

Orange County Public Schools

# Magnolia School



## 2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

---

## Table of Contents

---

<b>School Demographics</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>Title I Requirements</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>0</b>

# Magnolia School

1900 MATTERHORNE DR, Orlando, FL 32818

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

## Demographics

**Principal: Timothy Shuler**

Start Date for this Principal: 3/13/2019

<b>2019-20 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Combination School PK-12
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	Special Education
<b>2018-19 Title I School</b>	Yes
<b>2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	79%
<b>2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities Black/African American Students Hispanic Students* Economically Disadvantaged Students*
<b>School Grades History</b>	2018-19: No Grade 2017-18: No Grade 2016-17: No Grade 2015-16: No Grade 2014-15: No Grade
<b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>	
<b>SI Region</b>	Southeast
<b>Regional Executive Director</b>	<a href="#">LaShawn Russ-Porterfield</a>
<b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>	N/A
<b>Year</b>	
<b>Support Tier</b>	
<b>ESSA Status</b>	CS&I
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, <a href="#">click here</a> .	

## 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](http://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

---

<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>Title I Requirements</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>0</b>

# Magnolia School

1900 MATTERHORNE DR, Orlando, FL 32818

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

## School Demographics

<p><b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)</p> <p>Combination School PK-12</p>	<p><b>2018-19 Title I School</b></p> <p>No</p>	<p><b>2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p>%</p>
<p><b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)</p> <p>Special Education</p>	<p><b>Charter School</b></p> <p>No</p>	<p><b>2018-19 Minority Rate</b> (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p>%</p>

## School Grades History

<p><b>Year</b></p> <p><b>Grade</b></p>		<p><b>2011-12</b></p> <p>F</p>
--	--	--------------------------------

## 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.**

Mission:

To lead our students to success with the support and involvement of families and the community.

**Provide the school's vision statement.**

Vision:

To be the top producer of successful students in the Nation

We envision all students at Magnolia School achieving their maximum individual, social, and academic potential.

### School Leadership Team

**Membership**

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

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Green, Latonia	Principal	
Thomson, Arlene	Assistant Principal	
Lee, Wendy	Assistant Principal	
Treffinger, Michelle	Other	Behavior Analyst
Adkins, Joshua	Other	
Garcia, Arlene	Instructional Coach	
Rodenberry, Lisa	Other	
Hogan, Andrea	Other	
Lee, Alia	Other	
Hughes, Cynthia	Attendance/Social Work	
Stockard, James	Other	

### Early Warning Systems

**Current Year**

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	11	2	9	15	7	26	76
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	1	0	2	2	14	23
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	2	0	2	7
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	0	1	8	0	8	23

**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	1	2	0	0	2	0	6	11

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

**FTE units allocated to school (total number of teacher units)**

42

**Date this data was collected or last updated**

Wednesday 6/26/2019

**Prior Year - As Reported**

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	3	1	0	10	17
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	0	2	5
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	2	10	10	5	4	37
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	0	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	1	1	1	3	1	0	4	11

**Prior Year - Updated**



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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	3	1	0	10	17
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	0	2	5
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	2	10	10	5	4	37
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	0	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	1	1	1	3	1	0	4	11

**Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis**

**School Data**

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

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	0%	62%	61%	0%	67%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	0%	60%	59%	0%	62%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	0%	55%	54%	0%	53%	51%
Math Achievement	0%	61%	62%	0%	62%	58%
Math Learning Gains	0%	60%	59%	0%	59%	56%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	0%	54%	52%	0%	52%	50%
Science Achievement	0%	56%	56%	0%	55%	53%
Social Studies Achievement	0%	74%	78%	0%	81%	75%

**EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey**

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	6 (0)	11 (0)	2 (0)	9 (0)	15 (0)	7 (0)	26 (0)	76 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	1 (1)	3 (1)	1 (1)	0 (3)	2 (1)	2 (0)	14 (10)	23 (17)
One or more suspensions	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	1 (0)	2 (1)	0 (0)	0 (1)	2 (1)	0 (0)	2 (2)	7 (5)
Course failure in ELA or Math	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey															
Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)													Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12		
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (3)	6 (3)	0 (2)	1 (10)	8 (10)	0 (5)	8 (4)	23 (37)

**Grade Level Data**

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

NOTE: 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
03	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
05	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
06	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
07	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
09	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
10	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019					
	2018					

<b>MATH</b>						
<b>Grade</b>	<b>Year</b>	<b>School</b>	<b>District</b>	<b>School-District Comparison</b>	<b>State</b>	<b>School-State Comparison</b>
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
05	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
06	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
07	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				

<b>SCIENCE</b>						
<b>Grade</b>	<b>Year</b>	<b>School</b>	<b>District</b>	<b>School-District Comparison</b>	<b>State</b>	<b>School-State Comparison</b>
05	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison						
08	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				

