekly observations, administration will monitor and provide coaching to support teachers and staff. Safe practice will be employed to allow for teachers to become comfortable with using new techniques and best practices in the classroom.. Immediate written feedback will be provided for teachers as well.

Person Responsible Jason Jimenez (jason.jimenez@ocps.net)

Administration will provide monthly communication to stakeholders highlighting the school improvement plan, and inviting stakeholders to discuss and identify ways to support students. Data will be shared with stakeholders to identify trends, areas of growth, and success stories.

Person Responsible Joy Lewis (joy.lewis@ocps.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities.

We need to increase proficiency in ELA. We realize that reading comprehension and vocabulary are our most critical areas that need to be addressed. ELA 7th grade, had the greatest gap at 25% less than the state average. Our students enter middle school at a major deficit, therefore, we have to implement strategic support interventions to close their academic gap. Common assessment data demonstrates that one of the greatest areas that students struggle with is vocabulary and comprehension in order to respond to questions presented. Additionally, our students lack the stamina required to read multiple texts within a specified time. This year we will place a strong emphasis on vocabulary, including the use of context clues in order to support student learning and comprehension.

Special care will be given to assign teachers and students in the most appropriate classes, providing strategic support that will allow for the maximum classroom experience. Students are carefully placed in specific interventions and core content classes with homogeneous grouping to support students according to their most needed area of growth. Continuous monitoring and tracking will allow teachers to readily identify students in crisis; administrators and resource personnel will track this data as well. Students will receive prompt attention and interventions as needed. This year, we will incorporate the cohort model for all students to accurately track their successes. Additionally, we will employ intense small group instruction using a myriad of resources and resource staff, including volunteer tutors and mentors to support our students. Through frequent and consistent monitoring of students by teachers, and subsequent monitoring of teachers by administration and district personnel, “in the moment” modifications can be made. Actionable feedback will be given for a more successful outcome. Lastly, administration will provide monthly communication to stakeholders highlighting the school improvement plan, and inviting stakeholders to discuss and identify ways to support students. Data will be shared with stakeholders to identify trends, areas of growth, and success stories.

Part IV: Positive Culture & Environment

A positive school culture and environment reflects: a supportive and fulfilling environment, learning conditions that meet the needs of all students, people who are sure of their roles and relationships in student learning, and a culture that values trust, respect and high expectations. Consulting with various stakeholder groups to employ school improvement strategies that impact the positive school culture and environment are critical. Stakeholder groups more proximal to the school include teachers, students, and families of students, volunteers, and school board members. Broad stakeholder groups include early childhood providers, community colleges and universities, social services, and business partners.

Stakeholders play a key role in school performance and addressing equity. Consulting various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment ensuring all stakeholders are involved.

Carver Middle School will address building a positive school culture and environment by becoming more culturally responsive in our approaches. We aim to focus on the equity of the students at Carver to enhance student achievement for all students and build school culture. Based on our culturally responsive goals and high-yield strategies, we created three collective standards to become a mantra for our success in student achievement and morale:

1. Growth is a mindset; We embrace the challenge and enjoy the journey.
2. We share ideas to expand our world.

3. We appreciate our success and uplift one another.

We plan to help our teachers become skilled in providing differentiated support based upon the specific needs of students, focus on literacy across all content areas, and infuse culturally responsive approaches to instruction. The administrative team members will create an action plan to measure and monitor the implementation and impact of specific focus strategies targeted in instruction. Faculty will actively collaborate and communicate ways to enhance school culture that focuses on effective instructional practice and student equity. We plan to collaborate with parents and community members to provide additional supports for our students. We will hold meetings with parents and stakeholders to gain feedback from their perspective. We will partner with the EXTEND Community Involvement Team to provide parents and stakeholders with an opportunity to have a hands-on experience assisting teachers to motivate and tutor striving students. The team members will work with students individually and in small groups and help interact with students during class changes. We will work with community members to train them on cultural awareness as well as common vocabulary and strategies within the content areas. Our business partners will assist in creating moments of celebration for student success as well as providing resources of support for students and families. We have a relationship with a community music organization to support the arts, partnership with a black-owned dentistry to support dental hygiene, a relationship with the Historically Black College/University community, and the National Pan-Hellenic Council to support higher learning and mentoring. We are also working with faith-based partners to support mental health and mentoring.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Social Emotional Learning	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00