College Park Middle

2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

College Park Middle

1201 MAURY RD, Orlando, FL 32804

https://collegeparkms.ocps.net/

Demographics

Principal: Derrick Fontaine

Start Date for this Principal: 8/9/2022

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
2021-22 Title I School	Yes
2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2021-22 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 Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2021-22: C (46%) 2018-19: C (46%) 2017-18: C (47%)
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	ATSI
* 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.](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

College Park Middle

1201 MAURY RD, Orlando, FL 32804

https://collegeparkms.ocps.net/

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	**2021-22 Title I School**	**2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
Middle School 6-8	Yes	100%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	94%

School Grades History

Year	2021-22	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19
Grade	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
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.**:**

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Barringer, Alexandra	Media Specialist	Provide support to teachers and students utilizing media-related materials, technology, and books. Teach media production classes and facilitate Title I compliance.
Bush, Kenneth		Provide discipline support to students and teachers, support and conduct safety procedures and supervision.
Calderon, Leonardo		Provide professional development, analyze data, provide peer coaching support and peer observation feedback, assist with small group instruction, and facilitate Math/Science common planning.
Gage, Tanekia		Facilitates instructional rounds and provides teachers with actionable feedback to enhance their professional practices. Partners with the principal and assistant principal to implement systems and structures that yield a strong learning environment. Analyzes common assessment data to make timely instructional decisions that impact student achievement. Ms. Gage monitors discipline processes to ensure a safe learning and working environment.
Gordon , Monica		Dr. Gordon serves as the instructional leader, operational manager, and community liaison of the school. She monitors instructional delivery of the standards and allocation of resources to ensure students are being provided with a high-quality education. The principal facilitates instructional rounds and provides teachers with actionable feedback to enhance their professional practices. Dr. Gordon establishes systems of guidance that result in a supportive learning environment with high expectations and increased student outcomes. Equally important, she provides avenues for teachers to collaborate, plan rigorous lessons, and contribute input for the optimal functioning of the school. The principal engages with district and community members to facilitate the use of resources that directly impacts student achievement
Hurst, Kristy		Provide professional development, analyze data, coordinate instructional resource alignment, facilitate school-wide testing, facilitate ESL compliance and monitoring, and assist with small group instruction.
Lloyd, Deborah		Holding compliance meetings for IEP and 504 students. Collaborating with ESE stakeholders to ensure correct placements for students.
Pearce, Hollie		Facilitates instructional rounds and provides teachers with actionable feedback to enhance their professional practices. Partners with the principal and assistant principal to implement systems and structures that yield a strong learning environment. Analyzes common assessment data to make timely instructional decisions that impact student achievement. Ms. Pearce monitors instructional processes to ensure academic goals and systems meet the needs of student and teachers.

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Sharpe, Alecia		Student academic counseling, scheduling, mental health counseling, student recognitions.
Williams, Thisha		Student academic counseling, scheduling, mental health counseling, student recognitions.
Washington, Monica		Coordinating resources for coaches, teachers, and interventionists.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Tuesday 8/9/2022, Derrick Fontaine

Number of teachers with a 2022 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 2022 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.*

4

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

38

Total number of students enrolled at the school

757

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2021-22 school year.

14

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2022-23 school year.

10

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

Using prior year's 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	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	287	218	247	0	0	0	0	752
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	86	60	94	0	0	0	0	240
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	72	86	0	0	0	0	176
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	2	1	0	0	0	0	14
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	11	33	0	0	0	0	57
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	113	91	107	0	0	0	0	311
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	118	77	109	0	0	0	0	304
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	72	55	62	0	0	0	0	189

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level who have 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	107	100	124	0	0	0	0	331

Using current year data, complete the table below with the number of students identified as being "retained.":

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	5	0	0	0	0	10

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 8/4/2022

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	246	256	196	0	0	0	0	698
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	59	106	72	0	0	0	0	237
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	58	40	0	0	0	0	111
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	23	18	51	0	0	0	0	92
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	26	27	42	0	0	0	0	95
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	36	57	38	0	0	0	0	131
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	39	65	42	0	0	0	0	146
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	48	92	80	0	0	0	0	220

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

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	246	256	196	0	0	0	0	698
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	59	106	72	0	0	0	0	237
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	58	40	0	0	0	0	111
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	23	18	51	0	0	0	0	92
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	26	27	42	0	0	0	0	95
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	36	57	38	0	0	0	0	131
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	39	65	42	0	0	0	0	146
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	48	92	80	0	0	0	0	220

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

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data Review
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	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	31%	49%	50%				41%	52%	54%
ELA Learning Gains	37%						47%	52%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	26%						38%	45%	47%
Math Achievement	37%	36%	36%				41%	55%	58%
Math Learning Gains	49%						45%	55%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	53%						44%	50%	51%
Science Achievement	39%	55%	53%				44%	51%	51%
Social Studies Achievement	61%	61%	58%				48%	67%	72%