<b>BIOLOGY EOC</b>					
<b>Year</b>	<b>School</b>	<b>District</b>	<b>School Minus District</b>	<b>State</b>	<b>School Minus State</b>
2019					
2018					

<b>CIVICS EOC</b>					
<b>Year</b>	<b>School</b>	<b>District</b>	<b>School Minus District</b>	<b>State</b>	<b>School Minus State</b>
2019					
2018					

<b>HISTORY EOC</b>					
<b>Year</b>	<b>School</b>	<b>District</b>	<b>School Minus District</b>	<b>State</b>	<b>School Minus State</b>
2019					
2018					

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

  

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

**Subgroup Data**

2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	29	48		25	70		36				
BLK	31	50		38							
HSP	20			14							
FRL	40	53		32							

  

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

  

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

**ESSA Data**

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

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	CS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	33
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	YES
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	4
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	230
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	78%

**Subgroup Data**

<b>Students With Disabilities</b>	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	35
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
<b>English Language Learners</b>	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	
<b>Native American Students</b>	
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%	
<b>Asian Students</b>	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
<b>Black/African American Students</b>	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	40
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
<b>Hispanic Students</b>	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	17
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
<b>Multiracial Students</b>	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	
<b>Pacific Islander Students</b>	
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%	

White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	31
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

**Analysis**

**Data Reflection**

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

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

When comparing FSAA ELA data for high school students (grades 9 & 10) with the FSAA ELA data for middle school students, the ELA data for high school students were lower. Of the 13 middle school students who completed the FSAA ELA, 84% (11) scored Level 2 or higher, while 62.5% (15 of 24) high school students scored Level 2 or higher. The data for FSAA Mathematics for both groups of students were less skewed. Of the 13 students who were assessed, 69.2% (9 of 13) of middle school students received Level 2 or higher for FSAA Math, while 64.9% (22 of 34) of the high school students completing math assessments received Level 2 or higher.

The data component that showed the lowest performance was that of FSAA ELA for our high school students. Increasing the monitoring of instruction could have been more pervasive.

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

FSAA ELA data at the high school level have shown the greatest decline from the prior year (a 9% decrease over the prior year - 71.4% to 62.5%) . Frequently reviewing lesson plans, providing actionable feedback on instructional delivery, and helping teachers to utilize academic data to drive ELA instruction could have been embedded in 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.**

According to the ESSA data, the component that had the greatest gap was the student achievement data for the Hispanic subgroup. Seventeen percent of the student achievement data of our Hispanic students is below the 41% of the Federal Index threshold. This is the first year that the academic data for our Hispanic subgroup was below 32%. More focused and frequent support aligned with evidence-based strategies for instructing ELL students would have been beneficial for these students.

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

The FSA Mathematies data component showed the most improvement. 38% (5 of 13) of our middle school students and 23% (8 of 34) of our high school students scored Level 3. 31% of middle school students and 43% of high school students scored Level 2 on FSA Mathematies. While following the district Scope and Sequence, there was a greater focus on academic concepts that were realistically achievable by our students. There were also collaboration and professional development concerning teacher concept knowledge as well as effective delivery of specific concepts deemed most appropriate for students.

**Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern? (see Guidance tab for additional information)**

Attendance is an area of concern, especially among high school students. In 2018 -19, 60.9% of students with attendance below 90% were high school students.

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

1. Improving overall student performance levels
2. Improving attendance
3. Decrease gaps in ESSA subgroups

## Part III: Planning for Improvement

### Areas of Focus:

<b>#1</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Improving Overall Student Achievement in Reading and Mathematics
<b>Rationale</b>	The 2018-19 FSAA results were as follows: 84.6% (11 of 13) of middle school students scored Level 2 and above for ELA, and 69.2% (9 of 13) of these students scored Level 2 and above in Mathematics. 62.5% (15 of 24) of the high school students scored Level 2 and above for ELA, and 70.6% (24 of 34) of these students scored Level 2 and above for Mathematics.
<b>State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve</b>	By the end of 2019-20, it is expected that there will be a 5% increase over the 2018-2019's results in Reading and Math for students taking the FSAA.
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome</b>	Wendy Lee (wendy.lee@ocps.net)
<b>Evidence-based Strategy</b>	Implement progress monitoring assessments during the school year which yields student growth, will be done monthly by the instructional coaches and the administration. Teachers will make instructional decisions based on that data. Administration will conduct classroom observations and provide teachers with actionable feedback.
<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy</b>	Diagnostic assessments consist of concepts that correspond to the Priority Standards designated by the district. The diagnostic allows students and teacher to not only familiarize themselves with the testing setting, but also provides additional practice with specific concepts. Summative assessments allow a focus of specific concepts. Between these forms of assessment, teachers will be able to critique their own instruction and focus on concepts that may need to reteach. Administrators and instructional leaders want to make sure teachers are instructing the appropriate concepts, and are monitoring student growth, and students are on the trajectory to accomplish the goals.
<b>Action Step</b>	
<b>Description</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Teachers will be provided with resources and trainings regarding incorporating technology in their lesson delivery.</li> <li>2. During PLC's, teachers will focus on common strategies for implementation that are aligned to standards.</li> <li>3. The school leaders will frequently monitor instruction in the classrooms for appropriate demonstration of evidence-based PLC practices.</li> <li>4. School leaders will provide actionable feedback, and focused and frequent support to teachers will help them deliver effective lessons.</li> <li>5. School leaders will maintain running records regarding feedback provided to teachers and their evidence of instructional proficiency.</li> </ol>
<b>Person Responsible</b>	Wendy Lee (wendy.lee@ocps.net)



