

Orange County Public Schools

College Park Middle School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	11
III. Planning for Improvement	16
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	24
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	0
VI. Title I Requirements	0
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	24

College Park Middle

1201 MAURY RD, Orlando, FL 32804

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

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes (F.S.), requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a new, amended, or continuation SIP for each school in the district which has a school grade of D or F; has a significant gap in achievement on statewide, standardized assessments administered pursuant to s. 1008.22 by one or more student subgroups, as defined in the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), 20 U.S.C. s. 6311(b)(2)(C)(v)(II); has not significantly increased the percentage of students passing statewide, standardized assessments; has not significantly increased the percentage of students demonstrating Learning Gains, as defined in s. 1008.34, and as calculated under s. 1008.34(3)(b), who passed statewide, standardized assessments; has been identified as requiring instructional supports under the Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE) program established in s. 1008.365; or has significantly lower graduation rates for a subgroup when compared to the state's graduation rate. Rule 6A-1.098813, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.), requires district school boards to approve a SIP for each Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) school in the district rated as Unsatisfactory.

Below are the criteria for identification of traditional public and public charter schools pursuant to the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) State plan:

Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)

A school not identified for CSI or TSI, but has one or more subgroups with a Federal Index below 41%.

Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)

A school not identified as CSI that has at least one consistently underperforming subgroup with a Federal Index below 32% for three consecutive years.

Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)

A school can be identified as CSI in any of the following four ways:

1. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%;
2. Have a graduation rate at or below 67%;
3. Have a school grade of D or F; or
4. Have a Federal Index below 41% in the same subgroup(s) for 6 consecutive years.

ESEA sections 1111(d) requires that each school identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI develop a support and improvement plan created in partnership with stakeholders (including principals and other school leaders, teachers and parent), is informed by all indicators in the State's accountability system, includes evidence-based interventions, is based on a school-level needs assessment, and identifies resource inequities to be addressed through implementation of the plan. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as TSI, ATSI and non-Title I CSI must be approved and monitored by the school district. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as Title I, CSI must be approved by the school district and

Department. The Department must monitor and periodically review implementation of each CSI plan after approval.

The Department's SIP template in the Florida Continuous Improvement Management System (CIMS), <https://www.floridacims.org>, meets all state and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all ESSA components for a support and improvement plan required for traditional public and public charter schools identified as CSI, TSI and ATSI, and eligible schools applying for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) funds.

Districts may allow schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions to develop a SIP using the template in CIMS.

The responses to the corresponding sections in the Department's SIP template may address the requirements for: 1) Title I schools operating a schoolwide program (SWD), pursuant to ESSA, as amended, Section 1114(b); and 2) charter schools that receive a school grade of D or F or three consecutive grades below C, pursuant to Rule 6A-1.099827, F.A.C. The chart below lists the applicable requirements.

SIP Sections	Title I Schoolwide Program	Charter Schools
I-A: School Mission/Vision		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(1)
I-B-C: School Leadership, Stakeholder Involvement & SIP Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(2-3)	
I-E: Early Warning System	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-A-C: Data Review		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-F: Progress Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(3)	
III-A: Data Analysis/Reflection	ESSA 1114(b)(6)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(4)
III-B: Area(s) of Focus	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(i-iii)	
III-C: Other SI Priorities		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(5-9)
VI: Title I Requirements	ESSA 1114(b)(2, 4-5), (7)(A)(iii)(I-V)-(B) ESSA 1116(b-g)	

Note: Charter schools that are also Title I must comply with the requirements in both columns.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Department encourages schools to use the SIP as a “living document” by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

I. School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

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, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring

School Leadership Team

For each member of the school leadership team, select the employee name and email address from the dropdown. Identify the position title and job duties/responsibilities as it relates to SIP implementation for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Fontaine, Derrick	Principal	Mr. Fontaine serves as the instructional leader, operational manager, and community liaison of the school. He 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. Mr. Fontaine establishes systems of guidance that result in a supportive learning environment with high expectations and increased student outcomes. Equally important, he provides avenues for teachers to collaborate, plan rigorous lessons, and contribute input for the optimal functioning of the school. Mr. Fontaine engages with district and community members to facilitate the use of resources that directly impacts student achievement.
Greene, Chandar	Assistant Principal	Dr. Greene 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. Dr. Greene monitors instructional processes to ensure academic goals and systems meet the needs of student and teachers. Dr. Greene monitors the ESE department to ensure sound instructional practices are extended to fit the individual needs of each student.
Williams, Isis	Assistant Principal	Ms. Williams 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. Williams monitors discipline processes to ensure a safe learning and working environment. Ms. Williams also leads campus operations, ensuring our infrastructure supports our students, faculty, and staff.
Potter, Alexis	Instructional Coach	Coordinating resources for coaches, teachers, and interventionists.
Byfield, Michelle	Reading Coach	Provide professional development, analyze data, provide peer coaching support and peer observation feedback, assist with small group instruction, and facilitate ELA/Reading common planning.
Seaver, Sarah	Math Coach	Provide professional development, analyze data, provide peer coaching support and peer observation feedback, assist with small group instruction, and facilitate Math/ Science common planning.
Williams, Thisha	School Counselor	Student academic counseling, scheduling, mental health counseling, student recognitions.

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Sharpe, Alecia	School Counselor	Student academic counseling, scheduling, mental health counseling, student recognitions.
Gregory, Grace	Dean	Provide discipline support to students and teachers, support and conduct safety procedures and supervision
Williams, Anthony	Dean	Provide discipline support to students and teachers, support and conduct safety procedures and supervision
Wilson-Mosley, Dianna	Staffing Specialist	Holding compliance meetings for IDEA and Section 504 students. Collaborating with ESE, Section 504, and Gifted stakeholders to ensure correct placements for students.
Hurst, Kristy	Other	Provide professional development, analyze data, coordinate instructional resource alignment, facilitate school-wide testing, facilitate ESL compliance and monitoring, and assist with small group instruction.
Barringer, Alexandra	Other	Provide support to teachers and students utilizing media- related materials, technology, and books. Teach media production classes and facilitate Title I compliance.

Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Development

Describe the process for involving stakeholders (including the school leadership team, teachers and school staff, parents, students (mandatory for secondary schools) and families, and business or community leaders) and how their input was used in the SIP development process. (ESSA 1114(b)(2))

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

The leadership team of College Park Middle School took great care in selecting the stakeholders in the development of its School Improvement Plan (SIP). With our school demographic in mind, the leadership team's goal was to include stakeholders who represented the diversity of College Park MS, and its community. The leadership team was intentional in its inclusion of all stakeholder voices. All input from our stakeholder groups was respected and carefully considered in each step of the SIP's development. Stakeholders include faculty, staff, parents, students, and community members. Parents and teachers participate in Parent Teacher Student Association meetings and School Advisory Council Meetings. Staff participates in professional development based on science-based instructional practices.

SIP Monitoring

Describe how the SIP will be regularly monitored for effective implementation and impact on increasing the achievement of students in meeting the State's academic standards, particularly for those students with the greatest achievement gap. Describe how the school will revise the plan, as necessary, to ensure continuous improvement. (ESSA 1114(b)(3))

SIP will be regularly monitored by the stakeholder group and the leadership team. College Park MS will work collaboratively to analyze assessment data, create an action plan, and lay out steps to address

areas of focus. The implementation phase will then begin, with progress monitoring demarcations strategically placed. After which, all stakeholders will collaborate and make adjustments to the SIP as required.

