

Orange County Public Schools

Chain Of Lakes Middle



2018-19 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	3
School Information	4
Needs Assessment	6
Planning for Improvement	10
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Chain Of Lakes Middle

8700 CONROY WINDERMERE RD, Orlando, FL 32835

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

School Demographics

<p>School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)</p> <p>Middle School 6-8</p>	<p>2017-18 Title I School</p> <p>No</p>	<p>2017-18 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p>69%</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>84%</p>

School Grades History

Year	2017-18	2016-17	2015-16	2014-15
Grade	C	B	C	B*

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.

Our mission is to lead students to success with the support and involvement of families and the community.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Our vision is to be the top producer of successful students in the nation.

School Leadership Team

Membership

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

Name	Title
Anderson, Cheron	Principal
Morse, James	Assistant Principal
Slaughter, Angela	Assistant Principal
Rodriguez, Heather	Dean
Correa, Allison	Other
Coleman, Altresse	Instructional Coach
Powell, Kimberly	Dean
Gregory, Grace	Dean
Brown, James	Dean

Duties

Describe the roles and responsibilities of the members, including how they serve as instructional leaders and practice shared decision making.

The school-based leadership team is comprised of Cheron Anderson (Principal), Angela Slaughter (Assistant Principal for Instruction), James Morse (Assistant Principal), Heather Rodriguez (Academic Dean), Allison Correa (Compliance Teacher), Altresse Coleman Moore (Literacy Coach), Kimberly Powell (Dean), Grace Gregory (Dean), and James Brown (Dean). Members of the leadership team conduct weekly classroom walk through observations, attend weekly Professional Learning Community meetings, and actively engage in the collaborative planning process to monitor and evaluate instructional practices throughout the campus.

As the primary instructional leaders, Mr. Anderson, Mr. Morse, and Dr. Slaughter facilitate weekly leadership team meetings to evaluate school wide programs, discuss instructional practice and student data trends, and to develop plans to maintain instructional strengths while improving weaknesses. The leadership team also monitors and reviews the implementation and effectiveness of the MTSS process and best practice strategies in order to fully utilize the system and provide teachers and students with the highest level of support. The entire leadership team has been trained in the Marzano Observation protocol. Through routine disaggregation of teacher observation data, the team plans professional development based on the needs of the teachers and students. In addition, targeted element focus is discussed and disseminated to teachers to improve the implementation of

Marzano elements addressing content. As a result of these collaborative practices, the school's leadership team makes decisions in response to various sources of data.

Early Warning Systems

Year 2017-18

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	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	92	85	91	0	0	0	0	268
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	69	84	56	0	0	0	0	209
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	163	154	239	0	0	0	0	556
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	206	190	203	0	0	0	0	599

The number of students identified by the system as exhibiting two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students exhibiting two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	151	168	201	0	0	0	0	520

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	2	0	0	0	0	4
Retained Students: Previous Year(s)	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	5	0	0	0	0	14

Date this data was collected

Thursday 6/28/2018

Year 2016-17 - 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	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	88	77	97	0	0	0	0	262
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	121	75	98	0	0	0	0	294
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	165	193	126	0	0	0	0	484
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	165	173	136	0	0	0	0	474

The number of students identified by the system as exhibiting two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students exhibiting two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	159	138	123	0	0	0	0	420

Year 2016-17 - 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	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	88	77	97	0	0	0	0	262
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	121	75	98	0	0	0	0	294
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	165	193	126	0	0	0	0	484
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	165	173	136	0	0	0	0	474

The number of students identified by the system as exhibiting two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students exhibiting two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	159	138	123	0	0	0	0	420

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

Assessment & Analysis

Consider the following reflection prompts as you examine any/all relevant school data sources, including those in CIMS in the pages that follow.

Which data component performed the lowest? Is this a trend?

The lowest performing data component was learning gains for the lowest 25th percentile in Math at 35%. In 2016, this component performed the lowest at 38% and in 2017, second lowest at 50%. This indicates a trend of students in the lowest 25th percentile achieving some of the least learning gains for the past 3 years. Likewise, students categorized as black in the lowest 25th percentile was the lowest performing subgroup at 23% - compared to students categorized as white (63%), Hispanic (40%), students with disabilities (29), free and reduced lunch (30), and English language learners (26%).

Other areas of significant low performance were ELA achievement and Math learning gains. The data show that 48% of students school-wide were proficient in ELA achievement; this is a decrease from 57% the prior year. The data show that 43% of students made learning gains in Math compared to 55% the prior year.

Which data component showed the greatest decline from prior year?

The data component that showed the greatest decline from the prior year was learning gains for the lowest 25th percentile in Math at 15%. Similarly, there was a substantial decline in the number of 8th grade students achieving learning gains with a -29% difference from the prior year.