<b>#2</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Improving attendance
<b>Rationale</b>	Our students demonstrated poor attendance especially at the high school level. When students are not in school, they cannot learn. When they are in school, effective instruction must be executed so that students will demonstrate with proficiency, the academic skills taught. Learning gains will be increased across the board, and student academic achievements will improve.
<b>State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve</b>	By the end of the school year 2019-20, student attendance will be over 95% for the entire school year.
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome</b>	Arlene Thomson (arlene.thomson@ocps.net)
<b>Evidence-based Strategy</b>	The goal is to implement OCPS attendance intervention plan where students with frequent absences will receive calls home or home visits by the Social Worker. Members of the leadership team will attend Attendance Child Study Meetings to discuss student attendance and take action based on needs.
<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy</b>	DOE determines the attendance policies for school-aged students and schools. Our school will implement and monitor these policies in order to improve attendance.
<b>Action Step</b>	
<b>Description</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Classroom teachers will call home when a student is absent without an excuse. Teachers will be held accountable for the initial monitoring.</li> <li>2. Classroom teachers will advise the Attendance Clerk or the Social Worker on five or more absences during the month from a student. Five or more absences within the month triggers a call or communication from the school Social Worker or the Attendance Clerk. This monitoring of attendance must be vigilant, intentional, frequent and purposeful.</li> <li>3. The Attendance Clerk will also be frequently monitoring students' absences through Skyward and making contact with parents. During the monthly Attendance Child Study Team meeting, participants must determine further actions for student and parents to participate in so that the student will improve attendance.</li> <li>4. Administration will monitor attendance through weekly leadership data chats regarding attendance and restorative justice statistics.</li> <li>5. Administration will recognize student accomplishments in both academics and attendance.</li> </ol>
<b>Person Responsible</b>	Arlene Thomson (arlene.thomson@ocps.net)

<b>#3</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Reduce Learning Gaps for Students in ESSA Subgroups
<b>Rationale</b>	Currently, four subgroups fall below 41% in proficiency including Students With Disabilities (SWD), Black, Hispanic and Economically Disadvantaged (ED).
<b>State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve</b>	All ESSA subgroup data will increase to or exceed 41% as shown by the Florida Alternative Assessment. The SWD subgroup will increase from 35% to 41%. The Black subgroups will increase from 40% to 41%. The Hispanic subgroup will increase from 17% to 41%. The ED subgroup will increase from 31% to 41%
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome</b>	Arlene Thomson (arlene.thomson@ocps.net)
<b>Evidence-based Strategy</b>	School-based leadership and teachers will monitor student progress toward achieving proficiency with Florida Standards and adjust instruction accordingly. Administration will monitor teachers' instruction by conducting classroom observations and providing feedback.
<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy</b>	By recognizing students' specific deficiencies, teachers may take action toward differentiating instruction to meet students' needs. This individualized instruction should lead to increased student outcomes.
<b>Action Step</b>	
<b>Description</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Teachers will administer diagnostic assessments with students.</li> <li>2. Teachers will meet with leadership team members to review data from diagnostic assessments and develop a plan of action to increase student performance.</li> <li>3. Teachers will implement action plans and continue to monitor student performance throughout the year.</li> <li>4. Adjust action plans as dictated by student performance on progress monitoring data.</li> <li>5. A "Ruby Payne" training that embodies culturally responsive instruction, will be done early in the school year to motivate teachers in developing positive relationships with students that foster a desire to be in school and to learn.</li> <li>6. Administration will observe instruction to ensure students' receive differentiated instruction based on their individual learning needs. Administration will provide actionable feedback to teachers on this instruction.</li> </ol>
<b>Person Responsible</b>	Wendy Lee (wendy.lee@ocps.net)

**Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities (optional)**

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities (see the Guidance tab for more information).