Demographic Data
Only ESSA identification and school grade history updated 3/11/2024

2023-24 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Middle School 6-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	Yes
2022-23 Minority Rate	94%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	100%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	ATSI
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD)* English Language Learners (ELL)* Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: C 2019-20: C 2018-19: C 2017-18: C
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

Using 2022-23 data, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	42	83	80	205
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	109	92	211
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23	8	31
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	18	32
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	1	69	145	110	325
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	1	77	107	84	269
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	77	59	62	198
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that have two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	1	70	152	118	341

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

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

Prior Year (2022-23) As Initially Reported (pre-populated)

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	86	60	94	240
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	72	86	176
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	2	1	14
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	11	33	57
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	113	91	107	311
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	118	77	109	304
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	72	55	62	189

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	107	100	124	331

The number of students identified retained:

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

Prior Year (2022-23) Updated (pre-populated)

Section 3 includes data tables that are pre-populated based off information submitted in prior year's SIP.

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days							86	60	94	240
One or more suspensions							18	72	86	176
Course failure in ELA							11	2	1	14
Course failure in Math							13	11	33	57
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment							113	91	107	311
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment							118	77	109	304
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.							72	55	62	189

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	107	100	124	331

The number of students identified retained:

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

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review

ESSA School, District and State Comparison (pre-populated)

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school or combination schools). Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school.

On April 9, 2021, FDOE Emergency Order No. 2021-EO-02 made 2020-21 school grades optional. They have been removed from this publication.

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	28	48	49	31	49	50	34		
ELA Learning Gains				37			34		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				26			26		
Math Achievement*	39	57	56	37	36	36	34		
Math Learning Gains				49			28		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				53			29		
Science Achievement*	35	53	49	39	55	53	34		
Social Studies Achievement*	56	64	68	61	61	58	42		
Middle School Acceleration	74	77	73	84	52	49	65		
Graduation Rate					51	49			
College and Career Acceleration					69	70			
ELP Progress		43	40		79	76	47		

** In cases where a school does not test 95% of students in a subject, the achievement component will be different in the Federal Percent of Points Index (FPPI) than in school grades calculation.*

See [Florida School Grades, School Improvement Ratings and DJJ Accountability Ratings](#).

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	46
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	232
Total Components for the Federal Index	5

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
Percent Tested	98
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	46
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	417
Total Components for the Federal Index	9
Percent Tested	98
Graduation Rate	

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	19	Yes	4	1
ELL	24	Yes	2	1
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	43			
HSP	51			
MUL	41			
PAC				
WHT	59			
FRL	47			

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	32	Yes	3	
ELL	40	Yes	1	
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	41			
HSP	58			
MUL	47			
PAC				
WHT	62			
FRL	43			

Accountability Components by Subgroup

Each “blank” cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school. (pre-populated)

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2021-22	C & C Accel 2021-22	ELP Progress
All Students	28			39			35	56	74			
SWD	11			18			18	29			4	
ELL	17			25			27	25			4	
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	24			35			31	52	71		5	
HSP	36			38			43	61	76		5	
MUL	31			53			40				3	
PAC												
WHT	38			63			50	85			4	
FRL	28			37			36	56	76		5	

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21	ELP Progress
All Students	31	37	26	37	49	53	39	61	84			
SWD	17	31	29	24	39	41	33	41				
ELL	15	38	33	24	51	53	29	74				
AMI												
ASN												
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				
PAC												
WHT	43	47		62	61		63	76	81			
FRL	27	35	25	32	46	52	29	57	85			

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20	ELP Progress
All Students	34	34	26	34	28	29	34	42	65			47
SWD	13	22	16	15	29	32	0	19				
ELL	35	39	15	40	45	53	40	31				47
AMI												
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							
PAC												
WHT	45	33		53	41	50	68	45	81			
FRL	26	31	25	25	23	24	21	36	48			

Grade Level Data Review– State Assessments (pre-populated)

The data are raw data and include ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data. The percentages shown here represent ALL students who received a score of 3 or higher on the statewide assessments.