Which data component had the biggest gap when compared to the state average?

The data component that had the biggest gap when compared to the state was learning gains for the lowest 25th percentile in Math. There was a -16% difference between the state average (51%) and the school average (35%). During the prior year, this data component surpassed the district's average and matched the state average.

Which data component showed the most improvement? Is this a trend?

The data component that showed the most improvement was middle school acceleration. There was a 4% increase in the number of eligible students who passed a high school level EOC assessment or industry certification. Of significant impact was a 9% increase in the number of students passing the Algebra EOC. The data does indicate a trend as prior year's data showed a 14% increase in the middle school acceleration component, which was also the most improvement.

Describe the actions or changes that led to the improvement in this area.

The most significant changes that led to the improvement in middle school acceleration were: scheduling Level 3 Algebra students in a double block of Algebra, participation in the MAO Calculus Project, and increasing the number of course offerings eligible for industry certification.

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	2018			2017		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	48%	52%	53%	54%	52%	52%
ELA Learning Gains	51%	50%	54%	56%	53%	53%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	45%	42%	47%	51%	44%	45%
Math Achievement	44%	53%	58%	46%	53%	55%
Math Learning Gains	43%	51%	57%	44%	53%	55%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	35%	44%	51%	38%	46%	47%
Science Achievement	49%	51%	52%	44%	48%	50%
Social Studies Achievement	60%	68%	72%	66%	67%	67%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)			Total
	6	7	8	
Attendance below 90 percent	92 (88)	85 (77)	91 (97)	268 (262)
One or more suspensions	69 (121)	84 (75)	56 (98)	209 (294)
Course failure in ELA or Math	163 (165)	154 (193)	239 (126)	556 (484)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	206 (165)	190 (173)	203 (136)	599 (474)

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	2018	36%	48%	-12%	52%	-16%
	2017	50%	52%	-2%	52%	-2%
Same Grade Comparison		-14%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2018	42%	48%	-6%	51%	-9%
	2017	50%	52%	-2%	52%	-2%
Same Grade Comparison		-8%				
Cohort Comparison		-8%				
08	2018	50%	55%	-5%	58%	-8%
	2017	51%	52%	-1%	55%	-4%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2018	31%	35%	-4%	52%	-21%
	2017	33%	43%	-10%	51%	-18%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2018	40%	51%	-11%	54%	-14%
	2017	45%	52%	-7%	53%	-8%
Same Grade Comparison		-5%				
Cohort Comparison		7%				
08	2018	16%	32%	-16%	45%	-29%
	2017	21%	30%	-9%	46%	-25%
Same Grade Comparison		-5%				
Cohort Comparison		-29%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2018	44%	49%	-5%	50%	-6%
	2017					
Cohort Comparison						

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2018					
2017					

CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2018	54%	66%	-12%	71%	-17%
2017	59%	67%	-8%	69%	-10%
Compare		-5%			

HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2018					
2017					

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2018	81%	61%	20%	62%	19%
2017	72%	53%	19%	60%	12%
Compare		9%			

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2018	75%	65%	10%	56%	19%
2017	96%	43%	53%	53%	43%
Compare		-21%			

Subgroup Data

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	22	45	38	17	30	29	24	29	40		
ELL	25	52	49	29	44	36	26	42	77		
ASN	81	57		77	55		89	100	78		
BLK	37	43	37	27	31	23	32	48	58		
HSP	48	53	51	48	49	40	47	58	78		
MUL	63	67		67	62						
WHT	65	60	52	63	53	63	74	77	85		
FRL	44	48	43	38	39	30	44	55	73		

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	25	41	42	25	56	58	20	46			
ELL	38	62	64	27	56	52	21	60	61		
ASN	84	72		85	67		78	89	88		
BLK	41	49	45	29	46	40	30	53	56		
HSP	59	62	61	54	56	53	56	79	72		

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
MUL	60	70		52	48						
WHT	78	73	78	71	68	83	70	83	83		
FRL	49	55	54	41	52	48	43	60	66		

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Develop specific plans for addressing the school's highest-priority needs by identifying the most important areas of focus based on any/all relevant school data sources, including the data from Section II (Needs Assessment/Analysis).