Grade Level Data Review - State Assessments
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	2022					
	2019	42%	52%	-10%	54%	-12%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2022					
	2019	28%	48%	-20%	52%	-24%
Cohort Comparison		-42%				
08	2022					
	2019	46%	54%	-8%	56%	-10%
Cohort Comparison		-28%				

MATH						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
06	2022					
	2019	24%	43%	-19%	55%	-31%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2022					
	2019	34%	49%	-15%	54%	-20%
Cohort Comparison		-24%				
08	2022					
	2019	29%	36%	-7%	46%	-17%
Cohort Comparison		-34%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
06	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
07	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2022					
	2019	42%	49%	-7%	48%	-6%
Cohort Comparison		0%				

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	**School**	**District**	**School Minus District**	**State**	**School Minus State**
2022					
2019					
CIVICS EOC					
Year	**School**	**District**	**School Minus District**	**State**	**School Minus State**
2022					
2019	44%	66%	-22%	71%	-27%
HISTORY EOC					
Year	**School**	**District**	**School Minus District**	**State**	**School Minus State**
2022					
2019					

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	71%	63%	8%	61%	10%
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	78%	53%	25%	57%	21%

Subgroup Data Review

2022 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 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21
SWD	17	31	29	24	39	41	33	41			
ELL	15	38	33	24	51	53	29	74			
BLK	26	33	24	30	45	50	31	54	79		
HSP	38	46	42	50	59	67	51	74	95		
MUL	48	38		31	42			77			
WHT	43	47		62	61		63	76	81		
FRL	27	35	25	32	46	52	29	57	85		
2021 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 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
SWD	13	22	16	15	29	32		19			
ELL	35	39	15	40	45	53	40	31			
ASN	90	90		80	60						
BLK	29	32	26	27	25	28	22	37	45		
HSP	42	39	29	45	31	33	33	60	89		
MUL	45	29		32	17						
WHT	45	33		53	41	50	68	45	81		
FRL	26	31	25	25	23	24	21	36	48		
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	24	32	24	24	35	32	33	36			
ELL	29	41	38	36	54	52	38	43			
ASN	71	61		89	63				90		
BLK	32	42	36	29	40	41	29	39	59		
HSP	38	51	50	45	55	65	48	49	76		
MUL	55	40		41	41						
WHT	71	59	38	68	50	35	78	81	74		
FRL	32	44	38	32	41	41	34	40	60		

ESSA Data Review

This data has not been updated for the 2022-23 school year.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	46
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	417
Total Components for the Federal Index	9
Percent Tested	98%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	32
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	40
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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	41
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	58
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	47
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	62
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	43
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis
Answer the following analysis questions using the progress monitoring data and state assessment data, if applicable.

What trends emerge across grade levels, subgroups and core content areas?

Significant gains in the following components were made from 2018-2019 to 2021-2022: Math learning gains (45% to 49%), Math lowest 25% learning gains (44% to 53%), Civics (48% to 61%), and Acceleration (66% to 84%). All other components decreased from 2018-2019. The subgroup Students with Disabilities has remained under 41% consistently since 2018-2019. Black/African American and English Language Learner subgroups range just under or just over 41% since 2018-2019 making these subgroups areas of focus as well.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

The data components that need the greatest improvement are all areas of ELA. Proficiency in ELA is at 31% which is a 10 point drop from 2018-2019. Learning gains in ELA is at 37% which is a 10 point drop from 2018-2019. Lowest 25% learning gains in ELA is at 26% which is a 12 point drop from 2018-2019. The subgroups Students with Disabilities (32% proficiency) and English Language Learners (40% proficiency) are additional areas in need of improvement.

What were the contributing factors to this need for improvement? What new actions would need to be taken to address this need for improvement?

There were two vacancies in ELA that started during the first semester and remained unfilled throughout the year. Inconsistent instruction in these two classrooms contributed to gaps in learning the standards. There was a lack of systems and structures in place to reteach and provide intervention when students demonstrated a lack of mastery of the standards. One primary focus for common planning will be structures that can be put into place to monitor the data throughout each unit and small group instruction lessons that will meet these needs. The ELA instructional coach will work with the teams to ensure there is time dedicated to providing intervention and reteaching of the standards. If there are long term vacancies the ELA instructional coach will work with the Tier I interventionist to push in to support these classrooms to ensure consistent instruction is taking place on a daily basis.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

Progress monitoring data during the 2021-2022 school year did not indicate that students would improve the final outcomes on state assessments when compared to prior year progress monitoring data. Fortunately there were in fact significant gains in the following components of the end of year State Assessments from 2018-2019 to 2021-2022: Math learning gains increased four points (45% to 49%), Math lowest 25% learning gains increased nine points (44% to 53%), Civics increased proficiency by 13 points (48% to 61%), and Acceleration increased by 18 points (66% to 84%).