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

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
07	2023 - Spring	32%	45%	-13%	47%	-15%
08	2023 - Spring	26%	46%	-20%	47%	-21%
06	2023 - Spring	21%	44%	-23%	47%	-26%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	30%	53%	-23%	54%	-24%
07	2023 - Spring	22%	38%	-16%	48%	-26%
08	2023 - Spring	45%	58%	-13%	55%	-10%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	33%	50%	-17%	44%	-11%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	74%	47%	27%	50%	24%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	100%	45%	55%	48%	52%

CIVICS						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	53%	61%	-8%	66%	-13%

III. Planning for Improvement

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

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

Per the Accountability Component, English Language Arts (ELA) achievement decreased by 3 points, while learning gains for ELA increased to 37. ELA Lowest 25 percentile stayed flat at 26 from the previous year. With respect to the 2022-23 school year F.A.S.T. assessment scores, the data component that showed the lowest performance are all areas of ELA. School-wide proficiency in ELA was 14%. Three-year moving data shows steady decreases from the 2020-21 school year at 21.1%, to 17.1% from the 2021-22 school year. School-wide vacancies were a major contributing factor to last year's low performance in ELA. During the 2022-23 school year, there were three vacancies in the ELA department throughout the school year. The lack of structure, clear expectations, and proper systems in place to extend quality instructional practices and interventions contributed to students not demonstrating a mastery of the standards. Due to the departure of the ELA instructional coach in Quarter 1, the lack of strong Professional Learning Communities (PLC), Professional Development (PD), analyzation and disaggregation of the data, and linking the data to instructional outcomes was problematic. Lastly, interventionists had to fill in the vacancies and could not provide needed support to close gaps.

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

Based on all available data sources, including the F.A.S.T. assessment scores, the data component showing the greatest decline from the prior year is ELA. Multiple contributing factors were at play last school year. Again, multiple vacancies in the ELA department, the departure of the ELA Instructional Coach, lack of frequent and effective PLCs and PDs to strengthen educators' pedagogy.

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.

During school year 2021-22, College Park lagged behind the district and state in the area of ELA. The greatest gaps when compared to the state average with non-proficiency scores were over 20 percentage points higher at 44.8% compared to 24.6% for the state. When analyzing 2022-23 data, College Park has a non-proficiency score of approximately 68%. Again, multiple contributing factors were at play last school year. Again, multiple vacancies in the ELA department, the departure of the ELA Instructional Coach, lack of frequent and effective PLCs and PDs to strengthen educators' pedagogy.

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

Progress monitoring data during the 2022-2023 school year did indicate that students would improve the final outcomes on state assessments. With respect to schoolwide F.A.S.T. Math scores, from the Beginning of Year to End of Year, there was a 16% decrease in the number of students scoring non-proficient; there was a 17% increase in proficiency; there was an 8% increase in higher proficiency and a 4% increase in mastery. Per the Accountability Component data, Math achievement rose to 37 points from 34. Math learning gains increased to 49 from 28, while the Math lowest 25th percentile saw the largest increase of 24 points, from 29 to 53 points. Middle School Acceleration increased from 65 points to 84. Science and Social Studies achievement saw increases of 5 and 19 points respectively. Actions taken by College Park revealed 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.

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

Based on the EWS data from Part 1, a potential area of concern would be non-proficiency performance on the ELA F.A.S.T. assessment. An additional area of concern would be students failing Math.

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

Our highest priorities for school improvement for the upcoming school year would be: School Safety and Culture; Providing quality instruction using science-based strategies and interventions for all students including all sub-groups; Analyzing data and allowing the data to drive instruction; Building a culture that sees the importance of PLCs and PD; Increase parent and community relations.

Area of Focus

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

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Instructional Coaching/Professional Learning**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed.