**Part IV: Title I Requirements**

**Additional Title I Requirements**

This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A schoolwide program and opts to use the Schoolwide Improvement Plan to satisfy the requirements of the schoolwide program plan, as outlined in the Every Student Succeeds Act, Public Law No. 114-95, Â§ 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

**Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families, and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission and support the needs of students.**

Family engagement is vital to student success. Parents are children's first teachers and parents are partners with teachers in the education of their children. The following framework will be utilized as a plan to increase family engagement at Magnolia:

Connecting with families by building a positive relationship and communicating the school's vision to work together with families will help guide the student's comprehensive learning. Engage parents by providing a variety of activities and frequent occasions to fully involve families including providing family support, increasing communication with families, creating volunteer opportunities, supporting learning at home, encouraging parents to be a part of the decision making team in school and collaborating with the community.

Sustain family engagement by addressing the common challenges to getting and keeping them engaged such as scheduling conflicts, transportation, making families feel welcome at school, and supporting teachers and staff in building relationships with families.

**PFEP Link**

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

**Describe how the school ensures the social-emotional needs of all students are being met, which may include providing counseling, mentoring and other pupil services.**

All members of the school staff participate in professional learning communities that meet informally and formally on a regular schedule. Collaboration occurs across grade levels, content areas, and feeder schools. Staff members implement a formal process that promotes productive discussion about student learning. School personnel can clearly link collaboration to improvement results in instructional practice and student performance. Successful implementation of social emotional learning programs such as Behavior Tools can increase support for student improvement and allow for a successful transition into post-secondary programs and or return to student's zoned school. Additionally, our onsite social worker and guidance counselor provide additional support for students by means of small groups and individual counseling.

**Describe the strategies the school employs to support incoming and outgoing cohorts of students in transition from one school level to another.**

The school-based MTSS leadership team will focus meetings on the development and maintenance of a problem-solving system to focus on student achievement. The MTSS leadership team meets bi-monthly to collaborate, problem-solve, share effective practices and strategies, evaluate implementation and fidelity of implementation, make data based decisions, and practice new processes and skills that are based on current academic data and observations. The team facilitates student learning and progress toward goal attainment.

Title I funds are utilized, in conjunction with various other federal, state, and local funds to support high quality instruction, family engagement, and professional development for student achievement. Title I services are coordinated and integrated with other resources through collaboration of staff in various

offices and departments, including: School and Community Support, Teaching and Learning, Assessment, Accountability, and Research, Professional Development, Communications, Partnerships, Human Resources, and Transportation. Title I staff monitor expenditures of Title I funds to ensure that they supplement rather than supplant other funds available to the school.

**Describe the process through which school leadership identifies and aligns all available resources (e.g., personnel, instructional, curricular) in order to meet the needs of all students and maximize desired student outcomes. Include the methodology for coordinating and supplementing federal, state and local funds, services and programs. Provide the person(s) responsible, frequency of meetings, how an inventory of resources is maintained and any problem-solving activities used to determine how to apply resources for the highest impact.**

The school leadership identifies and aligns all available resources in order to meet the needs of all students and maximize desired student outcomes. After the administrators and instructional coaches monitor teachers' instructional execution and student outcomes, teachers are tiered to offer them differentiated professional development to meet their specific professional needs. After professional development has been provided, leadership team members monitor and give actionable feedback to teachers to coach them, and to ensure they are instructing students effectively. This is an on-going process throughout the school year. New teachers are provided with an experienced mentor, and are also supported through participation in PLC. Master teachers and instructional coaches share evidence-based instructional strategies in the weekly PLCs and in other formal settings to assist peer teachers. The instructional coach and the curriculum resource teacher support teachers with evidence-based, best practices.

Federal, state and local funds are used and managed to support core curriculum activities and parent engagement events. The school bookkeeper manages these funds, and provides the principal with monthly reports. Our technology professional manages the technology equipment and apparatus needed for staff and students. This person is also responsible for keeping appropriate checks and balances to ensure that all technology devices are accounted for during the annual internal audit performed by the district or upon request by school administrators.

While these personnel are accountable for the inventory of the physical, material, and financial resources, it is the school administrator who is ultimately responsible for the appropriate use of all financial and physical resources of the school.

**Describe the strategies the school uses to advance college and career awareness, which may include establishing partnerships with business, industry or community organizations.**

The Bridges program at Magnolia provides intensive training and instruction for students ages 18 - 22 and prepares them for life at home, in the community and the workplace. Our curriculum focuses on functional living and employment skills. The goal is to ensure viable employment skills for every student upon graduating from Magnolia School. Developing job skills, work habits and appropriate social/emotional skills is a critical process to positive post-secondary outcomes. Students will acquire the knowledge and skills necessary for increased independence, self-determination, vocational/career interests and daily living skills. We believe that upon their exit from this program, they are equipped with 21st. century skills that will enable them to adapt and work well in business, industry or community organizations.