What were the contributing factors to this improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

In each of these areas data analysis and targeted instruction were evident in common planning meetings and classroom walkthrough observations. The math interventionists were consistent and in a teacher's absence were able to continue instruction with fidelity. In Acceleration courses students were monitored closely and adjustments were made as needed for placement. The math coach was able to work closely with the teacher in these acceleration courses to model instruction and provide side by side coaching during lessons. Civics teachers were consistent in their attendance and data analysis and continued to use a spiral review throughout the year for areas in need of improvement. One of the civics teachers went through multiple coaching cycles with our school instructional coach as well as the district program assistant.

What strategies will need to be implemented in order to accelerate learning?

Data based decision-making will be used to determine where students are performing per standard to design and implement lessons to accelerate students. Teachers will provide targeted small group instruction that will meet students where they are within a standard in order to build on prior knowledge. Students will have access to individualized adaptive digital curriculum so that teachers can tailor instruction based on their current level of mastery.

Based on the contributing factors and strategies identified to accelerate learning, describe the professional development opportunities that will be provided at the school to support teachers and leaders.

Teachers will receive training in small group instruction, resources, acceleration strategies, the Multi Tiered Systems of Support process, and how to meet the needs of Students with Disabilities, Students with 504 plans, and English Language Learner students.

Provide a description of the additional services that will be implemented to ensure sustainability of improvement in the next year and beyond.

College Park Middle School will provide additional support to instruction by adding six interventionist positions to provide direct instruction during ELA and Math. We have an instructional coach dedicated to ELA support the transition to the B.E.S.T. Standards and a Curriculum Resource Teacher to coordinate the use of resources to support differentiation. Our teachers are provided Professional Development to build capacity and are provided weekly coaching and feedback to ensure sustainability.

Areas of Focus
Identify the key Areas of Focus to address your school's highest priorities based on any/all relevant data sources.

:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Differentiation	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.	College Park Middle School will use data based decision-making to drive differentiated instruction by consistently monitoring academic growth, and provide relevant interventions in ELA, Math, Science, and Civics. 2021-2022 state assessment data indicates that proficiency in ELA is 31%, Math is 37%, Science is 39%, and Civics is 61%. This is a decrease of ten points from the 2018-2019 school year in ELA, a four point decrease in Math, a five point decrease in Science, and a thirteen point increase in Civics.
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	Proficiency in ELA, Math, Science, and Civics will increase by 10% moving from 31% to 41% in ELA, 38% to 48% in Math and Science, and 61% to 71% in Civics.
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	Instructional practices relating to differentiation will be monitored through classroom walks, the coaching cycle, and the Multi Tiered Systems of Support process.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Monica Gordon (monica.gordon@ocps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being	College Park Middle School will use data based decision-making to drive differentiated instruction by consistently monitoring academic growth, and provide relevant interventions in ELA, Math, Science, and Civics. The Curriculum Resource Teacher will coordinate with coaches and teachers to match instructional resources to the needs identified during data analysis. Some of the resources that may be utilized in ELA and Intensive Reading will be iReady digital curriculum, iReady Teacher's Toolbox, and SIPPS. In Math, resources may include iReady digital curriculum, iReady Teacher's Toolbox, and Math XL. In Civics, resources may include iCivics and other resources found in the district provided curriculum

implemented for this Area of Focus.	resources. In Science, teachers may utilize Study Island as a resource to address differentiated instructional needs.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/ criteria used for selecting this strategy.	We selected this strategy to support both the planning process for and delivery of standards-based scaffolding to reach mastery.

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.

Analyze classroom walkthrough data to monitor instructional focus areas with specific actionable feedback.

Person Responsible	Hollie Pearce (hollie.pearce@ocps.net)

The Curriculum Resource Teacher will coordinate with coaches and teachers to match instructional resources to the needs identified during data analysis.

Person Responsible	Hollie Pearce (hollie.pearce@ocps.net)

Monitor the fidelity of the implementation of interventions used to support students through classroom walkthrough trend data and student reassessment data.