One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

College Park Middle School will use data-driven decision-making to drive instructional practices through differentiated strategies. This will be achieved through consistently monitoring academic growth and providing relevant interventions in all core academic areas (ELA, Math, Science, and Civics). Per the Accountability Component, English Language Arts (ELA) achievement decreased by 3 points, while learning gains for ELA increased to 37. ELA Lowest 25 percentile stayed flat at 26 from the previous year. With respect to the 2022-23 school year F.A.S.T. assessment scores, the data component that showed the lowest performance are all areas of ELA. School-wide proficiency in ELA was 14%. Three-year moving data shows steady decreases from the 2020-21 school year at 21.1%, to 17.1% from the 2021-22 school year. Professional Development (PD) on how to meet the needs of Students with Disabilities, Students with 504 plans, and English Language Learner students. PDs will be provided to staff on offer accommodations to students with disabilities, through dedicated lesson planning, sound differentiated instructional practices, and common planning with ESE teachers as support facilitators. District support from the ESE department to provide sound interventions and strategies to assist both general education and ESE teachers support all learners.

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 14% to 24% in ELA, 20% to 30% in Math and Science, and 16% to 26% 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:

Derrick Fontaine (derrick.fontaine@ocps.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

College Park Middle School will use science-based, data-driven decision-making to drive differentiated instruction by consistently monitoring academic growth, and providing relevant interventions, through coaching and feedback in all core academic courses (ELA, Math, Science, and Civics). The Instructional Coach 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 Khan Academy, Imagine Learning (ELL), Scholastic Books, and SIPPS. In Math, resources may include Khan Academy, Hand2Mind Manipulatives, and Math XL. In Civics, resources may include iCivics and other resources found in the district-provided curriculum (CRMS), resources. In Science, teachers may utilize Study Island as a resource to address differentiated instructional needs.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Based on available data, the school team has decided on strategies to support both the planning process for and delivery of standards-based, scaffolded instruction to all students to reach mastery.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

The school team will analyze classroom walkthrough data to monitor instructional focus areas with specific actionable feedback presented with coaching cycle as a framework.

Person Responsible: Chandar Greene (chandar.greene@ocps.net)

By When: By the end of the 2023-2024 school year

The Instructional Coach will coordinate with coaches and teachers to match instructional resources to the needs identified during data analysis.

Person Responsible: Chandar Greene (chandar.greene@ocps.net)

By When: By the end of the 2023-2024 school year

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

Person Responsible: Derrick Fontaine (derrick.fontaine@ocps.net)

By When: By the end of the 2023-2024 school year

#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 crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

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% for the third consecutive year being under 42%. We will monitor instructional practices through classroom walkthroughs, progress monitoring from F.A.S.T. Assessments, and common assessment data.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Proficiency on statewide assessments for Students with Disabilities will increase by 10% moving from 32% to 42%.

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 desegregate and analyze data by subgroup, allowing the data to drive all differentiated and scaffolded instructional practices. We will monitor instructional practices through classroom walkthroughs, and progress monitoring data through statewide, district, and classroom assessments.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Derrick Fontaine (derrick.fontaine@ocps.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

College Park Middle School will develop a system to desegregate and analyze data, employ science-based instructional practices, and make data-driven adjustments that improve student academic outcomes.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

College Park Middle School selected this strategy due to the struggles with learning gains in all academic areas in our students with disabilities and similar groups such as those receiving services under Section 504. Progress monitoring and review of the implementation of accommodations and relevant services (with fidelity), then using these sources to make data-driving decisions and adjustments.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Classroom teachers will review the Students with Disabilities sub-group data for each common assessment to monitor the progress of these students as compared with all students. Classroom teachers will

desegregate and analyze the data and identify trends. During common planning and PLCs, the team will use the data to drive instructional decisions.

Person Responsible: Chandar Greene (chandar.greene@ocps.net)

By When: By the end of the 2023-2024 school year

Instructional coaches, teachers, support facilitators, and tier I interventionists will work to identify Students with Disabilities who are not making progress and create an individualized plan for intervention, to work in tandem with their IEP/Section 504 plan, matching resources and support staff to meet each student's needs.

Person Responsible: Alexis Potter (alexis.potter@ocps.net)

By When: By the end of the 2023-2024 school year

#3. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Early Warning System**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed.