Areas of Focus:

Activity #1	
Title	Chain of Lakes Middle School will focus on monitoring student mastery of content-specific complex texts and rigorous, standards-aligned tasks.
Rationale	According to the school grade component data, students showed a significant overall decrease in ELA achievement (-9%) and Math learning gains (-12%). Building and monitoring teachers' and students' capacity to utilize close reading strategies will impact students' ability to be successful when working with content-specific, complex texts and rigorous, standards-aligned tasks. Providing professional development will enable teachers to develop rigorous learning opportunities and expose students to more rigorous, standards-aligned tasks. And, implementing deliberate monitoring practices will inform action steps to help ensure student understanding and mastery of learning standards. As a result, student achievement will increase.
Intended Outcome	The intended outcome is that students will show measurable performance increases in the classroom and on the Florida Standards Assessments. Specifically, the intent is for 59% of students to achieve a proficient level in ELA and Math achievement and to improve learning gains for all students in ELA (62%) and Math (59%).
Point Person	Cheron Anderson (cheron.anderson@ocps.net)
Action Step	
Description	<p>The first action step is that the District PLC will support teachers with using close reading strategies to enable students to comprehend and persevere through complex texts. Teachers will choose appropriate, content-specific, complex texts and model close reading strategies and tools. Teachers will also reflect and modify instructional practice based on student evidence and professional learning. Teachers will build students' capacity to independently use close reading strategies to be successful with complex texts.</p> <p>The second action step is for resource teachers to facilitate professional learning opportunities to support the planning of rigorous, standards - aligned tasks. Resource teachers will develop a plan for rigor and standards alignment of lessons. Resource teachers will also provide professional learning and ongoing support for teachers in monitoring student understanding and mastery of learning standards. Teachers will engage in evaluation of planned learning tasks for alignment to the rigor of Florida Standards.</p> <p>The third action step is for the leadership team to develop a structured system for monitoring teacher and student progress. Monitoring for teachers will be differentiated based on need as determined through classroom walk-throughs and observations. Monitoring for student mastery will occur through PLC data chats and school-wide progress monitoring.</p>
Person Responsible	Altesse Coleman (altesse.coleman@ocps.net)
Plan to Monitor Effectiveness	
Description	To monitor effectiveness, members of the leadership team will actively participate in and monitor school level professional development and support sessions facilitated by the District PLC team members. Leadership team members will also conduct weekly walk-through observations to monitor classroom instruction, ensuring close reading strategies are implemented. Evidence of implementation will include lesson plans, reflections on the use of content area reading, classroom observation data showing implementation of close reading strategies, and student evidence of the ability to independently use close reading strategies.

To monitor effectiveness of professional learning opportunities, the leadership team will review the professional development plans for execution and alignment to growth goals. The leadership team will evaluate the facilitation of the professional learning opportunities targeting rigorous, standards-aligned tasks. Evidence of execution and alignment will include a professional development calendar aligned with growth goals, professional development sign-in sheets, classroom observation data demonstrating rigorous, standards-aligned tasks, and student performance data indicating student mastery of Florida standards.

Person Responsible Cheron Anderson (cheron.anderson@ocps.net)

Activity #2	
Title	Chain of Lakes Middle School will focus on improving student engagement through culturally responsive teaching.
Rationale	According to the school grade component data, there is a significant achievement gap between demographic subgroups of the student population. The most evident indicator is that for the Math learning gains data component, students categorized as black in the lowest 25th percentile was the lowest performing subgroup at 23%. This was a significant difference compared to students categorized as white (63%), Hispanic (40%), students with disabilities (29%), free and reduced lunch (30%), and English language learners (26%). Therefore, providing structured support and guidance for culturally responsive teaching will facilitate more effective instruction. Implementation of, and active student engagement in, research based culturally responsive teaching practices, coupled with the effective use of monitoring and collaborative learning strategies, will help the school meet the diverse learning needs of students.
Intended Outcome	The main intended outcome of focusing on culturally responsive teaching is to help at least 50% of our lowest 25th percentile students, and 35% of our black subgroup, achieve learning gains in Math.
Point Person	Angela Slaughter (angela.slaughter@ocps.net)
Action Step	
Description	The leadership team will research and provide opportunities for professional growth and learning in the area of culturally responsive teaching. The initiative will be supported by best instructional practices related to cooperative learning, monitoring, and student engagement. Teachers will review data on student subgroups and identify target students in need of significant support. Teachers will develop and implement strategies for facilitating collaborative learning, monitoring student learning, and engaging all students. The leadership team will continuously model proper culturally responsive instruction, monitor for evidence of effective implementation, and provide support to PLCs.
Person Responsible	Angela Slaughter (angela.slaughter@ocps.net)
Plan to Monitor Effectiveness	
Description	The leadership team will attend PLC meetings and review PLC documentation and common lesson plans to determine the implementation of structures that support culturally responsive teaching. Evidence of this will teacher lesson plans reflecting rich and meaningful learning experiences and PLC and data forms reflecting the use of data to drive instruction
Description	The leadership team will conduct weekly classroom observations and review lesson plans to determine implementation of monitoring strategies during daily instruction. Evidence of this will include classroom observation data showing student centered learning; additionally, the leadership team will collect evidence for lessons reflecting deliberate collaboration, monitoring, and engagement strategies.
Person Responsible	Angela Slaughter (angela.slaughter@ocps.net)