Person Responsible	Monica Gordon (monica.gordon@ocps.net)

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: **Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.**	College Park Middle School will increase learning gains for Students with Disabilities (SWD) by developing a system to analyze data by subgroup and scaffold instructional practices. Proficiency for Students with Disabilities was 32% in 2018-2019 and again in 2021-2022. We will monitor instructional practices through classroom walkthroughs.
Measurable Outcome: **State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.**	Proficiency for Students with Disabilities will increase by 10% moving from 32% to 42% by the end of the 2022-2023 school year.
Monitoring: **Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.**	College Park Middle School will increase learning gains for Students with Disabilities (SWD) by developing a system to analyze data by subgroup and scaffold instructional practices. We will monitor instructional practices through classroom walkthroughs.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Monica Gordon (monica.gordon@ocps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy: **Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.**	Build a system to analyze data, instructional practices, and make data-driven adjustments that improve student outcomes.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: **Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.**	We selected this strategy because our students with disabilities and similar groups such as those designated as 504 continue to struggle with learning gains in all areas. After teachers of students with disabilities implement instruction with accommodations, they will monitor student progress and make data-driven adjustments.

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.

Teachers will pull the Students with Disabilities sub group data for each common assessment to monitor the progress of these students as compared with all students.

Person Responsible	Hollie Pearce (hollie.pearce@ocps.net)

Coaches, teachers, support facilitators, and tier I interventionists will work to identify Students with Disabilities who are not making progress and create a plan for intervention matching resources and support staff to meet student needs.

Person Responsible	Monica Washington (monica.washington@ocps.net)

#3. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to improving conditions for learning.	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.	College Park Middle School will integrate and monitor resources and strategies that strengthen a culture for social and emotional wellbeing to grow every student academically, socially, and emotionally. Academic learning is enhanced when students have opportunities to interact with others and make meaningful connections to the subject material. By strengthening our school's culture for social and emotional wellbeing, we will support a positive culture and climate.
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	We will measure the success of our social and emotional wellbeing goal with the following data sources looking to see an increase in favorable responses and data indicators. These sources include: Early Warning Systems indicator data, Student Survey data, Teacher and Staff Survey data, and Family Survey data. Survey data will be measurable by our panorama survey. Student data will increase by 10% in School Climate from 26% to 36% and in Sense of Belonging from 29% to 39%. Teacher and Staff data will increase by 10% in Resources from 28% to 38% and in School Climate from 30% to 40%. Family data will increase by 10% in School Fit from 57% to 67% and in School Climate from 61% to 71%.
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	We will monitor the results of our Culture and Climate Continuum data, classroom walkthrough trend data, evaluative instructional and leadership practice observational data, and qualitative data from students, staff, and families.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Tanekia Gage (tanekia.gage@ocps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.	Use distributive leadership and social and emotional learning to implement a continuous improvement plan for social and emotional learning focused on implementing a school-wide Social Emotional Learning curriculum, intentionally integrating aligned instructional strategies, and deliberate school supports for families.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/ criteria used for selecting this strategy.

In order to achieve large-scale and sustainable improvement, it is necessary to invest in the collective capacity of a school building, including its families. To strengthen a culture of social and emotional learning with families, staff, and students, it is critical to harness the professional skills and leadership capabilities of everyone in the school. Through a distributive leadership model, our school will strengthen the integration of instructional strategies and deliberate school supports necessary for collective organizational improvement and change.

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.

Professional Development on self-advocacy, empathy, clear communication for students and adults

Person Responsible   Tanekia Gage (tanekia.gage@ocps.net)

Implementing a Positive Behavior Interventions and Supports district initiative monitored via Social and Emotional Learning walk-throughs.

Person Responsible   Thisha Williams (thisha.williams@ocps.net)

School counselor will conduct classroom lessons, group lessons, and individual counseling sessions.

Person Responsible   Alecia Sharpe (alecia.sharpe@ocps.net)

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 is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies that impact the school culture and environment. 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.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment.

In order to achieve large-scale and sustainable improvement, it is necessary to invest in the collective capacity of a school building, including its families. To strengthen a culture of social and emotional learning with families, staff, and students, it is critical to harness the professional skills and leadership capabilities of everyone in the school.

The school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families, and other community stakeholders.

The PTSA's goal is to foster a nurturing and caring environment that strives for continued parent involvement
in helping build a better educational environment for our students. The PTSA, along with SAC, seeks to promote a school community where teachers and administrators can do their best work with the resources we can provide and help make school fun.

For the PTSA to be effective and truly representative of the school, it is essential to have parental involvement from as many parents as possible. Many activities will be held during the evening hours to ensure increased participation of parents in school-sponsored activities. When parents volunteer they get the opportunity to enjoy interacting with their students.

In addition, a Secondary Engagement Liaison (SEL) is purchased with Title I funds to serve as a liaison to bridge the gap between school and home. The SEL advocates for the parents and encourages their involvement in all school activities. We will also develop and implement discipline policies that balance accountability with an understanding of trauma.

Identify the stakeholders and their role in promoting a positive school culture and environment.

Stakeholders include faculty, staff, parents, students, and community members. Parents and teachers participate in Parent Teacher Student Associate meetings and School Advisory Council Meetings. Staff participates in professional development based on Social Emotional Wellbeing instructional practices.