One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

College Park Middle School will foster an inclusive instructional environment that builds upon implemented and integrated instructional practices and strategies. By doing so, we feel this will build a culture that will positively enhance the learning outcomes of each student holistically and in all sub-groups. Building a culture where each student is afforded the opportunity to engage in collaborative groups, explore the social and emotional aspects of connection with one another, and find strong connections to the content. By providing a safe learning environment, with high expectations, we will be able to forge a culture to support higher learning gains.

Measurable Outcome:

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

College Park will measure the success of our culture through an active engagement goal with the following data sources looking to see an increase in favorable responses and data indicators. These sources include: Progress monitoring in all sub-groups, 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 41% to 51% and in Sense of Belonging from 44% to 54%. Teacher and Staff data will increase by 10% in Resources from 40% to 50% and in School Climate from 26% to 36%. Family data will increase by 10% in School Fit from 60% to 70% and in School Climate from 33% to 43%.

Monitoring:

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

College Park Middle School will monitor the results of our Culture and Climate Continuum data, classroom walkthrough trend data, evaluative instructional and leadership practice observational data, and qualitative/quantitative/anecdotal data from students, staff, and families.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Isis Williams (12566@ocps.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Use distributive and emotionally intelligent leadership and implement a continuous improvement plan with a science-based cultural and engagement focus for school-wide implementation, intentionally integrating aligned instructional strategies, and deliberate school support for all students (with all sub-groups), teachers, and families.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

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

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Professional Development on building an inclusive and culturally focused learning environment with communication for constituents.

Person Responsible: Isis Williams (isis.williams@ocps.net)

By When: By the end of the 2023-2024 school year

Implementing a Positive Behavior Interventions and Supports (PBIS) initiative. The school team will monitor data from discipline records, PBIS data, and instructional walk-throughs.

Person Responsible: Isis Williams (isis.williams@ocps.net)

By When: By the end of the 2023-2024 school year

CSI, TSI and ATSI Resource Review
 Describe the process to review school improvement funding allocations and ensure resources are allocated based on needs. This section must be completed if the school is identified as ATSI, TSI or CSI in addition to completing an Area(s) of Focus identifying interventions and activities within the SIP (ESSA 1111(d)(1)(B)(4) and (d)(2)(C)).

School improvement allocations for funding and resources are based on the needs of the students. College Park Middle School is committed to fiscal responsibility as it relates to allocations. The principal will form a team of stakeholders which would include teachers, administration, and other constituents. The school team and all stakeholders will meet regularly to monitor funding and resource expenditures. The school team and stakeholders will ensure all resources are allocated to support specific data-driven needs. The school team will set the calendar, demarcating the times of review for the team. Each meeting will be held with fidelity, with each proposed expenditure being thoroughly reviewed. Once approved, each expenditure will be monitored for effectiveness in improving instructional outcomes. If the data from progress monitoring reveals any ineffectiveness or low return on investment, the school team will review the data and make informed decisions.

Budget to Support Areas of Focus

Part VII: Budget to Support Areas of Focus

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

1	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Instructional Coaching/Professional Learning				\$0.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2023-24
	Classroom Teachers and ESE Teachers		0581 - College Park Middle	General Fund	4.0	\$0.00
<i>Notes: Any use of the General Fund, must be allocated to student improvement.</i>						

2	III.B.	Area of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities				\$0.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2023-24
	Classroom Teachers, ESE Teachers, and Instructional Coaches and Interventionists		0581 - College Park Middle	General Fund	7.0	\$0.00
<i>Notes: Any use of the General Fund, must be allocated to student improvement.</i>						
3	III.B.	Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Early Warning System				\$0.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2023-24
	Administration, stakeholder faculty groups, students, and families		0581 - College Park Middle			\$0.00
<i>Notes: Any use of the General Fund, must be allocated to student improvement.</i>						
Total:						\$0.00

Budget Approval

Check if this school is eligible and opting out of UniSIG funds for the 2023-24 school year.

No